

HEW is assuming that it can put new life into the FDA by teaching the old watchdog new tricks, but in and out of Congress this approach is considered excessively optimistic in view of the past handling of drug problems. Critics believe the FDA can become the great, vital agency HUMPHREY envisions only if the old watchdogs are replaced by a new breed of scientist-administrators.

The hearings by Senator HUMPHREY's Government Reorganization Subcommittee this month and next will be followed by more hearings in the House. But it remains to be seen whether the FDA can continue to ignore criticism as it has in the past, or if Dr. Moulton will continue to stand by her testimony of 1960 that "hundreds of people, not merely in this country, suffer daily, and many die because the Food and Drug Administration has failed utterly in its solemn task of enforcing those sections of the law dealing with the safety and misbranding of drugs * * *."

THE GIANT CANADA GOOSE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my intention yesterday to call to the attention of the Senate a human interest story. At this time I shall take only a few moments to do so.

I had hoped to announce to the Senate, yesterday, that the world's largest goose, the giant Canada, which for over 30 years was thought to be extinct, has been rediscovered in Minnesota. These huge geese, which range in weight from 15 to 19 pounds, were found by Dr. Harold Hanson, of the Illinois Natural History Survey. Dr. Hanson, in cooperation with personnel of the Minnesota Department of Conservation and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Bureau of Sport, Fisheries and Wildlife, trapped approximately 200 of the birds, for examination and banding.

I am sure this will come as welcome news to sportsmen throughout the country. It also will be a source of joy to the membership of the Midwest Goose Association. Our Minnesota town of Sleepy Eye was privileged to be host to that association when it held its annual meeting January 10.

The flock of giant geese has been roosting on Silver Lake, which is in a Rochester park. The present nesting grounds of this giant goose are not known with certainty; but small scattered populations are believed to nest in the Dakotas, in western Minnesota, and in Manitoba. Returns from birds banded this winter may shed further light on the location of the present breeding grounds.

The giant Canada goose was well known to a past generation of hunters in the northern prairie States. In 1951, Jean Delacour, the internationally known waterfowl authority, supported the findings of James Moffitt, America's foremost student of geese, by describing and naming the giant Canada goose after it was thought to be extinct.

We in Minnesota are inclined to boast a bit about our North Star State. Our forefathers built a great and growing commonwealth out of the beautiful and fertile wilderness they found there. The rediscovery in Minnesota of the giant Canada goose is just one of many signifi-

cant occurrences involving our great State which give us even more reason to do a little bragging.

We are very proud of the fact that our State provides very wholesome recreation. It is one of the fine hunting areas in the United States; and we are particularly proud of the fish, the fowl, and the other wildlife which make possible some of the most enjoyable outdoor sports activities which America is privileged to have.

Let this be notice to historians of the future that on Silver Lake, in Rochester, Minn., a lake kept partly open by the discharge of warm water from a nearby electric generating plant, it was discovered that the giant goose not only is still among us, but even appears to have a sizable population that is adapting to man's changes of environment.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come at this time before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn, in accordance with the previous order, until tomorrow, at 10 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 3, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 2, 1963:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John Lawrence Ryan, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grades as follows:

Lt. Gen. Theodore William Parker, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

Maj. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), in the grade of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Creighton William Abrams, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), in the grade of lieutenant general.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Edward W. Snedeker, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. Frederick L. Wieseman, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Colossians 3: 14: *Above all these things put on love, which is the bond of perfectness.*

Almighty God, our Father, who art the same, yesterday, today, and forever, amid all the miseries and mutations of time, grant that our hearts may be the sanctuaries of Thy love.

May we feel the wealth and warmth of Thy love and seek to make it the commanding and controlling factor and force in our daily life.

Inspire us to discover in these critical and confused days that love is the one cardinal virtue that will cast out fear and constrain us to rise above all cold and rebellious tempers of spirit.

Hear us for the sake of our Lord who walked the road of the loving heart. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4374. An act to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; and

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1035. An act to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the Report of the Archivist of the United States Numbered 63-9.

CUBAN ANTI-CASTRO GROUPS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, U.S. policy to discourage Cuban exile raids on Castro's seacoast is a complete contradiction of our national goals.

It is true that the Government must uphold U.S. neutrality laws. However, this Nation has no right to interfere with the operations of foreign-based anti-Castro Cubans. Furthermore, the United States is not responsible for foreign-based raids against Communist Cuba.

It is argued that these hit-and-run raids have little significance. This argument is false. Hit-and-run tactics signaled the beginning of Castro's rise to power. The Communists are using these same tactics even now to subvert Latin America.

The Cuban Communists do not want war in the Caribbean, and they have backed down with an apology for firing on a U.S. boat last Saturday. Freeing Cuba is a job for Cubans, and I certainly hope the United States will encourage them to do it.

BLOCKADE OF COMMUNIST CUBA

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, at last the United States and Great Britain have established a blockade of Cuba, but, unfortunately, the United States seems to have lost sight of its values and traditions, for through this blockade our country is protecting Castro from those Cuban exiles who yearn to return freedom to their homeland. I find it extremely hard to understand why we are actually protecting a Communist government and suppressing the activities of people who are fighting to rid Cuba of the Communist menace. This is a complete reversal from our policy of aiding the anti-Castro invasion just 2 years ago. How foolish it is to take steps which permit communism to survive in Cuba when we all realize that Cuba is the chief steppingstone to the establishment of communism throughout Central and South America. Our excuse for protecting Castro seems weak, indeed, when we glance back at our own history of fighting for freedom and human rights. It seems to me that the attacks launched against the Communist Cuba would have a terrific morale-boosting effect on those patriots still in Cuba, who with sufficient evidence of support could rid their country of communism.

How can any of our South American allies gain confidence in the policies of the United States when with one hand we tell the anti-Castro forces that we want them to free their homeland while with the other hand we take steps to insure that they will not? To make matters worse, we are now playing the role

of informant against the Cuban patriots as well as protector for Castro.

In my opinion, the administration has failed to understand our demands for a blockade of Cuba, for what we are demanding was a blockade of Communist Cuba, not a blockade of freedom.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MUTUAL DEFENSE AND ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 94)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

"Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war," wrote Milton. And no peacetime victory in history has been as far reaching in its impact, nor served the cause of freedom so well, as the victories scored in the last 17 years by this Nation's mutual defense and assistance programs. These victories have been, in the main, quiet instead of dramatic. Their aim has been, not to gain territories for the United States or support in the United Nations, but to preserve freedom and hope, and to prevent tyranny and subversion, in dozens of key nations all over the world.

The United States today is spending over 10 percent of its gross national product on programs primarily aimed at improving our national security. Somewhat less than one-twelfth of this amount, and less than 0.7 percent of our GNP, goes into the mutual assistance program: roughly half for economic development, and half for military and other short-term assistance. The contribution of this program to our national interest clearly outweighs its cost. The richest nation in the world would surely be justified in spending less than 1 percent of its national income on assistance to its less fortunate sister nations solely as a matter of international responsibility; but inasmuch as these programs are not merely the right thing to do, but clearly in our national self-interest, all criticisms should be placed in that perspective. That our aid programs can be improved is not a matter of debate. But that our aid programs serve both our national traditions and our national interest is beyond all reasonable doubt.

History records that our aid programs to Turkey and Greece were the crucial element that enabled Turkey to stand up against heavyhanded Soviet pressures, Greece to put down Communist aggres-

sion and both to re-create stable societies and to move forward in the direction of economic and social growth.

History records that the Marshall plan made it possible for the nations of Western Europe, including the United Kingdom, to recover from the devastation of the world's most destructive war, to rebuild military strength, to withstand the expansionist thrust of Stalinist Russia, and to embark on an economic renaissance which has made Western Europe the second greatest and richest industrial complex in the world today—a vital center of free world strength, itself now contributing to the growth and strength of less developed countries.

History records that our military and economic assistance to nations on the frontiers of the Communist world—such as Iran, Pakistan, India, Vietnam, and free China—has enabled threatened peoples to stay free and independent, when they otherwise would have either been overrun by aggressive Communist power or fallen victim of utter chaos, poverty, and despair.

History records that our contributions to international aid have been the critical factor in the growth of a whole family of international financial institutions and agencies, playing an ever more important role in the ceaseless war against want and the struggle for growth and freedom.

And, finally, history will record that today our technical assistance and development loans are giving hope where hope was lacking, sparking action where life was static, and stimulating progress around the earth—simultaneously supporting the military security of the free world, helping to erect barriers against the growth of communism where those barriers count the most, helping to build the kind of world community of independent, self-supporting nations in which we want to live, and helping to serve the deep American urge to extend a generous hand to those working toward a better life for themselves and their children.

Despite noisy opposition from the very first days—despite dire predictions that foreign aid would bankrupt the Republic—despite warnings that the Marshall plan and successor programs were "throwing our money down a rathole"—despite great practical difficulties and some mistakes and disappointments—the fact is that our aid programs generally and consistently have done what they were expected to do.

Freedom is not on the run anywhere in the world—not in Europe, Asia, Africa, or Latin America—as it might well have been without U.S. aid. And we now know that freedom—all freedom, including our own—is diminished when other countries fall under Communist domination, as in China in 1949, North Vietnam and the northern provinces of Laos in 1954, and Cuba in 1959. Freedom, all freedom, is threatened by the subtle, varied and unceasing Communist efforts at subversion in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. And the prospect for freedom is also endangered or eroded in countries which see no hope—no hope for a better

life based on economic progress, education, social justice and the development of stable institutions. These are the frontiers of freedom which our military and economic aid programs seek to advance; and in so doing, they serve our deepest national interest.

This view has been held by three successive Presidents—Democratic and Republican alike.

It has been endorsed by a bipartisan majority of nine successive Congresses.

It has been supported for 17 years by a bipartisan majority of the American people.

And it has only recently been reaffirmed by a distinguished committee of private citizens, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay and including Messrs. Robert Anderson, Eugene Black, Clifford Hardin, Robert Lovett, Edward Mason, L. F. McCollum, George Meany, Herman Phleger, and Howard Rusk. Their report stated:

We believe these programs, properly conceived and implemented, to be essential to the security of our Nation and necessary to the exercise of its worldwide responsibilities.

There is, in short, a national consensus of many years standing on the vital importance of these programs. The principle and purpose of U.S. assistance to less secure and less fortunate nations are not and cannot be seriously in doubt.

II. PRESENT NEEDS

The question now is: What about the future? In the perspective of these past gains, what is the dimension of present needs, what are our opportunities, and what changes do we face at this juncture in world history?

I believe it is a crucial juncture. Our world is near the climax of a historic convulsion. A tidal wave of national independence has nearly finished its sweep through lands which contain one out of every three people in the world. The industrial and scientific revolution is spreading to the far corners of the earth. And two irreconcilable views of the value, the rights, and the role of the individual human being confront the peoples of the world.

In some 80 developing nations, countless large and small decisions will be made in the days and months and years ahead—decisions which, taken together, will establish the economic and social system, determine the political leadership, shape the political practices, and mold the structure of the institutions which will promote either consent or coercion for one-third of humanity. And these decisions will drastically affect the shape of the world in which our children grow to maturity.

Africa is stirring restlessly to consolidate its independence and to make that independence meaningful for its people through economic and social development. The people of America have affirmed and reaffirmed their sympathy with these objectives.

Free Asia is responding resolutely to the political, economic, and military challenge of Communist China's relentless efforts to dominate the continent.

Latin America is striving to take decisive steps toward effective democracy—

amid the turbulence of rapid social change and the menace of Communist subversion.

The United States—the richest and most powerful of all peoples, a nation committed to the independence of nations and to a better life for all peoples—can no more stand aside in this climactic age of decision than we can withdraw from the community of free nations. Our effort is not merely symbolic. It is addressed to our vital security interests.

It is in this context that I hope the American people through their representatives in Congress will consider our request this year for foreign aid funds designed carefully and explicitly to meet these specific challenges. This is not a wearisome burden. It is a new chapter in our involvement in a continuously vital struggle—the most challenging and constructive effort ever undertaken by man on behalf of freedom and his fellow man.

III. OBJECTIVES FOR IMPROVEMENT

In a changing world, our programs of mutual defense and assistance must be kept under constant review. My recommendations herein reflect the work of the Clay Committee, the scrutiny undertaken by the new Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and the experience gained in our first full year of administering the new and improved program enacted by the Congress in 1961. There is fundamental agreement throughout these reviews: that these assistance programs are of great value to our deepest national interest—that their basic concepts and organization, as embodied in the existing legislation, are properly conceived—that progress has been made and is being made in translating these concepts into action—but that much still remains to be done to improve our performance and make the best possible use of these programs.

In addition, there is fundamental agreement in all these reviews regarding six key recommendations for the future.

Objective No. 1: To apply stricter standards of selectivity and self-help in aiding developing countries. This objective was given special attention by the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World (the Clay report), which estimated that the application of such criteria could result in substantial savings in selected programs over the next 1 to 3 years.

Considerable progress has already been made along these lines. While the number of former colonies achieving independence has lengthened the total list of countries receiving assistance, 80 percent of all economic assistance now goes to only 20 countries; and military assistance is even more narrowly concentrated. The proportion of development loans, as contrasted with outright grants, has increased from 10 to 60 percent. We have placed all our development lending on a dollar repayable basis; and this year we are increasing our efforts, as the Clay committee recommended, to tailor our loan terms so that interest rates and maturities will reflect to a greater extent the differences in the ability of different countries to service debt.

In the Alliance for Progress in particular, and increasingly in other aid programs, emphasis is placed upon self-help and self-reform by the recipients themselves, using our aid as a catalyst for progress and not as a handout. Finally, in addition to emphasizing primarily economic rather than military assistance, wherever conditions permit, we are taking a sharp new look at both the size and purpose of those local military forces which receive our assistance. Our increased stress on internal security and civic action in military assistance is in keeping with our experience that in developing countries, military forces can have an important economic as well as protective role to play. For example, in Latin America, in fiscal year 1963, military assistance funds allocated for the support of engineer, medical, and other civic action type units more than doubled.

Objective No. 2: To achieve a reduction and ultimate elimination of U.S. assistance by enabling nations to stand on their own as rapidly as possible. Both this Nation and the countries we help have a stake in their reaching the point of self-sustaining growth—the point where they no longer require external aid to maintain their independence. Our goal is not an arbitrary cutoff date but the earliest possible “take off” date—the date when their economies will have been launched with sufficient momentum to enable them to become self-supporting, requiring only the same normal sources of external financing to meet expanding capital needs that this country required for many decades.

For some, this goal is near at hand, insofar as economic assistance is concerned. For others, more time will be needed. But in all cases, specific programs leading to self-support should be set and priorities established—including those steps which must be taken by the recipient countries and all others who are willing to help them.

The record clearly shows that foreign aid is not an endless or unchanging process. Fifteen years ago, our assistance went almost entirely to the advanced countries of Europe and Japan; today it is directed almost entirely to the developing world. Ten years ago most of our assistance was given to shoring up military forces and unstable economies; today this kind of aid has been cut in half, and our assistance goes increasingly toward economic development. There are still, however, important cases where there has been no diminution in the Communist military threat, and both military and economic aid are still required. Such cases range from relatively stabilized frontiers, as in Korea and Turkey, to areas of active aggression, such as Vietnam.

Objective No. 3: To secure the increased participation of other industrialized nations in sharing the cost of international development assistance. The United States is no longer alone in aiding the developing countries, and its proportionate share of the burden is diminishing. The flow of funds from other industrialized countries—now totaling on the order of \$2 billion a year—is expected to continue; and we expect

to work more closely with these other countries in order to make the most effective use of our joint efforts. In addition, the international lending and technical assistance agencies—to which we contribute heavily—have expanded the schedule and scope of their operations; and we look forward to supplementing those resources selectively in conjunction with increased contributions from other nations. We will continue to work with our allies, urging them to increase their assistance efforts and to extend assistance on terms less burdensome to the developing countries.

Objective No. 4: To lighten any adverse impact of the aid program on our own balance of payments and economy. A few years ago, more than half of U.S. economic aid funds were spent abroad, contributing to the drain on our dollars and gold. Of our current commitments, over 80 percent will be spent in the United States, contributing to the growth of our economy and employment opportunities. This proportion is rising as further measures are being taken to this end. I might add that our balance-of-payments position today is being significantly helped by the repayment of loans made to European countries under the Marshall plan and by the Export-Import Bank. I am confident that in the future, as income in the less-developed countries rises, we will similarly benefit from the loans we are now making to them.

Our economy is also being helped by the expansion of commercial exports to countries whose present growth and prosperity were spurred by U.S. economic assistance in earlier years. Over the last decade, our exports to Western Europe and the United Kingdom have more than doubled, and our exports to Japan have increased fourfold. Similarly, we can look forward to a future widening of trade opportunities in those countries whose economic development we are currently assisting.

In addition, our food for peace program is increasingly using our agricultural commodities to stimulate the economic growth of developing nations and to assist in achieving other U.S. foreign policy goals. As the economies of developing nations improve, we are encouraging them to shift from foreign currency to cash sales or to dollar credit sales for these commodities.

The relative burden of our assistance programs has been steadily reduced—from some 2 percent of our national product at the beginning of the Marshall plan to seven-tenths of 1 percent today—from 11.5 percent of the Federal budget in 1949 to 4 percent today.

Although these figures indicate that our aid programs cost, in relative terms, considerably less today than they did 10 or 15 years ago, we are continuing our efforts to improve the effectiveness of these programs and increase the return on every dollar invested. Personnel, procedures, and administration are being improved. A number of field missions have been closed, scaled down, or merged into embassies or regional offices. These efforts toward greater efficiency and

economy are being accelerated under the new Administrator.

Objective No. 5: To continue to assist in the defense of countries under threat of external and internal Communist attack. Our military assistance program has been an essential element in keeping the boundary of Soviet and Chinese military power relatively stable for over a decade. Without its protection the substantial economic progress made by underdeveloped countries along the Sino-Soviet periphery would hardly have been possible. As these countries build economic strength, they will be able to assume more of the burden of their defense. But we must not assume that military assistance to these countries—or to others primarily exposed to subversive internal attack—can be ended in the foreseeable future. On the contrary, while it will be possible to reduce and terminate some programs, we should anticipate the need for new and expanded programs.

India is a case in point. The wisdom of earlier U.S. aid in helping the Indian subcontinent's considerable and fruitful efforts toward progress and stability can hardly now be in question. The threat made plain by the Chinese attack on India last fall may require additional efforts on our part to help bolster the security of this crucial area, assuming these efforts can be matched in an appropriate way by the efforts of India and Pakistan.

But overall, the magnitude of military assistance is small in relation to our national security expenditures; in this fiscal year it amounts to about 3 percent of our defense budget.

Dollar for dollar—

Said the Clay Committee with particular reference to the border areas—

these programs contribute more to the security of the free world than corresponding expenditures in our defense appropriations. These countries are providing more than 2 million armed men ready, for the most part, for any emergency.

Clearly, if this program did not exist, our defense budget would undoubtedly have to be increased substantially to provide an equivalent contribution to the free world's defense.

Objective No. 6: To increase the role of private investment and other non-Federal resources in assisting developing nations. In recent months, important new steps have been taken to mobilize on behalf of this program the competence of a variety of nongovernmental organizations and individuals in this country. Cooperatives and savings and loan associations have been very active in establishing similar institutions abroad, particularly in Latin America. Our land-grant and other universities are establishing better working relationships with our programs to assist overseas rural development. Already there are 37 U.S. universities and land-grant institutions at work in Latin America, for example, with a substantial increase expected during the coming year. Public and private leaders from the State of California are exploring with their counterparts in Chile how the talents and resources of a particular State can be more directly

channeled toward assisting a particular country. Labor unions, foundations, trade associations, professional societies, and many others likewise possess skills and resources which we are drawing upon increasingly—in order to engage in a more systematic and meaningful way, in this vital nation-building process, the whole complex of private and public institutions upon which our own national life depends. For at the heart of the modernization process lies the central problem of creating, adapting, and improving the institutions which any modern society will need.

IV. PRIVATE INVESTMENT

The primary new initiative in this year's program relates to our increased efforts to encourage the investment of private capital in the underdeveloped countries. Already considerable progress has been made fostering U.S. private investment through the use of investment guaranties—with over \$900 million now outstanding—and by means of cost-sharing on investment surveys, loans of local currencies, and other measures provided under existing law. During the first half of this fiscal year alone, \$7.7 million in local currencies have been loaned to private business firms.

I believe much more should be done, however, both administratively through more vigorous action by the Agency for International Development, and legislatively by the Congress. Administratively, our ambassadors and missions abroad, in their negotiations with the less developed countries, are being directed to urge more forcefully the importance of making full use of private resources and improving the climate for private investment, both domestic, and foreign. In particular, I am concerned that the investment guaranty program is not fully operative in some countries because of the failure of their governments to execute the normal intergovernmental agreements relating to investment guaranties.

In addition, the Agency for International Development will also strengthen and enlarge its own activities relating to private enterprise—both its efforts to assist in the development of vigorous private economies in the developing countries, and its facilities for mobilizing and assisting the capital and skills of private business in contributing to economic development.

Legislatively, I am recommending the following:

(a) An amendment to the Internal Revenue Code for a trial period to grant U.S. taxpayers a tax credit for new investments in developing countries, which should also apply to some extent to reinvestments of their earnings in those countries. Such a credit, by making possible an increased rate of return, should substantially encourage additional private investment in the developing countries. The U.S. businessmen's committee for the Alliance for Progress has recommended the adoption of such a measure.

(b) Amendments in the investment guaranty provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act designed to enlarge and clarify the guaranty program.

Economic and social growth cannot be accomplished by governments alone. The effective participation of an enlightened U.S. businessman, especially in partnership with private interests in the developing country, brings not only his investment but his technological and management skills into the process of development. His successful participation in turn helps create that climate of confidence which is so critical in attracting and holding vital external and internal capital. We welcome and encourage initiatives being taken in the private sector in Latin America to accelerate industrial growth and hope that similar cooperative efforts will be established with other developing countries.

V. THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

In a special sense, the achievements of the Alliance for Progress in the coming years will be the measure of our determination, our ideals, and our wisdom. Here in this hemisphere, in this last year, our resourcefulness as a people was challenged in the clearest terms. We moved at once to resist the threat of aggressive nuclear weapons in Cuba, and we found the nations of Latin America at our side. They, like ourselves, were brought to a new awareness of the danger of permitting the poverty and despair of a whole people to continue long anywhere in this continent.

Had the needs of the people of Cuba been met in the pre-Castro period—their need for food, for housing, for education, for jobs, above all, for a democratic responsibility in the fulfillment of their own hopes—there would have been no Castro, no missiles in Cuba, and no need for Cuba's neighbors to incur the immense risks of resistance to threatened aggression from that island.

There is but one way to avoid being faced with similar dilemmas in the future. It is to bring about in all the countries of Latin America the conditions of hope, in which the peoples of this continent will know that they can shape a better future for themselves, not through obeying the inhumane commands of an alien and cynical ideology, but through personal self-expression, individual judgment, and the acts of responsible citizenship.

As Americans, we have long recognized the legitimacy of these aspirations; in recent months we have been able to see, as never before, their urgency and, I believe, the concrete means for their realization.

In less than 2 years, the 10-year program of the Alliance for Progress has become more than an idea and more than a commitment of governments. The necessary initial effort to develop plans, to organize institutions, to test and experiment has itself required and achieved a new dedication—a new dedication to intelligent compromise between old and new ways of life. In the long run, it is this effort and not the threat of communism—that will determine the fate of freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

These years have not been easy ones for any group in Latin America. A similar change in the fundamental orientation of our own society would have been no easier. The difficulty of the changes

to be brought about makes all the more heartening the success of many nations of Latin America in achieving reforms which will make their fundamental economic and social structures both more efficient and more equitable.

Some striking accomplishments, moreover, are already visible. New housing is being expanded in most countries of the region. Educational facilities are growing rapidly. Road construction, particularly in agricultural areas, is accelerating at a rapid pace. With U.S. funds, over 2 million textbooks are being distributed to combat the illiteracy of nearly half of the 210 million people of Latin America. In the countries of the Alliance for Progress, the diets of 8 million children and mothers are being supplemented with U.S. food for peace, and this figure should reach nearly 16 million by next year.

In trouble-ridden northeast Brazil, under an agreement with the State of Rio Grande do Norte, a program is underway to train 3,000 teachers, build 1,000 classrooms, 10 vocational schools, 8 normal schools, and 4 teacher training centers. A \$30 million slum clearance project is underway in Venezuela. In Bogotá, Colombia, the site of the old airport is becoming a new city for 71,000 persons who are building their own homes with support from the Social Progress Trust Fund.

This year I received a letter from Senor Argemil Plazas García whom I met in Bogotá upon the dedication of an Alianza housing project. He writes:

Today I am living in the house with my 13 children, and we are very happy to be free of such poverty and no longer to be moving around like outcasts. Now we have dignity and freedom. . . . My wife, my children, and I are writing you this humble letter, to express to you the warm gratitude of such Colombian friends who now have a home in which they can live happily.

Of even greater long-range importance, a number of beginnings in self-help and reforms are now evident.

Since 1961, 11 Latin American countries—Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela—have made structural reforms in their tax systems. Twelve countries have improved their income tax laws and administration.

New large-scale programs for improved land use and land reform have been undertaken in Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, and two States in Brazil. More limited plans are being carried out in Chile, Colombia, Panama, Uruguay, and Central America.

Six Latin American countries—Colombia, Chile, Bolivia, Honduras, Mexico, and Venezuela—have submitted development programs to the Panel of Experts of the Organization of American States. The Panel has evaluated and reported on the first three and will soon offer its views on the balance.

Viewed against the background of decades of neglect—or, at most, intermittent bursts of attention to basic problems—the start that has been made is encouraging. Perhaps most significant of all is a change in the hearts and minds of the people—a growing will to develop

their countries. We can only help Latin Americans to save themselves. It is for this reason that the increasing determination of the peoples of the region to build modern societies is heartening. And it is for this reason that responsible leadership in Latin America must respond to this popular will with a greater sense of urgency and purpose, lest aspirations turn into frustrations and hope turn into despair. Pending reform legislation must be enacted, statutes already on the books must be enforced, and mechanisms for carrying out programs must be organized and invigorated. These steps are not easy, as we know from our own experience, but they must be taken.

Our own intention is to concentrate our support in Latin America on those countries adhering to the principles established in the Charter of Punta del Este, and to work with our neighbors to indicate more precisely the particular policy changes, reforms, and other self-help measures which are necessary to make our assistance effective and the Alliance a success. The Clay Committee recommendation that we continue to expand our efforts to encourage economic integration within the region and the expansion of trade among the countries of Latin America has great merit. The determination of the Central American Presidents to move boldly in this direction impressed me greatly during my recent meeting with them in San Jose, Costa Rica; and the Agency for International Development has already established a regional office in Central America, is giving support to a regional development bank and has participated in regional trade conferences.

A beginning has been made in the first 2 years of the Alliance; but the job that is still ahead must be tackled with continuing urgency. Many of the ingredients for a successful decade are at hand, and the fundamental course for the future is clear. It remains for all parties to the Alliance to provide the continuous will and effort needed to move steadily along that course.

VI. THIS YEAR'S AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION

Translating the foregoing facts and principles into program costs and appropriations, based on the application of the standards set forth above and affirmed by the Clay Committee, yields the following results:

First, upward of \$200 million of economic assistance funds now available are expected to be saved and not used in the present fiscal year, and upward of \$100 million of these unused funds will remain available for lending in the future;

Second, in addition to the savings carried forward into next year, close review has indicated a number of reductions that can be made in the original budget estimates for economic and military assistance without serious damage to the national interest.

Together these factors permit a reduction in the original budget estimates from \$4.9 to \$4.5 billion. This amount reflects anticipated reductions in military and economic assistance to a number of countries, in line with these

standards and recommendations, and unavoidable increases to others. The principal net increases proposed in 1964 appropriations are the following:

An additional \$325 million for lending in Latin America—\$125 million through the Agency for International Development and \$200 million through the Social Progress Trust Fund, administered for the United States by the Inter-American Development Bank (for which no appropriation was needed in fiscal year 1963 because a 2-year appropriation had been made the year before);

An additional \$85 million for lending elsewhere in the world, mostly in countries such as India, Pakistan, and Nigeria which are meeting those high standards of self-help and fiscal and economic progress which permit our aid to be directed toward ultimate full self-support;

An additional \$80 million for military aid, including the increased requirements for India (but still far below the fiscal 1961 level); and

An additional \$50 million for the contingency fund, which provides a flexibility indispensable to our security. We cannot ignore the possibility that new threats similar to those in Laos or Vietnam might arise in areas which now look calm, or that new opportunities will open up to achieve major gains in the cause of freedom. Foreign aid policy can no more be static than foreign policy itself.

I believe that it is necessary and desirable that these funds be provided by the Congress to meet program needs and to be available for program opportunities. Funds which are not required under the increasingly selective program and performance standards of our assistance programs will, as in this year, not be spent or committed.

The legislative amendments which I am forwarding herewith carry forward the basic structure and intent of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. No fundamental changes in this legislative structure now appear to be required.

One relatively minor change I am proposing is for a separate authorization for the appropriation of funds to assist American schools and hospitals abroad. A number of these schools sponsored by Americans have been most successful in the developing countries in providing an education built upon American standards. Until now some assistance has been made available to these schools from general economic aid funds, but this is becoming increasingly inappropriate. Separate authorization and appropriations would be used to help these schools carry out long-term programs to establish themselves on a sounder financial footing, becoming gradually independent, if at all possible, of U.S. Government support.

Finally, I am requesting the Congress in this legislation to amend that section of the Trade Expansion Act which requires the denial of equal tariff treatment to imports from Poland and Yugoslavia. It is appropriate that this amendment should be incorporated in this bill since it is my conviction that trade and other forms of normal rela-

tions constitute a sounder basis than aid for our future relationship with these countries.

VII. CONCLUSION

In closing, let me again emphasize the overriding importance of the efforts in which we are engaged.

At this point in history we can look back to many successes in the struggle to preserve freedom. Our Nation is still daily winning unseen victories in the fight against Communist subversion in the slums and hamlets, in the hospitals and schools, and in the offices of governments across a world bent on lifting itself. Two centuries of pioneering and growth must be telescoped into decades and even years. This is a field of action for which our history has prepared us, to which our aspirations have drawn us, and into which our national interest moves us.

Around the world cracks in the monolithic apparatus of our adversary are there for all to see. This, for the American people, is a time for vision, for patience, for work, and for wisdom. For better or worse, we are the pacesetters. Freedom's leader cannot flag or falter, or another runner will set the pace.

We have dared to label the sixties the "Decade of Development." But it is not the eloquence of our slogans, but the quality of our endurance, which will determine whether this generation of Americans deserves the leadership which history has thrust upon us.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 2, 1963.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the sorry spectacle of throwing money away to solve problems is best demonstrated by our foreign aid programs, via the President's message.

The President says "Peace hath her victories, no less renown'd than war" quoting Milton about the peacetime victory of our foreign giveaway. The President should be quoting the hard-pressed patriotic taxpayers who want the battle of the budget to be won, who expects a victory in fiscal responsibility, who needs the security of sound currency and a government oriented around freedom and capitalism, not regimentation and socialism.

The people of the United States believe morally and spiritually in the importance and dignity of human beings, in God-given rights, and they are tired of our exporting gross materialism, of granting aid to dictators who subjugate the people with our aid, who teach socialism and downgrade capitalistic freedom.

People are tired of shipping food and supplies to other nations who transship

them to enemies, even as Poland aided North Vietnam, whose people are busy killing American men.

Our taxpayers are tired of the farce of aiding Socialists and Communists in the name of Christian charity, and saddling the debt on our children of the future.

How can our aid to Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the U.N., which then dispenses our money further, help protect capitalism and freedom in the life or death struggle of our society against this alien philosophy? How can our people be helped by borrowing money to give it away? How do we strengthen the United States when we aid neutrals like India that turn against us? How stupid does the President think we Americans are?

The President says:

Our Nation is still daily winning unseen victories in the fight against Communist subversion.

How tragic. Those with eyes that cannot see. We are losing our shirts financially in our giveaway programs, which are threatening our currency, undermining our entire economy, endangering the entire free world which has looked to us for leadership.

And we are losing, in spite of our tremendous outpouring of over \$100 billion since World War II. Indeed, communism is now on our doorstep in Cuba, and we are permitting the subversion of all of Central and South America. Has foreign aid prevented this—or has it encouraged communism's expansion—or does not our annual foreign aid make any difference?

Well, there is the proof. We borrowed \$100 billion since 1945 to give it away, and Khrushchev and worldwide communism controls Cuba 90 miles from the United States. Now, who is kidding whom?

The President's choice of words is interesting. In his closing paragraph he says, "But it is not the eloquence of our slogans, but the quality of our endurance, which will determine whether this generation of Americans deserves the leadership which history has thrust upon us." Look at the slogans, this bill is now "free world defenses and assistance programs," not a foreign aid bill. New Frontier replaced the tired old New Deal and Fair Deal. The Peace Corps, foreign and domestic, is more foreign aid abroad, and CCC, Civilian Conservation Corps at home. The campaign slogans "missile gap" turned out, not to be a gap at all. The "fallen prestige" label of the Eisenhower foreign policy, which now seems utterly virtuous by comparison, replaced with the no-policy of the New Frontier. And so it goes. Slogans are all we are being given, as a poor substitute for vigorous policy at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, if treason is defined as "giving aid and comfort to the enemy," how can we give aid to Communists and Socialists? Are they enemies or not? They mean to bury us.

If we believe in self-determination for nations, how can we, through foreign aid, "jimmy" up the economies and programs

of other nations? If we are spiritually motivated, how can we set out to buy the world with dollars, to buy friends? If we believe in charity, how can we take money from taxpayers through force, and threatened jail sentences, to give to dictators and governments who misuse the money, who relabel the goods, who build bank deposits in Switzerland in individual names?

If we love freedom, why do we subsidize the enslavement of others through gifts to their governments?

Why cannot we proudly, unapologetically, brand ourselves freedom-loving, capitalistic, sovereign, and help others by precept and example; not by robbing them of their own initiative, inventiveness, and self-respect as we pour money into their economies?

The foreign aid that will help will be those programs conceived, created, and financed by each nation according to their own level of development and preference. We could sell our services, for value received, in helping others in projects when they ask us. No gifts are needed. More dislike us for our giving, than appreciate it, and we rob them of their pride and independence as well as foul up their economies.

The President says "leadership which history has thrust upon us." What does that mean? Our leadership was earned, not thrust upon us, earned by sweat, by ingenuity, by hustle and so we grew economically strong with the highest standard of living.

We earned it. It was not given to us. The good Lord gave us the opportunity and we took matters into our own hands.

All we can do to help others is to set a good example. No gifts. Build American industries and trade, brag about capitalism and free enterprise and individual freedom—to sink or swim. Capitalism deserves to be bragged about. Our people are energetic, hard working, thrifty, and believe in the private and free market of supply and demand. Let us show it off to the world. Let us not apologize for it, or pretend we do not know our own strength. No gifts, just get up and go. A good example: finer homes, cars, refrigerators, school buildings—all produced privately by free people—capitalistic entrepreneurs.

Finally, if there be some who want power for themselves in leadership positions through foreign aid let us not reward them in the United States or abroad. Our "Republic within a democracy" is limited government, of limited power. Let us not build our Government so powerful we are subjugated. Let us not give aid to other governments which subjugate their peoples. Foreign aid or free world defense and assistance programs must be stopped now.

THE BUYING AND SELLING OF COMMUNIST-MADE MERCHANDISE AT REQUEST OF STATE AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post, in a story written by Phillip Warden, reports that two of the Nation's largest department stores are buying and selling Communist-made merchandise at the request of the State and Commerce Departments. One of the stores is Macy's, in New York, the other is Davison-Paxon Co., in Atlanta, Ga.

In recent years the Federal Government has been interfering in private business to an unreasonable extent. The Federal Big Brother attitude is being extended by the Kennedy administration way beyond anything seen in America in recent decades. It is getting so that, whether as a creditor, lender, observer, regulator, or law enforcer, the Federal Government is a silent partner in everybody's business. This is harmful to individual initiative. It is contrary to cultivation of the independence and driving force that helped to create this great Nation. It is time that the balance wheel started to swing back toward less Government interference in private affairs.

But there is one field in which the Federal Government has no business at all telling the private businesses what to do and what not to do. This is in the field of patriotism. The Departments of State and Commerce have no right to ask any business, even such a big one as R. H. Macy Co., to trade in Communist-made goods. Neither has R. H. Macy Co. any obligation to abide by such requests.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is unpatriotic and anti-American for American stores to stock in trade goods that are the product of Communist slave labor. I say that it is the solemn obligation of all business, including Macy's, to decline Government requests of this nature. I say it is close to a sin to put Communist goods on American shelves to undersell American products because the men and women making those goods are not paid a fair wage for their hours of slave labor.

The State Department and the Commerce Department should know better than to make such a request. Once again we see evidence of the dismal fact that the Kennedy administration just does not realize that communism is the mortal enemy of the United States and seeks to destroy us. Trading with communism only helps communism to be stronger. The trade will not make friends for us. It only spreads wider our international reputation for being suckers. Once again, it is the responsibility of this Congress, acting through the proper committees, to find out who is responsible in the Department of State and in the Department of Commerce for requesting America's private business to trade with Communists.

Such governmental policies are not only incredibly stupid; they are tainted with yellow. In the President's message to Congress today he requests amendment to the Trade Expansion Act in favor of imports from Communist satel-

lites Poland and Yugoslavia. This is just more of the same stupidity. Congress, for America, should deny this request.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

DAVID H. FORMAN AND JULIA FORMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1544) for the relief of David H. Forman and Julia Forman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to David H. Forman and Julia Forman, his wife, of Maricopa County, Arizona, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land in the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 2, township 1 north, range 3 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, described as follows: Beginning at a point on the north line of the said northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 2, said point being south 89 degrees 54 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 661.37 feet from the northeast corner of said section 2; thence south 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 33 feet to the true point of beginning; thence south 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 111.08 feet to a point on the north right-of-way line of the Appropriators Canal; thence south 47 degrees 38 minutes 45 seconds, east, along said north right-of-way line, a distance of 81.78 feet; thence south 0 degrees 22 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 63.05 feet; thence north 47 degrees 38 minutes 45 seconds west, parallel to the south right-of-way line of said Appropriators Canal, a distance of 190.90 feet; thence north 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 100.57 feet to a point 33 feet south of the north line of said northeast quarter northeast quarter; thence north 89 degrees 54 minutes 30 seconds east, parallel to the north line of said northeast quarter northeast quarter a distance of 80.06 feet to the point of beginning. Subject to an easement to the city of Phoenix for sewer purposes within the right-of-way of the said Appropriators Canal.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That consent is hereby given that a civil action may be instituted against the United States within one year after the date of enactment of this Act by or on behalf of David H. Forman and Julia Forman in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona to determine their right, title, and interest in and to a parcel of land in the northeast quarter of section 2, township 1 north, range 3 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Maricopa County, Arizona, described as follows: Beginning at a point on the north line of the said northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 2, said point being south 89 degrees 54 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 661.37 feet from the northeast corner of said section 2; thence south 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 33 feet to the true point of beginning; thence south 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 111.08 feet to a point on the north right-of-way line of the Appropriators Canal;

thence south 47 degrees 38 minutes 45 seconds east, along said north right-of-way line, a distance of 81.78 feet; thence south 0 degrees 22 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 63.05 feet; thence north 47 degrees 38 minutes 45 seconds west, parallel to the south right-of-way line of said Appropriators Canal, a distance of 190.90 feet; thence north 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 100.57 feet to a point 33 feet south of the north line of said northeast quarter northeast quarter; thence north 89 degrees 54 minutes 30 seconds east, parallel to the north line of said northeast quarter northeast quarter, a distance of 80.06 feet to the point of beginning."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEWIS S. CASS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2291) regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall reinstate the homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass (Anchorage Numbered XXXXXX) that was canceled because at the time the entry was made the land was in a withdrawn status, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to process the entry in accordance with the applicable provisions of law, subject to such modification of time requirements as he deems equitable in view of the prior cancellation of the entry.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEY LAND IN VICINITY OF UNALAKLEET, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2294) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue, subject to the provisions of section 2, to Mrs. William E. Beltz a patent in fee (exclusive of oil, gas, and other mineral rights) to the following described tract of land, together with all buildings and other improvements thereon, situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska: Post numbered 1 located on left limit of North River on sandbar approximately 400 feet east of the North River Bridge; thence 2,640 feet in an easterly direction following the river upstream to a narrow slough and following the slough to post numbered 2; thence 2,640 feet in a southerly direction (through timber) to post numbered 3; thence 2,640 feet in a westerly direction to post numbered 4

located on the bank of the North River; thence upstream in a northerly direction back to post numbered 1 approximately 2,640 feet from post numbered 4; such land being the same land described in the homestead settlement claim (No. XXXXXX) of the late William E. Beltz.

Sec. 2. The patent shall be subject to outstanding gravel permits and rights-of-way, the patent may be issued only after payment of the fees that the deceased entryman would have been required to pay, and the patent shall be based upon a survey made without cost to Mrs. Beltz.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICHOLAS E. VILLAREAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1230) for the relief of Nicholas E. Villareal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Nicholas E. Villareal, 342 West Beechwood, Pine-dale, California, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States all interest and costs on the sum of \$322 representing the total of allotment payments made to his mother, Mrs. Carmen T. Estrella, in the period from January 1, 1948, to April 30, 1949, inclusive, which have been ruled to have been overpayments because no deductions were made from his Army pay in accordance with the authorizations he executed directing that the proper deductions be made from his pay in order that a class F allotment would be paid to his mother.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COL. FRANK D. SCHWIKERT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3623) for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

MAJ. LEONARD H. POTTERBAUM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3625) for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

RONNIE E. HUNTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3626) for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle the claim of Ronnie E. Hunter, 6512

Lake Stellacoom Avenue, Tacoma 99, Washington, for reimbursement of expenses incurred incident to the employment of expert witnesses to testify in his behalf at a special court-martial trial held at McChord Air Force Base, Washington, on August 18 and 21, 1961, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the sum of \$200. There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$200 for payment of said claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR C. BERRY AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3627) for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 2 OF PRIVATE LAW 87-673

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1535) to amend section 2 of Private Law 87-673.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of October 23, 1962 (Private Law 87-673), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For the purposes of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Mehmet Vecihi Kalayciloglu shall be held and considered to have complied with the residential and physical presence requirements of that section of the said Act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] rise?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not object, I make this reservation in order to call the attention of the House to House Document No. 90, a communication from the President of the United States. In essence, this communication states that the cost of claims and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, enacted by the Congress last year, amounted to about \$17 million. This amount is not related dollar by dollar to private claim bills, but no doubt a substantial portion of it is a result of bills passed under the procedure we have on the floor of the House today, the calling of the Private Calendar.

So the Private Calendar is not just a perfunctory procedure that we go

through. It does represent a substantial cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES, FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] and one-half of the time to be controlled by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am just wondering why on a bill involving something like \$5 billion, the first departmental appropriation bill that we have up for our consideration, and the House having no further business between now and next Thursday, why should there not be an ample amount of time for Members who wish to talk on the subject of the budget have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I shall not make any objection, if that is the decision of the gentleman in charge of the bill. If that is the case, it is all right, but I still do not understand just why when the House has nothing else to do there should not be ample time for a little talk about this situation of the Federal budget not only with reference to this bill, but on other bills that will come later on.

Mr. KIRWAN. May I point out to my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, that this bill does not call for even \$1 billion to say nothing of \$5 billion, which is the amount mentioned by the gentleman. The amount involved here is only \$935 million.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I probably have another bill in mind, but the amount involved in this bill does amount to quite a bit of money in anybody's book.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is a lot of money, but this budget has been well trimmed and furthermore the activities covered here take in quite a bit in revenues. The amount that will be received is \$787 million, and as a result the bill costs only about \$150 million.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not complaining about your bill, but I am wondering why there should be so much

haste here when the House is not doing anything else.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, will the gentleman ask for 3 hours and, if the time is not used, of course, it can be yielded back.

Mr. KIRWAN. I would not have any objection even if we talk here until the next Fourth of July.

Mr. GROSS. That is fine, then how about making it 3 hours?

Mr. KIRWAN. I have no objection to that. It is all right with me.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited not to exceed 3 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] and one-half of the time by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent request, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked for only 2 hours general debate on the bill is because that is all we thought would be needed. Only a very few Members indicated a desire to use time. I have no objection to the Members talking as long as they want on whatever subject they want, but to talk about the bill.

I want to thank the members of the subcommittee for their cooperation in processing this bill. Their attendance at the hearings was almost 100 percent and everyone worked hard. The new members gave much time and close attention to everything we had to do. The gentleman from Wyoming, who is the ranking minority member, was new to the job but made outstanding contributions and was always most cooperative.

If you go to a ball park you find a fellow just inside the gates wanting to sell you a program so you can identify what is going on at the ball park. The same thing applies at a racetrack or a football game. There is a good report on this bill, a very good one. That is why I ask everyone to read the report, for those who did not sit through the hearings will get a great deal of information from it.

In 1896 when I started to work, the last year of Grover Cleveland's administration, I knew America like very few people knew it. In 1896 it took less than \$500 million to run this country. There were 92 million people in America at that time. In 1940 we had 132 million people in the country, and now we have 180 million people. It is obvious what this has meant in the expansion of requirements that have to be met with this bill, involving everything from mapping to provisions for millions of visitors to our parks. For example, over \$266 million is now required for the education, health, and welfare of the Indians.

Very few people have any good idea of the Indian problem unless they have lived in an area where there are Indian reservations. We have had some 400 ironclad contracts with the Indians and I do not think we ever kept 1. If we do not keep contracts with the people who owned this country what chance have we got trying to please the rest of the world?

It was my job to go down to the South Pacific a year ago last November and when I got down there the first school I saw with the American flag flying on it did not have one bench in it, one chair, or one desk. Our enemies realize this. All they have to do is take the hearings on the Interior Department appropriations. We have owned American Samoa for many years and this year we graduated the first high school students—never a college student. No wonder parts of the world are shocked when they hear us say we are the greatest race on earth. Now we are providing funds in this bill to correct the neglect in American Samoa and the trust territory.

This bill is cut approximately 9 percent and the interesting thing about it is that this bill is cut \$21 million below the chamber of commerce recommendation.

Now, if I had my way, and if the Nation were in a better financial situation, this bill would call for \$2 or \$3 billion, because there is not a man or woman in this room who does not know we have robbed and looted the greatest country in the world for 300 years, all the way from Maine to California. One of our great Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt, established the Reclamation Act of 1902. He was the savior of this country. It stopped them from robbing and looting. But all the money we spent on America from 1902 to 1932 on reclamation was about \$300 million to save the greatest country in the world.

Here is a bill that produces revenues of \$787 million, largely offsetting the \$935 million that you are appropriating. If the rest of the bills were like it we would have money in the bank.

You cannot continue to have this country go forward and not spend a few dollars on its natural resources.

There are some problems of overlapping in agency and department programs. That is why I asked you to look at the report. There are 8 different departments and 19 agencies that have gone into the study of water. Can you imagine, 19 agencies have gone into the study of water? With budget requests totaling over \$76 million.

When I tell you that it is a good bill, I mean it is a good bill.

You hear a lot of people say, "I wish we could go back to the olden days." Here is a picture that shows what happened during the olden days. This was taken in 1896. The oldest boy working in the breaker was 9 years of age and the youngest was 7. He got 3½ cents an hour. And, notice the breaker boss. You cannot see his body, but you can see his hands. In one hand he has a club and in the other a mace. That is what he beat you with. A camera does not lie. That is the olden days. That was America when we were not spending a dime on ourselves, and it has not changed much down through the years, when you look at the objections at every turn of the road when we try to help mankind or try to improve this country. You always find people objecting and denouncing things that are good for America. But, life was good to me; the country was good to me; my Maker was good to me, very, very good.

You will notice in this bill that the Park Service is trying to buy 5,000 more acres in the Everglades when they have 1,300,000 acres already and should be budgeting its request on urgent items. And, again, they are trying to buy more land across the Potomac River from George Washington's home. We took care of the essential purchase at Mockley Point last year. We have appraisals on land in that area running as high as \$12,000 an acre.

I defy any man in this room to say he voted to spend \$12,000 an acre for land to protect the view from Mt. Vernon. This view is not going to be disturbed anyway.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to look back and again ask the Members to reflect upon our forests and our streams. For instance, the Susquehanna River in the early 1890's I recall quite vividly. As a boy on a steamboat which traveled that river between Harrisburg and other points. Today you cannot run a canoe on it. There has been a great eroding and filling in that river, and all of the rivers in America. When you undertake to correct this and spend the money, oh, the howling and the growling that comes about.

Mr. Chairman, we would not have this budget in here today if the Congress down through the years had done its job. We did not in the Committee on Appropriations pass the authorizing legislation providing for the programs for which we are now asked to appropriate money. It was the Congress that passed it and not the Committee on Appropriations. We have no authorizing rights. Everything in this bill was passed by the Congress of the United States. Some of the Members who voted for its passage are now complaining about the cost involved. We cannot blame the people down the street for this. This is the result of action on the floor of the U.S. Congress. The Congress passed the bill. Some want us to buy almost one-third of America for parks and wet lands. We already have over 500 million acres of land under the control of the Department of the Interior. Look at the money

we are wasting buying additional land when we have so much land now that we do not know what to do with it. But, we are grinding out the authorizations.

Mr. Chairman, we may have been a little slow in getting this bill before the House for action, but when it comes in here, the bill is as nearly correct and right as we can make it. I urge the Members to get a copy of the report and take a look at it. In my opinion any time a committee of the Congress brings a bill out of the committee in the amount of \$21 million less than the chamber of commerce suggested, that committee is doing a good job.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. By what amount is this bill below the spending level for this agency last year?

Mr. KIRWAN. The bill is only \$9,242,200 or 1 percent, over the current year. One item of increase is to improve education in the trust islands. The authorizing committee authorized over \$15 million for this purpose in the trust islands. We did not authorize this. However, this is the law.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, what is it below the budget?

Mr. KIRWAN. It is \$92.8 million below the budget. We cut that much out of it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has made an excellent statement with respect to employment in the Department of the Interior which statement is to be found on page 43 of the committee hearings. However, I would ask the gentleman if his committee increased the number of employees and, if so, by how many?

Mr. KIRWAN. We added something like 796 employees, a 1 percent increase. We cut out 2,679, a 5-percent reduction in the total.

The increase is for teachers for the Indian schools, trust territory, mapping, parks, and all those items in the budgets. The committee did not authorize that, the Congress did.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but this again gets back to the innocuousness of an authorization bill. The gentleman from Ohio, I am sure, does not believe that any authorization bill coming to the House of Representatives is innocuous simply because it is an authorization bill; is that not correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. Within the total, we had to provide an increase of \$22.5 million for forest access roads because of the new contract authority in the Federal-aid Highway Act. That we have nothing to do with. It is back-door spending. Probably the bill would be millions less if it were not for the fact that we have no control over the contract authorizations, such as highway spending, and so on. What we are faced with is that we owe the money and have to pay it according to the law. If it were not for that, this bill would be way below the bill of last year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, on the subject of the pay increase bill, does the gentleman have in mind the amount of increase in the bill that was necessary because of that pay increase bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. They asked for over \$13 million and we cut the pay increase item 40 percent. They will have to take care of that themselves.

Mr. GROSS. That is, the amount that they asked to fund the pay increase of last year?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct. We cut it 40 percent.

Mr. GROSS. On the assumption that by attrition and by greater productivity they could take up that 40 percent?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. They will have to find ways and means.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman is acquainted with the Randall report last year which said that the entire pay increase in all agencies and departments of Government would be taken care of through greater productivity.

Mr. KIRWAN. We have cut employees each year.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman's committee cut it 40 percent, but there is still a 60-percent increase for that purpose in the bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. Was it the Committee on Appropriations that authorized the pay increase? The gentleman knows that is not so.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I have a question I would like the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee to answer for the record. I should be surprised if the information is available without some research, but I think Members of the House and the people of the country ought to know the vast amount of money that is being spent by the executive departments traveling all over the United States and throughout the world. Nothing has impressed me more in our hearings in the Independent Offices Subcommittee than the constant and continuous requests for increased funds to finance travel. Would it be possible before this debate is concluded, sometime during the afternoon, for the chairman to have some information placed in the Record indicating how much money there is in this bill for travel?

Mr. KIRWAN. We cut the travel item in two agencies that did not live up to our requests in the last bill. We censured them in this bill. That is what I am trying to tell the gentleman, this is a good bill.

Mr. JONAS. I think it is a good bill and intend to vote for it. I want to congratulate publicly the subcommittee on making substantial cuts.

Mr. KIRWAN. There were only two agencies in this bill that did not conform to the committee's request last year and cut out travel. We censured those two agencies for not doing so.

Mr. JONAS. It is a question of control and how much travel is involved.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. We have asked the agencies to exercise strict control on travel. I will say this about travel; one

of the wealthiest men I know used to denounce me every time I took a trip. He finally retired from business and went around the world. He sent me a letter saying, "I know that you have my letters on file and I would like to have them sent back to me. All my life I was a businessman, but after my trip around the world I found out that you do not make enough trips, you and the rest of your friends in Congress, to see what is becoming of the American dollar and the American boy. Every time you make one of those trips somebody in the press denounces you for going on a junket."

It takes a man of courage to make one of those trips to find out what becomes of the boy and the dollar.

Mr. JONAS. I agree. I think we ought to have closer examination and investigation of places where the public money is being spent. I have never hesitated to take trips when they can serve a useful purpose.

Mr. KIRWAN. But you have to do it.

Mr. JONAS. The congressional branch of the Government is subjected to most of the criticism, but I think somewhere along the line the record ought to show how much travel is being done by members of the executive branch. I know it would be a difficult thing to pull it all together in one lump sum in a bill as big as this is. We are going to make an effort to do it in the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. I will be glad to do it in this bill and every bill to find out how much travel is going up.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. I commend my friend from Ohio for another very fine conservation statement. I know how deeply he feels about the soil, the forests, and the land of America. I know he knows that in the years to come we are going to have some 300 million people living in this country. I commend him for the many hours of work he and his committee have put in on this bill. There is no finer or more worthwhile expenditure in the whole budget than the amount he has in this Interior Department Appropriations bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman from Ohio has made a very good point in regard to the authorization by the legislative committee, but I want to remind our colleagues that the legislative committee also has a problem in this regard. Take for instance the Cape Cod National Seashore Park. Under the leadership of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] this committee no longer writes an open-end bill. There is always a specific dollar amount in the bill.

When the committee asked the people who were sponsoring this legislation from the administrative branch how much this

would cost they said it would cost \$14 million. This year when the Park Service came to the committee of the gentleman from Ohio they said, "I think we estimated the entire cost at around \$20 million." You see it has gone up \$6 million from the time they told our committee \$14 million. But if we take the average figures that have been paid for land to this point and look at the amount of land that is left to buy there, we will spend not \$20 million but in the neighborhood of \$50 to \$60 million to acquire all this property.

What I am asking the gentleman is whether he does not think that we might have a little more honesty in the estimated appraised value of these properties we are acquiring when the bills are before the Congress in the first place.

Mr. KIRWAN. Certainly. I know what the gentleman is talking about. A few years ago they said most of the people were going to donate easements on their land on a particular project and that \$1,600 an acre would be the most we would have to pay for the land to be purchased. If I were on the committee I would do the same as the committee did, I would vote it out as they did, without a dissenting vote. But when it came before the Committee on Appropriations the lawyer representing some of the people who were supposed to donate the land said, "Do you think we are crazy? We are not donating a foot of this land." That is not what they said to the authorizing committee. I am not blaming them. Now the waterfront property comes up to \$12,000 an acre. But that is not what we were told. It is when they come before the Committee on Appropriations that we get the truth. It all looks pretty when they come in front of you, but when they come in front of the Appropriations Committee and they have a lawyer in there they say, "No, we won't donate a foot of this land."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman on bringing before the Congress what I think is a very good bill. I am very pleased I can be a member of this committee. It is a pleasure to work with both the majority and minority members of the committee.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the two clerks of this committee, Eugene Wilhelm and his assistant, Carson Culp. They know the Department of the Interior and related agencies from A to Z, and I know the chairman knows that they have been a great help to the committee.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. I, too, wish to commend the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee. In my opinion, they have reported out a very realistic bill. I think in light of conditions as they are in the Nation at

the present time, perhaps, this is about all that can be logically spent for the purposes set forth.

I particularly wish to commend the chairman and the committee for his and the committee's willingness to work with the authorizing committee. This has been a relationship that has developed within the last few years. It makes it much easier for the authorizing committee to know the problems of the appropriating committee. I am sure that in some instances it makes it much easier for the appropriating committee to understand the difficulties under which the authorizing committees work. I think the gentleman from Ohio has made a very good statement. I do not know how you keep these evils of the private-enterprise system from working as they sometimes do. It is my opinion that when we authorize some of these park facilities, the people who appear before the authorizing committee are honest, and they are sincere in the position that they take and in the statements they make, but as soon as the authorization has been approved, then the people who want to make money move in and boost up the prices and make it almost impossible to follow through on a satisfactory legislative procedure.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the appropriating process that they just leave some of these facilities unappropriated, for after they reach the authorized sum of money, and let us see if we cannot get some of this operation back on a sound financial basis. It has only been in recent years that we have tried to close up these open-end authorizations, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House is one of the few committees that endeavors to do this. We do not get the job done, apparently, but there is this about it, everybody in this body can understand what has happened since the time of the authorization, and the appropriation and the construction that takes place thereafter in many of the activities, even in what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has to undertake, some of these programs, because they have had open-end authorizations, have grown from 1 installation to 23 installations. I am referring now, of course, to the Bureau of Mines. Perhaps the work that they do is satisfactory. Perhaps it is reasonably necessary. But certainly this body has the right to know every time a new facility has to be constructed. This has not been the case in the past. I commend the gentleman for the fine work that he has done not only in this instance but in the past.

Mr. KIRWAN. Please understand I am not condemning any of the witnesses who come before your committee or any authorizing committee or before the Committee on Appropriations.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us see about this bill. The amount recommended for 1964 is \$935,690,200. This year appropriations are estimated at \$926,448,000. In other words, this is \$9.2 million, or 1 percent, over 1963, including the pending supplementals. The bill is \$92.8 million, or 9 percent, below the budget estimate.

The revenues generated by activities in the bill are estimated at over \$787 million, an increase of \$7 million.

We made a 40-percent cut in requests for the increased 1964 Pay Act costs. No new construction starts of research facilities or vessels were allowed, which represented a cut of about \$11,337,000.

Requests for additional research funds totalling \$15.7 million were cut \$7.8 million, or 50 percent, allowing only the items placed in the highest priority by the bureaus.

All requests for additional passenger motor vehicles, were disallowed, except for 25 school buses.

Per diem allowances for consultants were held to \$75 per day.

The limitation on the unit cost of employee housing was continued at \$20,000.

Travel limitations were placed on two bureaus which did not take effective action to control expenditures as requested by the committee last year.

We have disallowed 2,679 positions or 80 percent of the requested increase of 3,475 permanent positions. This is a 5-percent cut in the total positions requested. The increase of 796 permanent positions allowed represents an increase of only 1 percent.

We would like to have cut out all new personnel, but we must provide expanded operations as follows:

Education and welfare and health of the Indians. There will be an additional 1,245 pupils to care for in Indian boarding and day schools, and an increase of 21,965 patient days in Indian hospitals.

It is estimated there will be 217 million visitors to the national parks and forests this year, an increase of 11 million.

Major budget increases allowed in the bill include an increase of \$8.9 million for the education, welfare, health, and economic development of the Indians. This is \$8.4 million less than requested.

An increase of \$5.7 million for Geological Survey, which is \$4.3 million less than requested, for additional topographic and geologic mapping and water resources investigations.

An increase of \$2.4 million for saline water research, a reduction of \$500,000.

An increase of \$22.5 million for forest access roads, a cut of \$6.4 million.

An increase of \$9.1 million for the Smithsonian Institution, including \$5.4 million for remodeling the old Patent Office Building.

It is desired to preserve the old Patent Office Building because of the associations with great people and events in our history. The additional funds for the Smithsonian Institution are needed because so many of their activities are scattered in different buildings and they should be concentrated in one place. They want to get into this building which the Civil Service Commission is vacating to take up permanent quarters in their new office building.

I hope when we start reading the bill the Members present will remember that this is one of the best bills the committee has brought in, at least during my 21 years on the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not yet said anything about the fish tank down here. I know we have appropriated something over \$300,000 to get blueprints for the tank.

Mr. KIRWAN. I think enough was said about it last year.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, no. I just want to help the gentleman cut the bill a little more.

Mr. KIRWAN. No. Now, just let me tell you something. They opened up an aquarium in Philadelphia recently. They are charging \$2 admission for an adult and \$1 for children under 18. It is planned to charge only 60 cents here and with the millions of visitors to the Nation's Capital the entire cost, as required by the authorization, will be repaid.

Mr. GROSS. I will not buy that at all.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might use.

Mr. Chairman, when the Department of the Interior and related agencies bill came before our committee, I must confess I was shocked to note that the Department asked for a 14.5-percent increase over their budget in 1963. It is no secret that I am one of those so-called conservatives. I join with many Members on my side of the aisle who feel that this country of ours is in a very serious financial situation, and that Congress, because it is the duty of the Congress, must make an effort to eliminate unnecessary domestic expenditures, reduce our continuing deficit spending, get back on a balanced budget, and make some honest attempt to pay our national debt. If this is not done, there is no question but what in years to come our survival will be much in doubt.

I was pleased to find that the welfare of our country and the need and desires to save money was not a partisan issue. I want to pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], for his willingness and his desire to see that proper and substantial cuts are made in the spending requests of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service.

I want to commend the other majority members of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], who also went along with my colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL], and myself in a desire to be perfectly fair in cutting this bill; perfectly fair in giving the Department the money they might need and should have without crucifying them or hurting their program, yet at the same time eliminating all of that money which we feel is unnecessary and which is now wasted.

It is no secret that over the years the Department has come before the Congress and asked for more money than they actually hoped to get. I do not believe there is an appropriation bill submitted to the Congress that cannot be cut, and I think they should be cut. It is our duty here in this body to see that the proper cuts are made and that the proper allocations are made to keep the departments in line and to see that they can continue the work they have to do.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. A discussion was engaged in about the rising cost of travel in the Department of the Interior. If my facts are straight, the Department of Defense, about a year ago, due to an Executive order which required that all personnel traveling by air at Government expense do so at the lowest available fare. I realize you cannot legislate in an appropriation bill. What would the gentleman think about the appropriation bill being amended to require that the personnel of the Department of the Interior using funds for air travel may do so only at the lowest available fare?

Mr. HARRISON. I will say to the gentleman that I certainly agree with his thinking. But, if he will check our record of the hearings, he will find that that point was brought out, particularly by the chairman, and that on many occasions a directive or instructions were issued to the different departments to use the economy class fare instead of first class. I think under the circumstances, in view of the hearings and the instructions given, that it would not be necessary to amend the bill this year. Of course, if they do not comply with those requests, then I think it would be in order next year to see that it is written in there so that they could not violate it in any way. There were some departments who did not take care of their travel in the proper way, and we specifically provided that they could not go over the amount that was allowed or spend any more money than allocated for that particular service.

Mr. FINDLEY. Am I correct in assuming, then, that it is departmentwide policy today that air travel be at the lowest available rate?

Mr. HARRISON. At the lowest economical rate. I assume they would use the economy rate rather than first-class travel.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON. Throughout our hearings our committee gave very thorough consideration to the requests of each of the departments. The hearings are lengthy, as you can tell from the volume of the hearings, and I think that we came up with a very fair figure as far as the amount which the committee allowed for the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service. We did make a cut of 9 percent. We think that is a very substantial cut. We think, however, it is a justified cut. The total cut of the amount requested was \$92,818,800. We also made a substantial cut in the number of new employees which the departments requested. There was a request for 3,475 new employees, an increase of 6 percent. We allowed an increase of 1 percent or 796 employees. And, they were designated for certain areas, such as health and other areas of that type, so that they were not spread all over the agency.

I might point out that the Bureau of Land Management wanted 198 new positions. They were all disallowed. The Bureau of Mines wanted 139; all disal-

lowed. Forest Service, 427; turned down. Indian Affairs asked for 664 to serve 1,245 new pupils, and they were allowed 47. I think our cut in employment is substantial, but I think the Department can operate on that basis. I think they will not be crippled in any way.

One thing that we found in our hearings is that there is a tendency—I know it is not only with these departments but with others—to use the word “research” to secure money from the Congress. We found that there were over 20 agencies engaged in water research, and we eliminated the Bureau of Mines from going into new research of ocean water, because that agency had no business there. And, I only hope that over the years Congress will take a much closer look at the question of research and try to avoid duplication in the different departments, and if research is necessary, for heaven’s sake let us put it in those agencies that now handle it but not have duplication, because with duplication there is an excessive waste of the public’s money.

I might say that I recognize the fact that there are many people who say we did not cut enough. There are probably many people who say we cut too much. There will be many people who say we did not put our cuts in the right place.

I think we did a good job. I think the committee worked hard and conscientiously. I am proud of the results that we have achieved.

Mr. Chairman, I might say very frankly to the members of the committee that I would have been most happy if we could have found other places to reduce, especially in view of the necessity to pinch every penny we can in this country, to really reduce every unnecessary expense, whether it be good or not, particularly if it is not needed at this particular time.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope if those things are found that they will be eliminated, but our feeling was that some of the funds that were left in the bill were the result of actions by legislative committees of the House of Representatives. They were programs which had been previously authorized and we felt we could not eliminate them. However, it will be your duty and your obligation and your prerogative here on the floor of the House to reduce those if you so desire.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have a very fair bill. I think it represents a substantial cut. I feel that if other departments receive the same cuts we will make a very substantial dent in the Federal expenditures for fiscal 1964.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentlemen of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee and particularly the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and also the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON]. I am greatly pleased with the increased appropriation of \$100,000 for expansion of

pesticide-wildlife studies under the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. This is a vital and important area and I urge that immediate action be undertaken lest we have a series of silent springs. It is of the utmost importance that we move quickly and do everything that we can to control this major problem which confronts all of humanity. In another area, I am pleased with the \$30,000 appropriation for the cooperative fishery unit at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst. With a strong professional staff already available there, I am sure important investigational work will be done immediately.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I might say to the gentleman that I too am very proud of the cuts we have made. I might say if we had not made substantial cuts I would have personally been in here with a minority report. But I also want to say in deference to our chairman and the cooperation which I received from the chairman and the majority members, and the fact that we did make substantial cuts and cuts which I thought were proper, certainly prevented me from even considering a minority report. I certainly will stand on the report which we have presented as being one which I think is a good report and one which should be approved.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in commending the subcommittee for reducing this budget by something like 9 percent. I think this is clear evidence that the information we have been getting—and most of it has been coming from the executive branch—that this budget was so tight it could not be cut is not true. I hope this is something which will give stimulus to other subcommittees to try to strive for further reductions. I think such cuts can be made and can be made in a way that they will not in any way damage the best interests of the United States either here or abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the subcommittee, and I certainly hope with all this publicity we are getting on the budget that this will be the initiative whereby we reduce it further. I feel it can be reduced in other areas as well as what the members of this subcommittee have done here.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, this is an historic occasion for the gentleman from South Dakota. I happen to be a member of a tribe that is being covered by the appropriation which is contained in this bill. I want here to express my deep appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], for his continued and deep interest in the welfare of the American Indian in this country.

I also want to express my appreciation at this point to the Members on my

side and the leadership which enabled me to be assigned to the Committee on Appropriations. It was doubly difficult for me to scrutinize every item contained in this appropriation bill for the reason that I spent almost a quarter of a century as an employee in the Department of the Interior, and I was familiar with the work. I was familiar with the work of each of the sections, branches, and bureaus and I knew the fine job that is done by the employees in those agencies. Of course, each wants to do an outstanding job and each can find many worthwhile things to do. But in a time such as we are in now, when we feel that we ought to get our budgetary arrangements in better shape, it was with some reluctance, knowing the job that needs to be done with our resources, that needs to be done with our people in order that we shall leave in a day ahead a better America for all who are yet to come, I was delighted to find the chairman of our subcommittee and the ranking minority member concerned with bringing the budget requests within some semblance of balance between the needs and the cost to our country.

So we find almost a 10-percent cut, agreed to by both sides alike, as the thing to do. I feel we have here a bill that has cut back in those areas that can be cut back without damage to our country and without harm to the people who will be affected. I feel that it is an excellent bill.

We have devoted a great deal of time in committee, with the help of the staff, to cut wherever it seemed possible to cut without doing harm to our country.

And so I am hopeful that when the debate finally ends we will be in sufficient agreement so that we can accept this bill as it is. I am sure, as was pointed out by the ranking minority member of our subcommittee that there are those who feel that there should be a greater cut and there are those who feel that we cut too much. But it has been our best judgment that this is a bill that we can defend here on the House floor.

We have joined together in bringing about the cuts that we think it can stand and leave our country with the kind of service that can be provided by the Department of the Interior and keep it a good and a going country.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, as I am sure almost every Member of this House knows I was a member of this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Interior for many years.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. JENSEN. I am delighted to yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot pass up the opportunity to say something for the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Appropriations. We all know our able and distinguished, hard working friend, Congressman JENSEN. We have all known him for many years. I do not think there is a finer man in this House, or any place else; or a harder working

Member, one more dedicated to the people of his district and the Nation.

As well as I recall, BEN, if I may call him that affectionately, and our able friend from Ohio, Mr. KIRWAN, have worked together on this bill for 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, what a tremendous job they have done. I hope the best of everything for our able friend from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. I want to listen very carefully to what he says, because whenever he takes the floor and talks, it is worthy of the attention of the membership of the House.

BEN, I wish you well, and I hope you live to be as old as I am, and that will make you only 34.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank my esteemed friend from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] for his kind words. I feel I am not entitled to all the praise he has just showered on me, but we are all vain, you know, so I thank you, AL.

I was about to say that I served on this subcommittee for the Interior Department appropriations for a period of 20 years. I found it necessary during this session of Congress to yield my membership on that committee in order to make a place for a new member on the Appropriations Committee. It has proven that my appointment of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] has borne out my contention that they would be valuable Members of this House to serve on this very important committee.

The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] was a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for several years and as such he became very well acquainted with all the ramifications of the Department of the Interior in all its facets. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] was an area director of the Indian Service for many years, and as such he is familiar with most every agency of the Interior Department. They have served on this committee in the most commendable manner during this session.

I want to compliment the chairman of this committee, my friend from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. I served with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] on this subcommittee 20 years. Some think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] is a liberal spender. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] knows that we must head off this unconscionable spending of the American people's tax dollars, or soon our dollars, the dollars in our pockets, will be very greatly depreciated in purchasing power.

This bill comes to the floor of the House reduced over 9 percent, making a dollarwise cut of \$92,818,800 below the President's budget.

Every dollar in this bill is for America and the American people, for the preservation and the conservation of our priceless topsoil, our forests and all our natural resources. In this bill is appropriated funds for recreation, for the Fish and Wildlife Service, and for the national parks and numerous other agencies.

Most important of all is the preservation and conservation of our most precious natural resource—our children. I

plead guilty, my colleagues, to being quite liberal in helping to appropriate for recreation, for the Fish and Wildlife Service and for the National Park Service. And why do I do that? Because I know that for example last year over 200 million people visited our lakes, our parks and forests. What does that mean? That means that mothers and fathers took their children to the great outdoors where they communed with nature. Nature, as you know, is God's business. These children by going to the great outdoors commune with nature and become interested in all the things that are natural. When they become natural, they become practical. When they become practical, they become good children and they grow up to be fine men and women. There is an old adage, my friends, which is just as true today as when the words were first uttered, "Take your boy hunting, and you will never have to hunt for your boy." Child delinquency is greatly reduced among children whose parents take their children to the great outdoors. So I shall not have it on my conscience nor will the members of this committee have it on their conscience that they have been a party to more child delinquency. The cost is a small fraction of 1 percent of the money wasted across the seven seas. I only wish we would put greater emphasis on clubs that would spend their time taking our American boys and girls to the great outdoors. In time child delinquency would dwindle to a minimum, if every American boy and girl could be taken by their parents or by people who are interested in children to the great outdoors. There is hardly such a thing as child delinquency among children whose parents take them hunting and fishing, boating and swimming.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk now about the education of our Indian children. When Glenn Emmons took over the directorship of the Indian Bureau in 1953, there were over 20,000 Indian children of school age without a teacher or a schoolroom. Today there are less than 2,500 Indian children without school facilities and that fine record has been made at minimum cost. We must continue to live up, as best we can, to the treaty which Uncle Sam made with the American Indians which was that we would furnish a schoolroom and a teacher for every 35 Indian children. We are now trying hard to live up to that treaty Mr. Chairman. I have always reserved the right to vote for any amendment that I felt was justified, which is introduced to any appropriation bill or any legislative bill. I reserve that right today. But I do say in all sincerity that the members of this committee and their great clerk, Gene Wilhelm, and his fine associate, Carson Culp, have done a good job, and I compliment them for it. I am happy that this bill comes to the floor with a cut of \$92,818,800 below the President's budget.

I thank you.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN].

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Appropriations Com-

mittee, I would like to commend and congratulate Chairman KIRWAN for the fair and impartial manner in which his subcommittee hearings were conducted and for this same fairness in the preparation of the Committee's final report. Chairman KIRWAN has an intimate grasp of the problems facing the agencies whose budgets were under consideration; his understanding of the general budget situation was a realistic one and it is a privilege and a pleasure to serve here.

I should also like to pay tribute to my committee colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON], and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

I want also to mention the work of the helpful and capable staff, Eugene Wilhelm and Carson Culp, who assisted us so skillfully and knowledgeably.

This is a luxurious budget. As finally approved by the committee the bill appropriates \$936,690,200 of which \$597,860,200 is for the Department of the Interior and \$337,830,000 for related agencies which represents a cut of \$95,423,200 from that suggested by the Bureau of the Budget. However, today's bill will continue existing services at present levels, allowing only increases with the highest justification.

The bill appropriates \$37.5 million more for 1964 than was available during the 1963 fiscal year. Most of this increase is explained by the additional \$8,400,000 suggested for the Trust Territory Schools and the additional \$22,500,000 suggested for forest access roads.

As Members of the House of Representatives know, the lumber industry throughout the Nation is faced with many problems. This is particularly so this year in the Pacific Northwest. The Appropriations Committee in its deliberations recognized this fact by increasing the amount appropriated for forest access roads from \$37½ to \$60 million.

The committee realized that the hurricane winds last October 12 in the Pacific Northwest resulting in a blowdown of about 11 billion board feet of prime timber, about 2 billion of which was on Federal lands, justified increases in funds to build roads on which this timber could be taken out of the woods. The committee realized also that a major factor to be considered was the necessity of removing ripe timber from the woods before fire and insect infestation endangered forests in the entire Northwest.

Among the other important programs so essential to the entire Nation in the field of forestry is that of research in the many major categories. For example one of the great problems is in the field of seeding and in the development of research to find better methods relative to wild-animal damage to small newly planted trees.

Not long ago I had a letter from Mr. Bill Hagenstein of the Western Forestry Association, in which he listed several case histories, and these I call to your attention now:

CASE HISTORY NO. 1

One example of this is a 957-acre area within the 1951 Forks Burn in Clallam County. This area was planted with 2-year-

old Douglas-fir in November and December of 1957 to an average density of 650 trees per acre. All seedlings had been previously treated with animal repellents to discourage damage by wildlife. Reports from planting crews and company foresters observed herds of elk in the area immediately after planting, and upon inspection found extensive damage to the planted seedlings, large numbers of which had been completely pulled from the ground. Seven months later an intensive inspection indicated seedling survival was only 20 percent of those planted. This survey also indicated that the remaining trees were 53 percent damaged by animals. The financial loss on this one area is outlined here:

Cost of planting at \$19 per acre.....	\$18,183.00
Approximate cost of seedlings at \$4 per acre.....	3,828.00
Total cost of project.....	22,011.00
Cost per acre.....	23.00
Loss of wildlife (80 percent).....	17,608.00
Dollar loss per acre.....	18.40

In addition to elk, deer and mountain beaver were contributors to the seedling loss. This is one example of what has occurred to

various degrees on 2,897 acres of — ownership in the Forks Burn planted between 1958 and 1961. As a result, hand planting, as a means of obtaining adequate reforestation in the Forks Burn, has been discontinued.

CASE HISTORY NO. 2

Area scarified in 1958-59 and planted in 1958-59, Clatsop

Elk activity here this past winter is probably the heaviest ever seen concentrated in an area. This plantation after scarification is severely browsed, in fact, to my eye is practically a total loss. Bordering area, containing some Douglas-fir planted in 1953 which was replanted in this 1958-59 season is equally struck. Evidence of heavy elk use is demonstrated by close cropping of herbaceous brush, grasses, and conifer trees, runs and tracks and beds.

Also, bordering the scarified-planted area is ground where alder encroached on 1953 plantings. This was sprayed by helicopter in the summer of 1959; and some of ground containing closed canopy alder was replanted in the 1959-60 season. Elk damage is severe here also. A staked survival row was checked from the 1959-60 planting. Following are the results:

TABLE I

Planted species	Number stakes	Thrifty number	Weak number	Dead number	Missing number	Percent survival
Sitka-spruce.....	24	5	10	3	6	62.5
Douglas-fir.....	19	0	9	5	5	47.5
Total or average.....	43	5	19	8	11	55.8

The above determines survival as is, but does not indicate the serious condition of 66.7 percent of the living trees. As follows:

TABLE II

	Number Sitka-spruce	Percent of total	Number Douglas-fir	Percent of total
1. Dead (undetermined).....	1	4.2	0	0
2. Killed; tree found pulled out, or stub found without foliage.....	2	8.3	5	26.3
3. Missing; no complete evidence, but probably elk pullups.....	6	25.0	5	26.3
4. Heavy, close cropped; trees not likely to survive.....	7	29.2	6	31.6
5. Medium, leader clipped, but tree should survive.....	1	4.2	3	15.8
6. Light, leader tip clipped; tree not impaired.....	3	12.5	0	0
7. Underaged.....	4	16.6	0	0
Total.....	24	-----	19	-----

Table II illustrates more conclusively the fate of this plantation by exactly categorizing each tree of the staked row examined. For example:

While table I shows 47.5-percent survival for Douglas-fir, actually only 15.8 percent of the trees will survive. Sitka spruce shows 62.5-percent survival, but only 33.3 percent will survive. And these trees will only survive if browsing ceases. It also illustrates that under severe conditions, spruce may be browsed, but not to the extent of Douglas-fir.

CASE HISTORY NO. 3

Reforestation on various company lands

Section 19, township 14 south, range 4 east: Hand seeded Douglas-fir and poison bait, 1954; hand planted Douglas-fir, 1958.

Sections 19 and 30, township 14 south, range 4 east: Hand seeded Douglas-fir, 1957; hand planted Douglas-fir, 1959.

Section 25, township 14 south, range 3 east: Hand planted Douglas-fir, 1954.

Section 25 and 26, township 14 south, range 3 east: Hand planted Douglas-fir, 1954; hand planted Douglas-fir, 1958.

Section 23, township 14 south, range 3 east: South half aerial seeded Douglas-fir and poison bait, 1951; portion of south half hand planted Douglas-fir, 1952; portion of southeast quarter hand seeded Douglas-fir,

1955; portion of southeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1959.

Section 26, township 14 south, range 3 east: West half, northwest quarter hand seeded Noble-fir, 1955; east half, northwest quarter hand seeded Douglas-fir, 1955; northwest quarter, southwest quarter seeded Douglas-fir, 1958; northwest quarter, southwest quarter aerial seeded Douglas-fir, 1959.

Section 22, township 14 south, range 3 east: South half aerial seeded Douglas-fir and poison bait, 1951; northwest quarter and west half, northeast quarter aerial poison baited, 1951; northeast quarter and north half, southeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1957; south half, north half, northeast quarter hand seeded Ponderosa Pine, 1959; north half, north half, northeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1960.

Section 16 township 14 south, range 3 east: No reforestation work.

Section 9, township 14 south, range 3 east: West half, northwest quarter, northeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1954; scarified area in northeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1959.

Section 5, township 14 south, range 3 east: North half hand planted Douglas-fir, 1954.

It was recognized in this bill that acceleration of the process of providing

educational facilities in the trust territories is more than justified, indeed is a necessity.

Recognition of the lag in elementary education among the young people in the trust territories led to the start of an accelerated elementary education program in 1963. The future of these people in a modern world depends largely upon the education they will obtain in their school systems. Certainly everything we can do to help these young people prepare for the future is our responsibility.

It is true in the territories as well as in our own Nation, that an educated person is a more responsible and productive person.

I want to mention also the appropriation requested for the Fish and Wildlife Service wherein funds requested for this agency are allocations of money to preserve and improve our fish resources. Many of our people depend upon fish for their livelihood and in view of the rapidly increasing population in our Nation it is absolutely essential that these important sources of food be protected and expanded. There is, of course, another aspect to this and that is the sport fishing industry. Millions of our fellow Americans relax with a fishing rod in their hand, and a great industry has been built around sport fishing.

Related to this preservation of our fishing industry is the work of the Bureau of Land Management. The appropriation bill allocates many millions of dollars to this agency. All of it to be used in making our Nation better. Millions of acres of Government land are managed by this agency. Thousands of acres of rangeland are being reseeded. Thousands more will be planted in trees and other crops. Soil conservation projects are underway. Certainly it is to the interest of this generation and to those in the future that this agency be given adequate funds to do the job assigned to it.

When discussing appropriation measures we cannot fail to mention money being used to improve the lives of our Indian citizens. The Bureau of Indian Affairs have under their care and supervision Indian tribes throughout the Nation. Money appropriated today will be used to prepare our Indian citizens for a more active participation in the life of their communities, States, and our Nation. Health standards will be improved, infant mortality decreased, the lifespan lengthened, educational needs fulfilled. Opening new and broadened opportunities for the Indian is a necessity if they are to achieve the full benefits of United States citizenship.

Again, my congratulations, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Ohio and his fine committee for a job well done. He always does a fine job on that committee. I think he has made substantial reductions that will not disrupt any essential function of this Government. I wish it had been possible

for him to make a few more. I hope every chairman as he comes along with an appropriation bill during this session of Congress will fall in line and do as well for the American taxpayer as the gentleman from Ohio has done.

I want to disagree, however, a little bit with the gentleman on Indians. I yield to no person in this Congress in the matter of sympathy for the American Indian. I think I know the American Indian possibly better than any man or woman in this great body, except perhaps the gentleman from South Dakota, BEN REIFEL. I have headed the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for a little over 8 years. I think I have visited every Indian reservation in America. I have wondered as I traveled about and wonder still if the Members of this Congress really know how much benefit the American Indian is obtaining from the tremendous amounts of money we are expending in his behalf. In 1954 the requested appropriations for the Indian Bureau were \$103 million.

The expenditures were somewhat less than \$85 million. The items contained in the present budget amount to \$266,533,300, an increase in the last 10 years of approximately \$181 million against an expression of the Congress of the United States that we wanted, as rapidly as possible, to make the Indian self-supporting and get him off the backs of the American people.

This Indian problem is not a new one. It has been with us since we became a nation. However, following the instructions of the Congress in the last 10 years, 13 tribes have been terminated, with a total population or a total number of 13,382.

I think there is a policy here in the Congress, it is not only in this particular bill but in every bill that you bring here or that we bring here, to look at the requested budget and not look back and see what the increases have been over the years and trying to find out where these tremendous sums of money are going.

Yes, I am sympathetic to the little Indian child, but I may say to my friend from Ohio, we have less children today going to Indian schools than we had 10 years ago. I say that nobody can challenge that, because as we move along on this program we are asking the State to take over the teaching of the Indian children.

In my State of Florida, where we have been operating Indian schools in the past, we do not operate them any more. We make an agreement with the local school authorities of those counties nearest the Indian reservation, and they take over the education of the Indian children at less than half the amount that was necessary to maintain Indian schools.

I do not blame this committee for this tremendous increase, I do not blame any chairman of the Appropriations Committee for bringing in a bill, to do what? To take care of the obligations that Congress has authorized, has obligated you to move forward on. Yes, as the chairman, Mr. ASPINALL, said just a while ago,

we try in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to have the people downtown, when they present a bill to that committee, tell us what it is going to cost. Every committee of the Congress should do that. If we did that we would find that in order to get additional money they would follow along. I assure you that in any of these programs you will be lucky if you get out of them with no less than twice the amount that they asked for. So it is not the fault or responsibility of this committee to cut beyond certain essentials. It is up to the Congress of the United States. You say you control the purse strings, you should control the purse strings, but do not lay the thing in this committee's lap. When you authorize programs, when you pass bills on this floor, find out what they are going to cost, put a ceiling on them, and make them come back and tell you if they have made a mistake. I assure you 75 percent of the time they will be coming back to this Congress and saying, "Oh, we made a mistake this time. We have expended more money. The project is about one-third to one-half complete, and we must have additional money."

Mr. Chairman, I again want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for doing the job, but I want to say to you that I think every person in this Congress, every chairman in this Congress should, when he brings a bill up, make them lay it on the line and let us find out what we are expending it for, and let us not let the people downtown tell us how to run the appropriations of this great Congress.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, it is ironic—and that is a charitable word—it is ironic that today we have a message on foreign aid on the same day we consider appropriations for the American Indian. Have your *Alianza Para Progreso*, if you wish, but for heaven's sake may we also have in the words of the Ogallala-Sioux "Toe ka'ta Kee'ya-un yampi-wolakota," a treaty of progress for the American Indian.

The voluminous hearings on the appropriations bill before the House include many statements expressing great satisfaction with the Federal Government's Indian program. It is not my purpose to charge anyone with incompetence or malfeasance. Nor is it my purpose to pose as an expert on Indian affairs. I have lived with Indians and close to Indians and have a continuing interest in the Indian which took me to several reservations and settlements last autumn and winter.

When one reads the other side of testimony before the Appropriations Committee, and witnesses first hand, the conditions on our Indian reservations, I cannot avoid the conclusion that our program for development of the American Indian has been a miserable failure. There are many who can take credit for trying to help the Indian. We all must share the blame for the lack of constructive results.

Bear two basic facts in mind:

There are now 380,000 Indians for which the Bureau is responsible. The Bureau was established in 1849.

On page 842 of the hearings note that 95 percent of the Indian children in the boarding schools come from non-English-speaking homes.

On page 844, note:

It is estimated that 65,000 Indian families are living in housing far below decent minimum standards. Many are living in tarpaper shacks, grass wickiups, etc., under extreme climatic conditions.

On page 845, we quote:

Our experience over a period of years has shown a steady annual increase in the number of people receiving general assistance.

On page 1468, find this comment:

Medicine men are still active on some of the reservations and at times the Indians place a great deal of faith in their ability in the healing arts, in conflict with medical treatment as we know it. * * * A language barrier still exists * * * which makes it difficult to communicate with many of the beneficiaries and requires the use of interpreters. * * * Approximately 60 percent of the Navajo and 35 percent of the Papago do not speak English.

Tens of thousands have only polluted water to drink and use. Even this must be hauled long distances.

On 1472, find this table, indicating the Indian mortality rate compared to those of all races in the country: Infant deaths are listed as less than two times greater except for Alaska natives where the rate is about 2.5 greater. There is some excuse for the latter.

Infections diseases—rates per 100,000 population—Indian excluding Alaskan 4 times greater. Gastroenteric diseases, Indian nearly 7 times greater. Influenza and pneumonia over 2 times greater.

Supplement these statistics with figures from 1487:

Up to the time the Indian infant leaves the hospital after birth, the rates of death are comparable to all races. However, when he leaves the hospital and goes to his Indian home he is subjected to marked unsanitary conditions, poor housing, poor nutrition, crowding, and all the adverse things that we find in the Indian community. As a result, we see the death rate among the Indians between the ages of 28 days to 11 months is 4 times greater than it is in all races.

These statements of fact, are quotations from personnel of the Indian Bureau and the Public Health Service.

How can we be proud of a 110-year record which leaves so much to be desired?

Nor can we complain about a lack of personnel. The chairman of the subcommittee reports on page 841 that investigations reveal 5,800 employees for educating approximately 42,000 Indian students. This represents a ration of one employee assigned to the educational activity for every seven Indian pupils.

Nor can the blame be laid at the feet of the Appropriations Committee which has provided generous funds through the period. In fact, we have provided for expenditures repeatedly which were used impractically.

The Federal Government proposes to spend many hundreds of thousands of

dollars in one area for the purpose of attracting industry to make jobs for reservation Indians. This is part of a reservoir project. Yet, one can find only a handful of Indians employed today on the vast projects right on the Indian reservation. Every level of labor skills is needed on the project. Yet, practically no Indians are employed.

Nearby is an Indian resettlement. It is a shameful huddle of tents, log cabins, and disreputable shacks. Sometime—sometime, a new town will be built. But for many months, the Indians are relocated on a dusty flat where there is no plumbing, there are no streets, there is no community lighting. There is a well, the water of which I would not drink. As a matter of fact, the make-shift well was condemned late last fall because of the presence of infectious disease. I suppose we should give credit to the State health authorities which closed the well. I cannot give credit to those who provided what I term unequivocally, an unsatisfactory supply of water.

There is, in an adjacent area, a clinic where the doctor serves the people 1 day a week. The day I visited was the appointed day for the medical visit. The doctor was present for a half hour, then left. I assume he had other duties. There was no note indicating he would be back. The Indian lady who walked a long distance carrying a child which she thought needed medical attention, simply started to walk away when she found the clinic unattended.

Elsewhere in America we fight segregation. With the Indians, we promote it. Except for a limited number of major crimes, an Indian judge provides justice.

One Indian judge I know has a fourth grade education. She is a fine woman. She is ambitious. She loves her people. But if she sentences an Indian for a violation which falls under her jurisdiction, there is no court of appeal except the Indian tribal council. Hers is a court apart. Of course, this procedure is in accordance with a treaty or agreement. It is inviolate. Yet, we violate another treaty on the same reservation, by taking land and water rights from the Indian.

There has been progress in some subject areas in various geographic areas. Yet, the general condition of the American Indian is a disgrace and a tragedy.

I compliment those who sincerely try to do something about this situation. I cannot agree that our record is good. Nothing short of a complete redirection of our effort will alter the situation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In 1849, that was the Old Frontier; was it not?

Mr. KYL. I would assume so.

Mr. GROSS. And, if the gentleman will yield further, the New Frontier in 1963 cannot waste a minute to get hundreds of millions of dollars down to South America, to the Congo, Africa, Ghana—you name it—and they are ready to go there with money to take care of the underdeveloped countries in those areas; is that about right?

Mr. KYL. I would assume so.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to add my commendation of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and members of his subcommittee for producing this wonderful bill, this great report and these 1800 pages of hearings.

Perhaps the developments of the past 3 weeks may have focused my attention a little more sharply on some of the bad effects of strip mining, because 3 weeks ago today, as a result of much of this strip mining in West Virginia and Kentucky our floods were made much more serious, and caused a great deal more damage. I wish each Member of the House could have been with me to the Staton Brothers Grocery Store and the Freeman Supermarket in Peach Creek, and numerous other areas of Logan County, W. Va., to see the damage done by this black, gummy, sludgy substance that came down out of the tributaries, which resulted I believe largely from the kind of strip mining which is going on in our coal producing States. Strip mining not only affects the mined areas, but makes it mighty tough on those for miles downstream from the strip mining operation.

Why cannot the Department of Interior do more about this? There are 500,000 acres, as I understand it, of abandoned and unreclaimed strip mining land in the coal-producing States. These lands place an increased tax burden on the whole area. They present health and safety hazards. They contribute soil erosion and stream pollution. And 103,000 of these acres are in the State of West Virginia.

What can be done about this strip mining? I am very deeply impressed with the thoroughness with which the committee has gone into this subject, citing the examples of what the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, and the Tennessee Valley Authority are already doing in this area. This is really not duplication. The Soil Conservation Service is obligated to protect the soil. TVA has a particular geographical area to which it devotes its energies. The Forest Service has to plant trees. But who is going to provide the leadership in order that we can do something about reclaiming these strip mining lands? It is an insult to God and nature to gouge out our beautiful hillsides, not only ruining the landscape but also making vast areas more vulnerable to floods.

I simply throw up my hands in despair and ask the question of whoever could answer it: Who can do something about this terrible situation in strip mining?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I can understand the interest of the gentleman from West Virginia, but I wish to advise him that this matter is not going unstudied as far as the Congress is concerned. We had legislation before the Committee on Interior and Insular Af-

fairs during the last Congress. We had people from various States who appeared before the committee and we had members of our committee who visited some of these areas.

We find that the States themselves and the authorities are not united in what they think is necessary to help take care of the situation. Neither are the representatives of industry. I can say that we have not finished our studies. We still have legislation before our committee and we shall continue to try to find the answer. It is the feeling of some of us that the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior does not have any specific authority for this work. That is the reason why the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and others of our committee have asked the committee to take further notice of the condition which the gentleman so forcefully brings to our mind.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado. I hope that aggressive efforts may be made to rehabilitate and reclaim these lands after strip mining has been completed, and I hope that the Federal Government in cooperation with the States and private industry can work harder toward this end.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee is again recommending that the House break faith with those who have worked to preserve the view from Mount Vernon, George Washington's home.

Less than 2 years ago, a bill which I introduced to preserve the Mount Vernon view passed the House without a dissenting vote.

Senator CLINTON ANDERSON's companion bill, passed the Senate without a dissenting vote, and those bills became Public Law 87-362.

Just a year ago, the Appropriations Committee recommended the disallowance of the funds to implement this law. The House, and the Senate, again without a dissenting vote, approved \$213,000 to begin acquisition of land, as recommended by the joint conference committee.

In spite of this, the Appropriations Committee recommends that we disallow any funds. The committee advances the same reasons as last year.

These so-called reasons are, that no actions are planned in this area which would detract from the present view of Mount Vernon, that the area is under adequate planning and zoning controls, that the cost will be far greater than estimated, and that the local jurisdiction should make a park at this site.

As I did just 1 year ago, I must again correct the RECORD so that the House may have the true facts.

To take the committee's last point first—that the purposes should be the responsibility of the local jurisdiction—as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I can again assure the House that the record is entirely clear. This is not a local bill passed to provide a park for local citizens. The

Interior Committee recommended Public Law 87-362 to protect the view from Mount Vernon for the millions of visitors who come to that shrine from all over America and all over the free world.

The Appropriations Committee again makes the point that it knows of "no evidence that any action is planned that would in any way detract from the present view from Mount Vernon." The committee again this year has chosen to ignore testimony, and repeated statements that the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission desires to locate a sewage plant within the confines of the area covered by Public Law 87-362.

The committee then re-recites the presence of adequate zoning. From testimony which it has, the committee must be aware that the adequate zoning they refer to allows development of 10,000 square feet lots under the rural residential category, and that the local zoning laws have no control over such agencies as the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, who have the power of eminent domain over land, even if it is directly across from Mount Vernon.

At this point the committee suggests that the generous donations by patriotic foundations of 350 acres along the Potomac and an additional 151 acres already donated on the south shore of Picataway Creek, coupled with the donation of scenic easements on hundreds of acres by scores of private citizens without cost to the Government, justifies the Congress going back on its commitments.

The committee's recommendations, if followed by the House, it will allow the three to five farmers who claim their farmland is worth \$12,000 per acre—a rather high price for farmland—to make a real killing. If the House allows the committee's recommendations, the farmers' land will be surrounded with lands donated without cost to the Federal Government, and protected by easements donated to the Federal Government. The committee wants these farmers to be free to proceed with high-density development within the area protected by Public Law 87-362, and the committee would have the House disregard the scores of individuals, and the organizations who have donated their land, or the rights to their land generously and patriotically.

I am afraid that the committee was outrageously bamboozled by the paid representative who testified for the farmers. This representative summarily dismissed the Interior Department's estimate of \$1,600 per acre. The committee now reports to the House "the committee can now find no basis for this estimate."

I call to your attention the fact that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee received testimony from the Interior Department and reported to the House that the \$1,600 price was based on the most recent transactions in the area between a willing seller and an informed buyer. This report and the testimony is, and has been, available to the Appropriations Committee.

The Appropriations Committee report then shows how completely the paid rep-

resentative of the three to five farmers took them in. This representative gave the following unsubstantiated testimony:

Up-to-date appraisals indicate the acquisition cost may run \$12,000 per acre instead of the \$1,600 per acre estimated by the Interior Department.

The committee solemnly advises the House "it is evident from recent appraisals running as high as \$12,000 an acre in this general area that a considerable increase in authorization would be required."

The committee has thrown out the testimony of the Interior Department based on the most recent comparable sales in the area covered by Public Law 87-362 and substituted the unsubstantiated opinion of the paid representative who believes his clients will want more money for their land.

The House is aware that these three to five farmers last year found time—between crops no doubt—to subject the House and the Senate to a barrage of letters distorting the facts, attacking our colleague FRANCES BOLTON, attacking the landowners in the area who have agreed to donate land and easements, attacking the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union—and even suggesting that Mount Vernon be condemned—as well as other organizations who have supported this measure.

A few days ago, after our colleague FRANCES BOLTON had left the witness chair, where she testified for this appropriation, and the hearing room, she was subjected to an attack by Mr. William Edison Owen, the paid representative of the farmers. This attack which grossly distorted the truth provided, as I have pointed out, some of the basis for the committee report. The House will be able to judge the testimony of Mr. Owen from the following excerpt from FRANCES BOLTON's statement:

Mr. Owen having attempted to show that the Moyaone Association is working with ulterior, selfish and profitmaking motives, then indicates that the cost of acquisition by the Government of his clients' land may run \$12,000 per acre instead of the \$1,600 per acre estimated by the Interior Department. This, the committee may consider is rather expensive land for farming.

The members of this committee should know that the acreage owned by Mr. Owen's identified clients, is, according to the Department of the Interior, currency assessed by the tax assessor of Prince Georges County at figures between \$28 and \$52 per acre.

Thus, Mr. Owen would have the committee believe that the property of one of his clients valued by the tax assessor at \$6,000 should be purchased by the Government for \$1,380,000; and another client whose property has an assessed value of \$8,000 would sell to the Government for \$2,676,000 and still another client's land assessed at a value of \$3,100 should bring \$1,547,000 from the Department of the Interior.

Thus, Mr. Owen calls upon the Appropriations Committee to believe his identified client's lands with a valuation set by the assessor of Prince Georges County at \$16,100 should cost the Interior Department \$5,603,000 or a selling price of 35,000 percent higher than assessed valuation.

It is on the basis of Mr. Owen's grossly inflated figures and flimsy evidence that

the Appropriations Committee advises the House:

A considerable increase in authorization would be required if the Federal Government were to purchase the remaining acreage in question.

I can only say that if the Appropriations Committee's dilatory tactics prevail, the price may ultimately rise to some figure like that presented by the committee.

Meanwhile, I urge the House not to stand idly by, but to act now to preserve this view so important to Mount Vernon, which, unless we act, most certainly will give way to high density development.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. DENTON. I would advise the gentleman that it was appraised by J. Randall Walcroft. He said there were 10,446 acres in this tract, and appraised it on January 28, 1963, as valued at \$120,113.

Mr. SAYLOR. Last year the appropriations committee broke faith with the Congress. At the time we brought in the authorizing bill they led us to believe the money would be forthcoming, and I call upon the Appropriations Committee now to put the money back and acquire these lands now.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps I should first assure everyone that the few remarks I want to make at this time certainly are not partisan in nature. I should like also to suggest at the outset that I am very happy that the appropriation bills are beginning to come before the House, because we all know that these are matters that must be disposed of before we can adjourn sine die. As far as I am concerned I think it is highly desirable that we dispose of as many of these appropriation bills as we can before the end of the fiscal year.

Last January, I think about the middle of the month, we received from the executive branch of the Government, the budget for the next fiscal year. It was right around \$108 billion in new obligatory authority, and that is what is generally referred to as the budget. I think a great many people were honestly and genuinely concerned about these spending proposals that were therein contained, and I say that advisedly when I refer to the fact that people here in the Congress on both sides of the aisle, and I can say it without regard to the political situation in the country, felt that we ought to do something about it if we had any regard for the welfare and the security of our country. Many of us thought that if we could make cuts we should make them. We felt that there were certain dangers inherent in excessive Government spending. As the leader on my side and being in the minority, I have recognized from the beginning, and I say again, that whatever must be done should be done on a bipartisan basis, because no matter what determination we might make on our side of the aisle as to

cuts that might be made, if we did not have some Members on the other side who feel the same way we do we would not get very far.

I have also said, and I say again, that it is the obligation of all of us to look this budget over very carefully and to cut it wherever we deem it can and should be cut.

I talk to the people once in a while on television, on the radio and personally. Earlier this year I appeared on a television program called "Meet the Press."

That was on February 6, last. Some of those reporters were quite insistent on inquiring about the budget. I took the position then that it should be cut, and I have maintained that position since that time in public and private statements and conversations.

On our side, the Republican side, we thought it might be well for us, having regard to the fact that whatever is accomplished must be on a bipartisan basis, to be able to do what we could to make the contribution in the direction I have been talking about, and that many of us have been talking about.

We started meetings with some of our members on the committee and with our legislative committee members. We set up a task force about which you have read and heard, headed by the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. Bowl]. We got some expert advice from people knowledgeable on matters covered by this budget, and I think it is fair to say that weeks and weeks of hard, diligent work, and effort have gone into this study. We have gone through the budget line by line. It was no hit and miss operation.

I recognize, of course, that some people shout when you talk about cutting the budget, "You cannot cut the budget. Sure, Congress controls the purse strings, but this is something you just cannot cut."

If anyone should take that position, may I say, in my opinion it is a negative, defeatist attitude that I do not find expressed here on the floor of the House today.

Some people have said, "Give us a bill of particulars." We have the bill of particulars, but the time and the place to talk about the bill of particulars will come along as we progress further in this session.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that there is alarm in the country about the spending that is proposed for the next fiscal year. I say people are alarmed and I think the mail all of us are getting is pretty clear proof that the people are expecting us to cut this budget wherever we can.

Having said as much, I am happy to see that the President has already cut, on his own direction, \$142 million from his requested budget; and, if my memory serves me correctly, the budget was often referred to as a hard budget right down to minimums. The message we heard today takes \$640 million out of the foreign assistance program.

May I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and the people who work with you, you have cut \$93 million from this budget request. The target some of us had set was something over \$100 million of a reduction.

So, in my opinion, this proves what can be done. Whether or not more cuts can be made, I do not know. There is a place or two I may be able to find I could vote to take something further out. But what has been done in connection with this bill, in my opinion, proves that the Congress can make some substantial reductions in the budget, and I hope as we go along we can continue to do that very thing.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to talk a little bit more about the general budget and our fiscal situation than I do about this particular bill, which was the reason I suggested we might have a little more time.

First let me say that I think this committee has done quite a comprehensive and laudable job on the question of reducing expenditures on projects in these appropriation bills that can be dispensed with or postponed. This bill represents a cut of \$93 million in the requested budget. It is still, however, \$37 million over the budget of last year. I would hope that this committee's action on this bill has set a percentage example for all of the appropriation bills that are going to come along later. They have cut 9 percent below the budget request. Now, that is very substantial progress, and I do not want anything I may say here to be taken as being in anywise critical of the splendid work of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and his able assistants on the subcommittees.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with a very large budget. Now, just remember that the budget of 2 years ago was \$81 billion. You are asked this year to appropriate \$107 billion.

Now, if you take a pencil, you can very readily ascertain that in those 2 years we have increased the requested budgets by 34 percent at a time when the country needs to cut its taxes. Now, we are all interested in cutting taxes. The country wants a tax cut. It would be good for the economy of the country. But, there are many of us and there are many people in this Nation who feel that you cannot properly cut your revenues by tax reduction at the same time that you are increasing your expenditures and have to borrow the money to operate your budget every year. Now, I think we have to consider that in every appropriation bill that comes up, because everybody is hungry and thirsting for a tax bill that is less confiscatory than the one we have now. I expect all of you know substantial business people as I do who have reached the point in the confiscatory nature of their income taxes that they have just about decided that they will take what they have made and go home and sit down and put it in a sock and just not contribute further to the economy of this country. And, that is bad. We ought to do something, but how are you going to do it when you are constantly increasing your expenditures every year and at the same time undertake to reduce your taxes? Now, that is not commonsense, and the people of

America are commonsense people, and they do not want that sort of an arrangement. So, I am deeply interested, as I know other Members are, in reducing all of these bills as much as we can without hurting the economy of the country. I do not think you will find a bill that comes before you that has not worthy and commendable projects in it that we can well postpone for a year or two or until we are in better shape to do so.

This bill in my judgment, with all due respect and with all my compliments to the committee, is no exception to the rule that somewhere there is some fat that can be cut out, or can be postponed.

Mr. Chairman, I refer particularly to the subject of ducks. There is a provision in this bill for a program on ducks. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has said, he did not authorize it. This Congress authorized it. In this bill there is an item of \$10 million for a program to acquire some—I think it is 1 million—when I get into these figures I get all balled up—acres of land that is either already marshland or is going to be converted into marshland for the use of migratory ducks to go back and sit down on and spend the winter. Now, I wonder. The ducks have been right patient with us. I wonder if they would not be willing to wait a year or two. I do not think it would do the duck hunters much harm. I am an old duck hunter myself. I cannot think of any more uncomfortable pursuit than hunting ducks in the middle of a snowstorm, sitting out in the middle of a river, hoping one is going to fly over. But, nevertheless, it is a very popular sport. I am sympathetic with the sport. But I think we could postpone that \$10 million. As a matter of fact, I think the committee probably felt a little that same way because the figure was supposed to have been \$12 million in the budget, and they cut it to \$10 million.

That program was authorized by this Congress. I reckon I was sitting around here somewhere when we did it, because I do not remember it. However, it authorized a program involving over \$100 million to buy over 1 million acres of land in North and South Dakota and Minnesota. I do not know why they want to buy land in Minnesota. Minnesota advertises itself as the State of Ten Thousand Lakes. That looks like it would take up enough of the State so that they would not want to be building any more duck ponds. But, nevertheless, we are going to build duck ponds in the State of Ten Thousand Lakes.

Mr. Chairman, in the Dakotas many thousands of acres can be bought there. Perhaps, they do not have so many lakes, because I notice from the figure they will have a good deal more ponds to be built than Minnesota. I also understand from what reading I have been able to do on the subject that North and South Dakota are saying "Now, hold a while; we do not want all our farmland turned into marshes to feed the ducks in the wintertime, so that they can fly down south and these rebels are going to shoot them all." They would rather have the farmland up there.

So, there is a good reason to postpone this appropriation, and let us wait a little bit until we are in better shape to do this.

I think even the duck hunters would appreciate it if we created here an atmosphere conducive to a tax reduction than to have a few more ducks. They cannot shoot but two of them in a day, anyway. So let us think about that when this bill is taken up for a vote.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, along that line, does not the gentleman think we might also postpone the \$10 million fish tank to be built along the Potomac and for which planning money is provided in this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know about fish in tanks, but I have not seen anything in the bill about that.

Mr. GROSS. It is in there, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] does not seem to realize that the bill said that it would not cost the taxpayers a dime; that is the point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. There is a gentleman on the floor who once told the House that the Washington Stadium would not cost the taxpayers a dime, either.

Mr. KIRWAN. I did not say anything about the stadium. The stadium and this aquarium are two different things. The law requires that the aquarium pay back all costs of planning and construction.

Mr. GROSS. Let me suggest that the gentleman not stake his reputation on the statement that the aquarium will pay for itself in 5 years.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would not change the subject to fish. I want to talk about ducks.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman that even if you cannot use this \$10 million it will not absolutely stop this program because in the authorization authority is given to use the receipts from duck stamps, which I understand amount to about \$4 million; and you can use that to acquire some of these ponds up in Minnesota or South Dakota or wherever they are; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman is entirely right. But we got off ducks onto fish and I had not reached that point. This authorization that calls for \$100 million for duck-pond renewal is supposed to be paid for out of what is called the duck stamp tax. That is supposed to yield \$4 million a year. So when I said that this bill carried \$10 million for duck ponds that did not include the \$4 million that they get out of the duck stamps each year, and which

receipts are supposed to be used to liquidate this other expense.

Let us do it the way it was contemplated in the bill, instead of trying to have a crash program to inundate half of Minnesota or North and South Dakota. Let us do it the way it was intended to do it. Let the \$4 million from the duck stamp money go each year, as it is going this year, but let us cut out this \$10 million and show the people of this country that we are going to cut the fat out of these bills wherever we can find it. I do not believe that this committee, which has done such a fine job on this bill, is going to object too strenuously to the elimination of that section.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened intently to the debate on H.R. 5279 and read the report of the committee amounting to some 46 pages, but I still have many reservations, I understand that no record vote was had because many do not want to go on record on this bill. This I do not understand.

I appreciate the fact that the committee has cut out \$92,818,800 worth of fat from this bill. I am glad to join with my colleagues in supporting amendments which have cut another \$6,600,000 from the bill. I also supported the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Florida, which would have eliminated another \$11 million had they passed.

This bill as amended still is almost \$31 million over the current appropriation. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the Department of the Interior and the related agencies have not suffered for lack of money in the current budget.

Included in this \$31 million is 796 new civilian Federal employees, the cost of which I cannot accurately determine from the report. The titles and groupings in the report make it impossible to determine all the fat in this appropriation, but some of it is indicated to me by comparison with this current year's authorization.

I cannot in good conscious support the expenditures of \$310,000 for planning of the fish aquarium which will ultimately cost the taxpayers \$10 million. It is said it would not cost a cent—but a third of a million is being spent today—and it is the taxpayers' money. I must agree with Judge SMITH that \$10 million for the creation of wetlands for duck refuges, while admirable, is not essential. Could not the Department of Agriculture quit paying for draining such lands and alleviate the problem?

Apparently this Congress is more interested in ducks than people—in fowls than taxpayers. People in my State could use some flood control projects rather than this "bird money." There is already \$4 million available for this work from the sale of Federal hunting stamps. Let us get our fiscal affairs in

order and spend our money—if we must—on our people, not the birds and foreign enemy countries. This \$10 million for the birds is an increase of \$3 million over the current year.

I see salaries for the Office of Saline Water are up \$2,400,000, while operating expenses are down \$150,000.

It appears to be more and higher paid employees to do less work. Salaries of the Office of the Solicitor are up \$138,000; salaries of the Office of the Secretary are up \$301,000; salaries of the Commission of Fine Arts up \$8,000; salaries of the National Planning Commission are up \$25,000 and the salaries and expenses of the Smithsonian Institution up \$2,055,000.

Mr. Chairman, I ask why this appropriation cannot be cut further. Sir, if this is an example of a hard budget, I would hate to see a soft one.

I suppose that without a record vote which I desired that this statement is indicative of my stand, I am willing to be counted.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I do not hesitate to express my disapproval of H.R. 5279 making appropriation for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. I refuse to support any spending program that exceeds last year's astronomical increase which led to a tremendous deficit. Not only should we cut back the bill to last year's level, which means eliminating the increase of 796 new positions and \$37,508,000, but we should cut the expenditures 5 percent or even 10 percent below last year. In either of these cases, I would vote for passage of the bill.

The committee report gives us adequate reasons for disapproving this bill and I commend the committee for those moments of blunt forthrightness. Here are some examples why this bill should not be passed:

First. The duplication of the overlapping agencies conducting research, including the seven agencies conducting research in reduction of evaporation and transpiration, the nine agencies studying flow in natural and artificial and open channels, and the eight departments of the oceanographic program.

Second. The request for increase in personnel of 3,475 when reduced to 796 is still an increase rather than a reduction.

Third. The limitation of cost per unit of employees housing of \$20,000 is too high.

Fourth. The income-producing receipts of Government should further reduce the need for new appropriations.

Indeed an effort should be made further to get Government out of business, wherever possible.

Fifth. The request for the Bureau of Indian Affairs of additional outside funds from the Area Redevelopment Administration and through accelerated

public works funds warrants further study in the pyramiding of appropriations.

Sixth. General administrative expenses should not be increased by \$64,000 over the 1963 appropriation.

Seventh. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should not receive \$762,900 more than last year.

Eighth. The Office of Oil and Gas should not receive further increase of \$51,000 for increased requirements under the administration of the oil import program.

These specific examples, Mr. Chairman, are but a few of the reasons why I cannot agree to support this program and suggest that further economies can be made. There is no way to cut spending without economizing; namely, cutting expenditures. Pretty speeches and good intentions will not get the job done. At a time of deficit financing and the danger of continuing inflation and gold outflow, the latter being so serious that money devaluation is just around the corner, there is no excuse for passing an appropriation bill increasing expenditures over last year. As I said earlier, last year's expenditures should be reduced.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I was, of course, disappointed that the Committee on Appropriations decided to delete from H.R. 5279 the \$2 million which was proposed for the use of Project Gasoline. However, I am pleased to note the references in the report which have been made by the committee that such action was merely deferred without prejudice, pending the review being conducted by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

This project is both notable and worthy. It has been suggested by Mr. Samuel G. Lasky, Assistant Director of the Office of Coal Research, in hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee, that we are at a point in this Nation where research thus far would indicate that gasoline could be made from coal—100-octane gasoline—at 13.6 cents per gallon. Observations have been further made that this is competitive with the refinery price of gasoline made from petroleum.

To continue research at its present rate in this field would indicate that 10 to 15 years would be consumed before a breakthrough could be obtained. The suggestion by the Office of Coal Research that they be permitted to enter into a contract to hasten or accelerate this research seems to me to be of tremendous importance, especially since they feel that a breakthrough could be accomplished within 3 or 4 years. This could have a powerful impact in every coal-producing State in this country.

We have had before us from various committees of the House programs which

have as their purpose resurrecting the economies of the depressed areas of our country, which are situated for the most part in the coal-producing States, in which great sums of money are committed for many of these programs which have been of little value or help in meeting the problem. It, therefore, seems reasonable to me that this Project Gasoline should be approved because when the breakthrough is obtained, coal-producing States and their economies will begin to move without the necessity of any pump priming by the Federal Government. We will again be self-sufficient; we will again have the opportunity to maintain our personal dignity and to shake the image of despair that surrounds us all.

I am pleased that the subcommittee chairman is sympathetic with this project, and I am hopeful that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the authorizing committee in this instance, will report favorably in the not-too-distant future on this project in order that the moneys might be made available in conference on this appropriation bill so that not a moment may be lost in realizing results from this venture.

The \$2 million that was requested in this instance is a budgeted item. It has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. What I am asking the Congress today is not inconsistent with the budget presentation. Therefore, I respectfully request the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to move with deliberate speed in approving this project.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a newspaper article.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call our colleagues' attention to one very important section of this bill we are considering today—the section which would provide \$2 million to begin land acquisition and development for the Point Reyes National Seashore.

Last year, after thorough investigation and consideration, Congress approved the bill, which I had cosponsored, to create this seashore—an area which the National Park Service has described as possessing a combination of scenic, recreation, and scientific interests found nowhere else in this country so near a large center of population.

Unfortunately, Congress adjourned last year without providing funds to begin land acquisition and development. Land developers and speculators, however, have not waited. Their advertisements, in fact, are encouraging people to purchase lots in "one of America's most sensational and exclusive communities—in the very heart of one of our country's newest and most gorgeous national parks."

Not only are land values being inflated by this speculation—an inflation which can only increase the eventual cost of this park to the people of the United States—but the valuable natural resource which Congress sought to pre-

serve is being whittled away and destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, this relatively small amount of money—this \$2 million—is an investment in the future of our country. It is an investment which will pay rich dividends in education and in recreation for countless future generations of Americans. It is an investment which is within our power to make today, but which if we further delay, may be lost forever.

NOW, BUY A DREAM LOT IN THE PROPOSED POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE—SPECTACULAR DRAKE'S BAY ESTATES

Now available: 45 dramatic view lots on gently sloping hills a stone's throw from the bay.

From \$5,500; as low as 10 percent down; easy terms.

A few marvelous beach sites—right on the historic shores of famed Drake's Bay.

Join one of America's most sensational and exclusive communities in the very heart of one of your country's newest and most gorgeous proposed national parks.

People do live in national parks. Hundreds, for example, own private property and homes in Yosemite National Park. Drake's Bay Estates dream sites have been going, going—\$600,000 worth of spectacular lots have been sold to date, with \$300,000 spent on exclusive homes—all-year, summer or winter retreats—deep in nature's solitude yet only 45 minutes from San Rafael. Unsurpassed swimming, boating, beachcombing, trout fishing, horseback riding.

All public utilities are in, as well as 5 miles of smooth paved roads.

Act now. Call, write, or visit for full particulars, prices, and attractive brochures.

DRAKE'S BEACH ESTATES, INC.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE
Management and investigations of resources

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); and maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; \$29,879,400.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: Page 24, line 3, after the figure "\$29,879,400", strike out the period and insert a comma and the following proviso: "of which not to exceed \$30,000 shall be used to establish a cooperative fishery unit at Pennsylvania State University."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will not cost any money. It will not cost \$30,000. All it does is make sure that a part of the \$29,879,400 be allocated to Pennsylvania State University for conducting a fisheries cooperative unit authorized in accordance with Public Law 686 of the 86th Congress. The units authorized by this law are now

in operation in 14 different universities. I think the great university which originally started the fishing research in the eastern part of the United States should be included. I just ask that the Secretary of the Interior be directed to use a portion of this \$29 million to establish one of these research centers in Pennsylvania.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while this committee was holding its meetings during the past several weeks, there were three Members who appeared before the committee from three different States, New York, Massachusetts, and Montana, requesting cooperative fishery units and the committee graciously gave them \$30,000 for each State. Now here is a gentleman, a fine gentleman, who not 10 minutes ago gave a lengthy talk and, yet, he did not appear before the committee with his request. The gentleman says it would not cost a dime? It will cost \$30,000, which would have to be taken from some other budgeted project. He did not come before the committee, but now to come here in the well of the House and tell a group of intelligent men to take \$30,000 out of some other project and put it into something that he wants, I think is asking too much.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would just like to say, if I had known that my Pennsylvania State University did not have this facility, I would have appeared before the committee. This morning I received a letter from the Pennsylvania State University informing me of the fact that they did not have such a facility, and they wanted to know whether or not it was possible. That is the first I knew about it. Of course, this is not in my district but it is in my State, and therefore at the first opportunity I had I asked the Members of the House to see that of the \$29 million, \$30,000 is expended for the University of the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KIRWAN. I think a great deal of Penn State University. Pennsylvania is my home State. I was born and raised there. But, if the university did not know enough about this until the hearings on the bill were closed and the bill was reported out, that in my opinion makes it even worse.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment is voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 24, line 3, strike the figure "\$29,879,400" and insert "\$29,829,400."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee why, with respect to getting this \$10 million fish tank underway, he put the planning money in two places in the bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, let me correct the gentleman. This is not a tank. The people of science who know about this will tell you that there will not be any tank in it. If you have not heard, the people downtown can tell you.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman can describe it any way he wants to.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not describing it. They are describing it downtown.

Mr. GROSS. Then let us call it a gill-edged, fur-lined fishpond.

Mr. KIRWAN. You can call it whatever you want to call it, but do not call it a tank.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to get at is why did you put planning money in two places in the bill and in two places in the report? This is planning money that you are asking for; \$50,000 is covered by this amendment and then in the next provision of the bill you have \$260,000 for planning. Why is it in two places in the bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. Because we are putting in the planning and the construction items. The construction goes under the GSA.

Mr. GROSS. But this is all planning money. There is a total of \$310,000 to plan for this fish tank. Why do you not put it all in one place?

Mr. KIRWAN. Because this is for the commission that is appointed. This \$50,000 is not for planning. It is for the commission that is appointed.

Mr. GROSS. This bill is still \$37 million-plus more than was spent on the Interior Department last year. To be sure, there is a cut in the budget request, but that was the administration's asking price, and it is always ballooned and inflated. There is still fat in this bill and some of it is represented by the planning for the \$10 million aquarium or glorified fish tank. This is something that can wait, as the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH has stated with respect to some of the duck ponds; this can wait for a year, or 2, or 3, or 4, if necessary. Let us cut out money for the fish tank this year, and try to get our financial house in order.

Then I assure the gentleman from Ohio that I will give real serious consideration to his fish tank. As a matter of fact, we might give consideration right now to putting some of his fish in the swimming pool in that marble pyramid on Independence Avenue known as the new, new House Office Building. There might be some two-legged fish there, too, but that would be all right. Let them swim with the finny tribes.

So I hope you will support my amendment. It takes \$50,000 of the planning money out. Then we should adopt the next amendment which will take \$260,000 out. This would be a nice substantial saving.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

CAN WE AFFORD IT?

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I review and study this appropriations bill, H.R. 5279, setting forth appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1964, I am faced with mixed and anxious emotions. There is much good in this bill. There are many justified and worthwhile projects.

I can conscientiously support this bill in many instances, such as the many good projects included for our American Indians, the preservation of our wonderful natural resources, the support of our fine national parks, our Fish and Wildlife Service and others.

But I very seriously question the soundness and advisability of including some of the items that are provided for in this bill. I specifically point to such costly projects as the \$310,000 appropriation to initiate planning for the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium, estimated to cost a projected total cost of \$10 million. It is difficult indeed for me to support such a bill as we have before us today with such irresponsibility as this when our country and our people are faced with a deficit spending program and record high budget. This, gentlemen, just is not consistent, sound, responsible business policy to spend this kind of money for such a project as this high-priced fish tank.

Further, I cannot support the kind of thinking that provides \$10 million for winter or summer quarters for ducks. This migratory bird conservation account is something that I believe we can put off until we have surplus money enough to put in such a project.

In this all-inclusive bill, under the appropriations for the Office of Saline Water the appropriation for salaries is increased \$2.4 million over the 1963 fiscal year while the costs of operation and maintenance in this division is reduced by \$150,000. Apparently they will have less to do in 1964, but they need more people to do it. There are many other similar programs in this bill that can, or should, be eliminated, or at least postponed until we can afford them.

This bill calls for an additional 796 new employees in the Department of the Interior and an increase of \$37,508,200 over their 1963 budget. At a time when this Nation and our people are facing an all-time-record-high budget and the resulting deficit spending, I cannot in good conscience, or in the interest of sound, responsible government, support this bill as it stands.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] made a statement, to be found on page 49 of the hearings, about employment in the Department of the Interior and how it had been going up. He made an excellent statement. Yet in this bill he provides the money for an advisory board and a director to start construction of his glorified fish tank. In other words, he is deliberately putting more bureaucrats on the payrolls. Creation of another director means the creation of a staff of secretaries and advisers to the director, and so on and so forth. So on the one hand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] properly castigates the Department of the Interior for increasing employment, but on the other hand he, himself, calls for an addition to the bureaucracy.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my good friend from Iowa, and he is my good friend, if he read what the dean of science at the Minnesota University said as to the benefits received by the public from the \$10 million we gave to the science exhibit at the Seattle World Fair. He said that in the 16 months the science building proved to be a tremendous attraction and was visited by millions of people, adults and children, and proved to be immensely worthwhile.

There are several million students coming to Washington every year. The only aquarium we have in the city is a disgrace to the Nation, a disgrace to the greatest capital in the world. This is going to be the greatest aquarium in the world.

That man, who knows more than I know, and most people, went on to tell what this is going to do for education and science and it is not going to cost the U.S. taxpayers a dime.

The opposition to the aquarium bill misled the public when they said the cost would be saddled on the taxpayers. They did not make clear it would pay for itself through admission fees.

I am telling you this is one of the best bills that ever came before the Congress of the United States. No wonder we are fighting. It is not going to cost the taxpayers a dime. That is why I am asking you here today to vote for this bill. In the center of Moscow there is an excellent aquarium. We have one down in the basement of the Department of Commerce Building. It amounts to nothing. This will be a great asset to the Nation's Capital and will be of great interest and value.

I hope this amendment is voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 63, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, \$3,678,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 24, line 9, strike the figure "\$3,678,000" and insert "\$3,418,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply take out \$260,000 of planning money for the gentleman from Ohio's fish tank down on Hains Point on the Potomac River. I do not know exactly what the gentleman meant a little while ago when he said that this proposition had not cost anybody anything. No, it has not cost anybody anything because up to this point no money has been extracted from the busted Federal Treasury to start the planning for this thing. I assume that is what he meant when he said it had

not cost anything. However, it is about to cost \$310,000 to get it off the ground unless this amendment is adopted. It was not many years ago that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] came to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to get an authorization to hire Government experts to raise carp down in the rice paddies of Arkansas. I wonder how that carp deal is coming along.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the House can do the taxpayers a good turn here this afternoon by accepting my amendment and thus saving another \$260,000 to start a project that will eventually lead to the spending of at least \$10 million—a project that can well be delayed until the Federal Government can get its financial house in order. As I said last year when this subject first came before the House, there are 10,000 or 10 million better and more essential ways to spend this money.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from Iowa has stated these two items will cost the taxpayers \$310,000. Now, the law says that every dime has to be paid back to the U.S. Government for the planning, the construction, and all other expenses connected with it. Ten million tourists come to this city annually. They spend a million dollars a day here and they will be satisfied to pay to visit this National Fisheries Center. I repeat, in the city of Philadelphia they are charging \$2 now for adults to get into the new aquarium and \$1 for the children. The admission fee will be only 60 cents here. So these appropriations will be repaid and I hope this amendment is voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

For an advance to the Migratory bird conservation account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (16 U.S.C. 715K-3, 5), \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 24, strike out all of lines 10 through 14.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for striking out the item that I spoke about a little while ago which is \$10 million to buy land to inundate for duck ponds for the wild ducks to stay on during the winter months. Now, the item reads as follows:

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

And this is what I want to strike out:

For an advance to the Migratory bird conservation account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (16 U.S.C. 715K-3, 5), \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Note that that provides for an advance on this program. The program, as I stated previously, was supposed to be

paid for out of the proceeds of the duck stamps which are sold to duck hunters and which has been and is now estimated at \$4 million a year.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very expensive program into which we are going, or that we are now into. My sole reason for offering this amendment is that in this time of an unbalanced budget when we are seeking to cut unnecessary expenses, to cut expenses that can be well postponed to a future date, that we cut out this \$10 million and help to bring this bill back more closely to the expenditures of the year previously.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Virginia. I believe the gentleman's position in this area is just exactly correct, and if we are going to do anything in regard to the budget we can do it wisely here with very little problem to anyone involved. I wish to say to the gentleman from Virginia that I am going to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when this authorization passed the House of Representatives the year before last, it called for the expenditure of \$15 million a year to be spent on the wetlands. Now, perhaps, I might be in sympathy with some of the things which the gentleman from Virginia has said, but nevertheless that is the law. It called for \$15 million a year. When the budget estimate of \$12 million came up for our consideration we cut the budget request by \$2 million. They asked for \$3 million less than the law provided and we cut it \$2 million more. I thought we did very well on the cut.

Mr. Chairman, I again repeat that on the floor of this Congress the Members of Congress of the United States—the west, the east, the north, and the south—all voted for this legislation. Now we come along 2 years after and we deny ourselves—not some country in Europe—and go against what we voted for previously.

Mr. Chairman, I shall always remember the story of one of our officials who had moved some pictures off the wall at one of the American Embassies. One of the career men said to him, "They will not like that here." The official replied, "Oh, but there are a lot of boys home in the barbershops who will like them." That remarks applies in exactly the same way with reference to this bill. There are a lot of boys home in the barbershops who have contributed to this wetlands problem through purchase of stamps and payment of excise taxes, and we ought to give them a little protection and give them a little run for their money.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I might say that if this amendment is adopted it will be a very serious blow to our conservation efforts in the acquisition of wildlife refuges. We have a program of acquisition that is spread over the next 10 years and the money appropriated in this bill is simply a loan; it will be subject to repayment from the duck stamp funds.

As a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission I sincerely hope this amendment will be defeated in order that our acquisition program may go ahead.

Mr. KIRWAN. I hope this amendment is voted down.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for the statement he has made. He has been entirely consistent in calling the attention of Congress to the fact that a few years ago, if the Members of the House had not liked it, then was the time to vote against it and not now. All your committee is doing is to implement the law that Congress passed.

I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to speak against an amendment that is intended to save money, and that is offered by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who I am sure is sincere in offering his amendment. But I want to point out to the House that when this public law was passed, it was about the most popular bill that came before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in that session of Congress. The Audubon Society and all the clubs in America that are interested in migratory waterfowl or birds or fish wrote to the committee in support of the legislation that was then pending before the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, millions of dollars have been spent by clubs and organizations throughout the country to arrest the growing disappearance of the hatching grounds of migratory birds. This bill is for the preservation of those grounds, not to build fishponds or duckponds, but to preserve the wetlands on the northern borders of the States that are next to Canada. Millions of dollars have been spent by private citizens of the United States to buy lands in Canada for the propagation of migratory waterfowl.

The duck stamp is not the only tax that is imposed on the hunter, boys 16 and 18 years old and men up to 65 who participate in this sport. They pay the ammunition tax, the gun tax, the hunting tax of the State, and so forth. And it all goes into funds for the protection and propagation of migratory birds and wildlife.

This is necessary because the decrease, by the actual count of the Fish and Wildlife Service, shows that unless something is done it will only be a few years, Mr. Chairman, when you will not see a canvasback or a mallard or birds of that kind down in Virginia, in the southern part of the country, along the Chesapeake and the Atlantic coast, the middle flyway through Mississippi and the Pacific flyway.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to associate myself with my distinguished friend from North Carolina in the remarks he has made, as well as with my colleague and member of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN]. I have been on this Commission now for the past several years and I think it is very constructive work—the propagation of our wildlife. I feel that this investment which will ultimately be repaid is a very wise one. I want to say that I concur in the recommendations of the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Missouri as far as migratory bird conservation is concerned.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it is my desire to see an increase in migratory birds rather than their extinction—should this amendment carry and the wetlands therefore not be preserved—it will only be a few years before all breeding grounds will disappear. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out, this is not an expenditure, but it is a loan on the part of the Government. This wetlands program is financed by the duck stamp. By the programs of the Department of Agriculture, we are draining wetlands, the habitat of the ducks, and we are losing ducks on account of that. This program proposes that we set up permanent wetlands. If this amendment is adopted it would cost a good deal of money because the land would be drained and then we would have to buy land and set it up as wetlands again. I know of one State where they have drained wetlands, and now they are talking about buying them and reestablish them for a duck refuge. They have drained the land and now they are talking about setting it up as wetland again. Congress passed this law. We reduced the request by \$2 million. I think it will be pennywise and pound foolish to adopt this amendment, because this enables the Commission to buy this land before it is drained. If you do not do that, you will have to buy up land after it has been drained and put it back to its wetland condition, if you want to keep the ducks.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have a high regard for the author of this amendment, but I am sure he does not understand what his amendment does to the legislation before the Congress. This appropriation was authorized by a unanimous vote of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. This legislation came about because the migratory waterfowl are approaching the lowest limits in history. Duck limits are falling to a point where it is hardly worth the trouble for a duck hunter to go out.

In 1936 or thereabouts when the Migratory Water Fowl Treaty was signed between the United States, Canada, and Mexico it was determined we needed 12,500,000 acres of land in which to care for the migratory waterfowl of this Nation. Subsequently an analysis was made of the rate at which wetlands were being acquired. It was found it would take 330 years for the United States to acquire the needed wetlands at the rate we were acquiring them. As a result of this a loan program was set up which is the subject of the appropriation for \$10 million which the gentleman seeks to strike.

This cut is not a cut of an appropriation which will not be paid back, this is a loan program. This money, every nickel of it, will be paid back by the duck hunters of the United States who will purchase migratory waterfowl hunting stamps, the proceeds of which will go to pay back this \$10 million loan.

The fact is that unless this money is authorized and appropriated by Congress, we may very well be seeing the last days in which we and our friends may hunt waterfowl on this continent. In the next few years we will have a population growth that will stagger anything gone before. By 1980 we will have 285 million people. For houses, roads, shopping centers, and municipal use we are taking 1 million acres a year from our lands. That is the equivalent of the acreage of Yellowstone National Park. A lot of this land is coming from draining waterfowl habitat. The purpose of this appropriation is to see that we acquire this desperately needed land in the time remaining. Land costs are going up, population is exploding, and the swamps, the habitats of the migratory waterfowl of this Nation, are being done away with at an accelerated pace. Unless the Congress appropriates the money to carry out the purposes of this law, that was unanimously enacted by this Congress not long back, you and I will be responsible to our constituents for having helped to destroy the migratory waterfowl resources of this country. What are these resources, and what is their value?

First of all, according to the studies of the Patman-Robertson Act, they bring in better than \$1 billion a year in expenditures for food, lodging, clothing, and from the sale of firearms, equipment, and ammunition. This is an enormous benefit to our country. Over and above this, hunter expenditures are mainstays of the economy of large portions of this country. Duck-hunting revenues derived from catering to duck hunters furnish a very important portion of the economy in many parts of this country. Most of us in this Congress have enjoyed the sight of migratory waterfowl. These refuges provide the population of this country with an opportunity for outdoor recreation. Just last year this Congress passed a piece of legislation authorizing the public recreational uses of these refuges bought through duck stamp purchases. This is an additional benefit that goes to all of our constituents. The principal author of this legislation was a minority Member of this body from

Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. What I am saying to the House today is—do not be penny-wise and pound foolish. This is the last opportunity the United States will have to acquire these wetlands. They are being drained at a fantastic pace. The limited bag limits that we have on migratory waterfowl today will be very generous when we contrast them to what we will have in the future unless we act now to save the habitat on which these waterfowl, a national treasure and a trust for the future are absolutely dependent.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to joint with the chairman of our subcommittee in opposition to this amendment. Although, of course, I am very sympathetic to any move to save additional money in this bill, I want to again point out that under the terms of H.R. 7391, which is now Public Law 87-383, this House and the Congress passed legislation which provided for an appropriation for a 7-year period beginning with fiscal year 1962 not to exceed \$105 million. If the \$105 million was divided by 7 years, it would mean an appropriation this year of \$15 million. The committee has recommended \$10 million instead of \$15 million. If this appropriation is not given this year and unless the legislation is repealed or changed, we are merely stirring up trouble for ourselves in years to come because we are going to have to double, perhaps next year or the year after, the amount of money requested under this law which is now in effect. I regret very much that the money is necessary. I would much prefer to see it not appropriated. But I think the committee did the right thing in allowing the \$10 million. I hope the amendment will not carry.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that my State of Arkansas is, perhaps, the greatest or one of the greatest duck-hunting areas in the United States. I know we can get a great deal of amusement out of talking about the ducks and the duck population, but I want to emphasize what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] said.

I suppose there are several hundred million dollars that have been spent by citizens and organizations and businesses in the construction and provision of duck hunting facilities and so forth throughout this great country of ours.

Stuttgart, Ark., is probably the duck capital of the world. I do not know how much money is needed in the wetlands to provide the necessary habitat. But, Mr. Chairman, let me give you, just for one moment, a little information affecting this important program.

The ducks go back to the North when the winter season is over, and contrary to what the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the author of the amendment, suggested a moment ago, they do not go back there in wintertime, they go back in the summertime for the purpose of propagation.

Twenty-five years ago, let me remind you, the legal limit in my own State was

25 a day; 25 years ago any one individual could legally kill 25 ducks a day during the season with 2 days' possession. That continued for many years. For years now the legal limit was four per day and 2 days' possession. Everybody knows of the drought in Canada and in the northern parts of the country in the last few years. Let me remind you that 2 years ago the legal limit in my State that one could kill during duck season was 2 a day and 2 days' limit.

Let me remind you further, and this House, that because of the condition that exists—I do not know anything about it up in Canada and the northern part of the country—but I know what the result is. In my State last year the legal limit on this, one of the greatest sports in this country, was one duck a day, and 2 days' possession. From what has been going on for the last several years, in the last 20 years, I do know that something needs to be done. I wish I had more information as to what is needed in this program; \$4 million goes into the fund from duck stamps, but I want to say that last year we lost thousands or perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars from people not buying duck stamps, because they could not kill ducks. I did not buy a duck stamp last year, for the first time I cannot remember when, because it was not worth it to go out for the purpose of trying to kill one duck a day. Year before last I did, and then the limit was only two, and I must say I had a very hard time getting even the limit of two. That shows you how scarce they were last year. I think we will have more this year and next. I hope so.

One of the objectives I have had in mind, and I want to say this in all sincerity to every Member of this House, is that I hope someday, if I may have the privilege of staying here that long, that we will get enough ducks and the Secretary of the Interior will set a limit and that we will have an increase in the limit per day so that I and the delegation from my State and our friends from my State can legally get enough wild ducks to bring them to Washington and have them served in the House restaurant to every Member of this Congress.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when legislation to acquire wetlands was first introduced and came before the Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee it was proposed to finance the program through back-door spending; in other words, the money could be borrowed from the Treasury to carry out the program of conservation looking to an increase of our duck population.

By arrangement in our committee, that financing was changed to the appropriation process. The reason I take the floor at this time is to indicate that had this legislation passed as it was originally introduced, the Department could have simply gone to the Treasury and borrowed \$15 million for acquiring these wetlands without having to come to the Congress.

The point I want to make today is that by coming to the Appropriations Committee careful scrutiny has been

made as to the needs of this program. The committee has cut \$2 million off of it. In allowing money they are fulfilling a responsibility that the House created originally when we passed the authorizing legislation.

I do not think anybody wants to cut down on the budget more than I do, but I feel in this instance the Congress adopted a program and we have to meet that commitment; therefore, it seems to me that we should carry out the recommendation of the very fine committee that brings this legislation to us. I am therefore with regret going to oppose this amendment and then will support the bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to get the ducks in a row here and find out exactly what we are doing.

It is a very popular program; I recognize that. I have participated in duck hunting myself. It is a great outdoor recreation, there is no question about that, but there are some facts that ought to be pointed out so that we know exactly what we are doing.

It is estimated—and I have the official records here—that this program before you are through with it will cost \$457,500,000. The income from duck stamps today is \$4 million a year. If you take it on this basis it is going to be over 100 years or more before there is an attempt to pay this off. The States of North Dakota and South Dakota have not yet approved the land acquisition plan as required by the Wetlands Act. What the gentleman from Virginia has done here is simply to say we can delay this for a while because of the fiscal situation of our country.

I hope when you sit in the duckblind waiting for the ducks to come by, as you take 5, 10, or 15 minutes, whatever it may be, that each minute while you sit there you will realize that \$19,000 a minute is being paid on the national debt. I hope you will realize what you are really faced with, and that it is going to be a question of whether the ducks are going to fly or whether your Nation goes bankrupt. It seems to me it is time we began to think about the condition of the country.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLODY. I want to ask a question. As I see the testimony of Daniel Janzen, Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, one of the reasons for this outlay or this appropriation is that the Department of Agriculture has been spending public money in order to help drain land so that the natural habitat is nonexistent. Now we find that the Department of the Interior asks for millions of dollars for acquiring additional lands in order to provide waterfowl with the natural habitat that the Department of Agriculture is eliminating.

Is that the way the gentleman understands it?

Mr. BOW. I think that is true. It is said this is not going to cost anything because these are loans that are to be

paid back. But they are interest-free loans. You are not paying any interest. Do not tell me it is not costing us anything. When we lend money at this time interest free, at least the interest is costing the American taxpayers something.

I join with the gentleman from Virginia. This is one of those programs that may be put over for a year or two. Do not forget, as I said, as we wait for the ducks to fly, there is the \$19,000 a minute on the national debt.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. With reference to paying this money back, how do we know it is going to be paid back? The only way it will ever be paid back will be over a good many years on which you get this \$4 million a year, when this program is finished, to pay on it, if enough people buy the duck stamps. It is a nebulous question as to whether any of it is ever going to be repaid.

Mr. BOW. This provides for land acquisition of 4.5 million acres at \$269 million; a basic minimum for levees, pools, roads, and fencing, \$188.5 million. We are not dealing with a small item; this is a big item. Let us take a good, hard look at it. Let us find out whether we are justified in a program of this kind and whether, under present financing methods, which will take 115 to 120 years, we will put that additional mortgage on the backs of our children and grandchildren. It is time for us to make up our minds whether we are for ducks or whether we are for grandchildren and for fiscal responsibility in this country.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to any Member in this House when it comes to a desire to lower this budget, but personally I do not believe that this is the proper place to do it. What will happen if we do not purchase this land at the present time? You need not look into your crystal ball to know what is going to happen if we wait for several years as has just been suggested. The Department of Agriculture is going to reclaim this land, and instead of spending \$10 million to acquire it we will probably spend \$100 million and pay subsidies to raise more farm surpluses. I personally think this is a good investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 107, noes 105.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SMITH of Virginia and Mr. DENTON.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 121, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

For expenses necessary to carry out section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, approved

May 28, 1956 (16 U.S.C. 568e), \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GIBBONS: On page 32, strike out lines 21 through 25.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I realize the ducks have gotten in a row around here, but this is not a duck amendment, this is an amendment based on frugality. We have had talk of the old frontier, and of the New Frontier and all kinds of frontiers discussed here today.

I would hesitate to try to improve on the excellent work this committee of the House has done on this bill. I have read this committee report through thoroughly. I think it is a very fine report in general. But I have had some experience in a State legislature in matching this type of funds on this type of program. I would say without fear of challenge that with this \$1 million that is to be saved here; not one tree will fail to be planted that otherwise would not be planted if the \$1 million were spent or not. This is a good time for the Congress to say that in the planting of trees on non-Federal lands as this appropriation proposes, that trees should either be planted by private enterprises, who reap the harvest from the tree farms, or they should be paid for by the States. This is one of those cooperative Federal-State programs for which I think there is no use. For those of you who are for trees, I say there are 183 million other dollars in this appropriation bill that will adequately take care of all the trees. This is just a \$1 million cut in this budget that will practice a little frontier frugality instead of frontier spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

REMODELING OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION BUILDING

For an additional amount for necessary expenses of preparing plans and specifications for remodeling the Civil Service Commission Building to make it suitable to house certain art galleries of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by the Act of March 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 68), including construction and not to exceed \$25,000, for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$5,465,000.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: On page 39, strike out all of lines 1 through 9, inclusive.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend the committee on an excellent job in cutting the appropriation request in this bill. As a matter of fact, it created a lot of hard work for members of the committee in searching for something else to cut out, and I want to commend them highly for the great work they have done.

I hesitate to offer this amendment because I may be falsely accused of lacking proper respect for things cultural. But it has to do with striking out some

money that is to be used for remodeling the Old Patent Office Building out of which the Civil Service Commission is moving. The remodeling is to be accomplished with the goal of putting into that building, which occupies 2 blocks in the center of the District of Columbia, in downtown Washington, valuable portraits and other works of art. I do not want anyone to think that I am not appreciative of the inspirational qualities of great art. I do indeed feel that the proper preservation and display of the Nation's art treasures is an important thing for our people. But I think that at this time and under the circumstances, this Government should not spend almost \$6 million to create a gallery in downtown Washington for still another display of works of art. If that building is to be vacant, I think it could be better used for housing some of the essential operations of the Government. I certainly do not criticize the committee for leaving this item in, but I think the membership of the Congress should have an opportunity to express an opinion at this time on this particular item.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the gentleman from Texas in support of his amendment. It is absolutely unthinkable that this Government would spend \$5½ million to remodel into a portrait gallery a structure occupying two full city blocks in the heart of Washington, D.C., when this same Government is spending millions of dollars a year on rent in private commercial buildings throughout the city to house overflow personnel from the various departments and agencies. How can you do this? If we must have such outfits as the Peace Corps, both domestic and international, put them into this Government-owned building as well as other overflow agencies. We are just completing a new Smithsonian Institution—a huge new building I mean to say—and yet you are telling us here today you do not have room for those portraits in the new building. How can this be possible in view of the huge structure that is being built down there? Do not do this to the taxpayers of this country. Do not remodel this usable office building when there is such an acute need for office space. Do not do this to the taxpayers.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Do I understand this would put the Government in the portrait holding business, that is, put the Government itself in that business?

Mr. GROSS. I assume it would.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. And, therefore, from now on, this would put us in the museum business in addition to the Smithsonian Institution that we already have?

Mr. GROSS. I understand these portraits are already in the Smithsonian In-

stitution or at least a part of them are. I see no reason why, if you want a portrait gallery, one of the old Smithsonian buildings cannot be used for that purpose? Do not spend \$5½ million to tear out the insides of this office building that can and should be used for the purpose for which it was intended. Let us try to save the taxpayers these millions of dollars.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, much as I admire the chairman and members of the Appropriations Subcommittee, I must disagree with them on this issue.

At this time when money is scarce at all levels of government, when our economy is hard pressed, when our unemployment is a matter of major concern to all—in short, at a time when our country must utilize every dollar to its maximum, I cannot go along with the start of a \$10 million addition to the beauties of our capital when these funds can be so much better employed elsewhere.

Thus, I must oppose the inclusion of planning money for the Aquarium as suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, and others.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the gentleman from Iowa picking on me. I did not authorize this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know that I accused the gentleman or any other member of the committee.

Mr. KIRWAN. Let me explain who is on the Board of Regents. It is not I who is deciding this. Sitting in the chancellor's chair on the Board of Regents is the Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. That is no recommendation for what you are doing.

Mr. KIRWAN. Next to him is the president of the largest bank in Washington, and next to him there are a half dozen scientists; then Senator ANDERSON, Senator SALTONSTALL and Representatives BOW and CANNON. I happen to be on that Board of Regents myself, and the Board of Regents adopted this. They are for it. We have millions of dollars' worth of art and no adequate space to display it.

The committee thought these funds were justified so we could bring these priceless collections out of the storage barns and other places, where they could be cared for and displayed. Are you opposed to protecting them?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Let them stay in the barns until we balance the budget. Think of the solvency of the Government.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman calls that economy. We just had the Mona Lisa on exhibition here in the city and people came from all over the country to see that picture. The pictures we

want to protect are valuable acquisitions of our Government and are of interest to many.

I hope the committee certainly will vote this amendment down.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Perhaps some of the gentlemen do not realize that the building the gentleman is talking about is one of the most historic buildings in the city of Washington and, as I said, it has been declared a national monument.

Mr. KIRWAN. Not only in Washington, but one of the most historic in the world.

Mr. MILLER of California. There is a great history to this building. When the British burned Washington this is one of the first buildings they went to. The curator of that building persuaded the commander of the British soldiers to spare the building in the name of science.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I wish to make this statement: I do not want to destroy the building, I am just trying to remodel it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, nobody wants to destroy this building; let us get this straight; nobody wants to destroy it. All I am saying, and I am sure that goes for the gentleman from Texas too, is that we do not want it remodeled into a portrait gallery. Leave it as it presently exists and use it as an office building. Let the portraits stay in storage until we can balance the Federal budget and get out of the financial situation we are in.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROGERS of Texas) there were ayes 112, noes 106.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL AIR MUSEUM

For necessary expenses of preparing plans and specifications for the construction of a suitable building for a National Air Museum for the use of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by the Act of September 6, 1958 (20 U.S.C. 77b note), and not to exceed \$60,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$1,600,000.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GIBBONS: On page 39, line 18, strike out lines 18 through line 2 on page 40.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to save \$1,600,000 of architects' fees and planning costs for a National Air Museum that no one knows how much it will cost.

This, I believe, is something that could certainly and wisely be postponed at this time. We have a lot of airplanes. We have air museums in this country at this time. Certainly this is one of the things that we can postpone until we are able to get the budget balanced.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this was authorized on September 6, 1958. The Board of Regents has recommended this planning appropriation, the completed plans must be submitted to Congress for authorization of construction before any construction funds are appropriated.

Smithsonian has accumulated the world's largest and finest collections of historic air and spacecraft, engines, rockets, and so forth.

Less than 10 percent of the collection is now on display in a World War I hangar and in overhead areas in the Arts and Industries Building. The remainder of the collection is, of necessity, in storage.

Over 38,000 visitors in 1 day tried to get into the World War I hangar last year. There were nearly 1 million visitors during last July and August.

I do not care how you vote. That is up to you. But you are not going to save anything. You are just postponing it, and that could make it more costly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), as amended (72 Stat. 1769), \$100,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I note on page 41, \$100,000 for the Civil War Centennial Commission. How much have we put into the Civil War Centennial Commission up to this point, and how much longer will it go on?

Mr. KIRWAN. About 1 more year.

Mr. GROSS. Another year?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That does not take into consideration financing the present operation in Mississippi?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is all; 1 year.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill be amended do pass.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHANSEN moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5279 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO EXTEND THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 3 OF PUBLIC LAW 87-346, RELATING TO DUAL-RATE CONTRACTS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual-rate contracts. An identical bill to H.R. 4555, passed the House on yesterday.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act of October 3, 1961 (Public Law 87-346; 76 Stat. 762), is amended as follows:

(a) By striking the words "of not to exceed one year after such filing" from the next to last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "but not beyond April 3, 1964."

(b) By striking the word "year" from the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word "period".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings by which the bill (H.R. 4555) was passed were vacated, and that bill was laid on the table.

SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Department in recent years has entered many new fields through programs authorized by the Congress. I cite the rural areas development program which is doing so much to revitalize many small rural communities. In a recent statement before the Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman outlined the objectives of the rural areas development program.

According to Secretary Freeman, this program seeks to fulfill several high priority national goals, which he described as follows:

First. To give direction, purpose, and hope to rural America as it adjusts to rapid changes;

Second. To readjust the rural land-use patterns, making more land available for the increasing needs of outdoor recreation and open spaces, while decreasing cropland areas;

Third. To fully protect and develop the Nation's renewable resources of soil, water, forests, fish and wildlife, and open spaces;

Fourth. To encourage more rapid rural industrialization and expansion of commercial enterprise in rural areas to provide new employment and other non-farm economic opportunities;

Fifth. To eliminate the causes of rural poverty;

Sixth. To strengthen the family farm pattern of American agriculture, insuring an efficient and productive source of food and fiber in a way that increased efficiency does not bring less income to the producer.

Another new USDA program, Mr. Speaker, was authorized by Congress last year. This is the public recreational development of watershed projects under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

This program permits the Agriculture Department to help create, enlarge, or improve bodies of water within watershed projects to assist in developing recreational areas bordering the water.

Up to 50 percent of the cost of land, easements, and rights-of-way, construction and minimum basic facilities needed for public access may be paid the Agriculture Department. Land bordering the reservoirs developed under this program could be used for picnicking, camping,

hunting, or other outdoor uses with the Department being able to provide local sponsors with funds to cover up to half the land costs. In addition, the Department would help local sponsors pay for the land inundated for recreational purposes.

Among minimum basic facilities which could be cost-shared are boat docks and ramps, beach development, parking lots, public water supply, sanitary facilities, planting, and other shoreline or area improvements, roads and trails, other similar facilities needed for public health, safety, access to, and use of the recreational areas.

Since the Congress, in these new non-farm programs, has recognized the need for greater utilization of the special skills, resources, and facilities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, and because of the growing interest of many communities in Massachusetts in conservation activities and the formation of local conservation commissions under the authority of a State law passed a few years ago, I am introducing in the House today a bill calling for increased participation of the Soil Conservation Service in such nonagricultural fields as the protection, development, and use of land in urban areas and the utilization of soil and water resources in these areas.

Many Massachusetts towns are taking advantage of the Massachusetts law which authorizes the establishment of local conservation commissions. In fact, this law has already enabled some towns to make desirable changes in land use through the cooperation and assistance of the Soil Conservation Service.

One community, the town of Hanover, has already gained favorable nationwide publicity through its community planning program prepared in cooperation with the Massachusetts Department of Commerce and the Soil Conservation Service. One of the features of the program is the remarkable use of scientific soil and water information, largely supplied by surveyors of the Soil Conservation Service, who made an acre-by-acre inventory of the town's resources.

Hanover has issued a planning document which is serving as a guide to other communities with similar problems. The plan features detailed maps of the town's natural resources which are helping the community in making decisions regarding future potentials and limitations in land use. In addition, the plan contains nine special soils maps rendered in colors and symbols to serve as guidelines in determining boundaries and locations of community facilities.

In previous years, Hanover had made random use of available soils information for construction projects, sewage disposal areas, and related activities, but now with the aid of the soil conservation experts the community has prepared a most helpful document outlining the quantity and quality of its natural terrain.

Most Massachusetts towns are not as fortunate as Hanover with its completed survey and, as a result, are seriously handicapped by the lack of soils information—the very same type of soils in-

formation made available from a soil survey used as a basis for a farm conservation plan. Some of these communities are becoming aware that the Soil Conservation Service can make available the same basic data for the development of land capabilities. Consequently, more and more local conservation commissions are turning to soil conservation officials for guidance on the best land use and water management. Local conservation commissions are learning that these same Agriculture Department officials can render expert assistance on proper land spacing, clean water, and other necessities in their rapidly expanding urban areas.

To meet the growing demand from urban areas for these special aids available from the Soil Conservation Service, I am introducing legislation directing the Secretary of Agriculture to provide technical help on community projects dealing with soil, land use, and water problems. Early approval of my bill would help many small communities to complete their development plans.

It has become apparent in my State and elsewhere that basic soils information is needed for good decisions on the lands to be used for industrial plants, housing developments, shopping centers, highways, and schools. My bill would strengthen the national soil program and I urge the early consideration of my proposal by my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district there are parts of five soil conservation districts—the Northeast Worcester County Soil Conservation District with the district office in Sterling, the Northwest Worcester County Soil Conservation District with an office in Barre, the Southern Worcester County Soil Conservation District with an office in Rochdale, the Middlesex Soil Conservation District with an office in Concord, and the Norfolk Soil Conservation District with its headquarters in Walpole.

When originally established, these districts dealt primarily with farmers on erosion control, drainage, and land improvements. With additional technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service, the districts have expanded their programs to include assistance on watershed planning and flood prevention.

While our farmers have continued to receive direct help on their conservation problems, there has arisen in recent years a greater need for assistance from the communities within these districts with the result that the soil conservation staff is faced with a much greater challenge and a growing demand for technical assistance.

Many sections of my district, now one of the largest in the State with nearly 450,000 people, are experiencing large population increases. These rapidly growing towns are trying desperately to decide on their future development. They are confronted with intense pressures on their natural resources with almost daily growing demands for land for industrial plants, parking lots, highways, housing developments, and schools.

Local officials are doing their best to meet the urgent problems of increasing

population and industrialization and still retain the more desirable aspects of country living, but they are finding that the whole character of the town is changing. These officials must make important decisions on how much good farmland can be retained for agriculture, how to utilize wetlands and woodlands as open green areas with water developments for recreation and wildlife.

Recognition of these special problems has brought about a new development in my State with the establishment of conservation commissions by many communities. Nearly 30 have already been established in my district alone and it is expected the total number in the State will soon reach 200.

These conservation commissions are working intensively on inventories of their towns' natural resources and are helping to develop plans for greenbelts and wildlife preservation. In increasing numbers, the commissions are turning to the Soil Conservation Districts for help on the technical features of their soil and water management problems. Increasing requests for Federal assistance are reaching me in recent months and I am cooperating fully with many town officials in seeking for their communities Soil Conservation Service help on a large number of drainage and water problems.

I have previously addressed the House on the value and importance of the watershed program of the Soil Conservation Service. This program has been of great assistance to many Massachusetts communities which suffered losses in the 1955 floods.

There have been two watershed work plans developed in my district under the Small Watersheds Act with the State and the towns in each watershed contributing toward the total costs. The first is the Suasco project, named after the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Rivers in the watershed, which is being developed at an estimated cost of \$1,660,000 of which \$650,000 will be paid by the State, the towns benefiting and the local landowners.

The second is the upper Quaboag project with a total estimated cost of \$2,750,000, of which about \$1 million will be borne by the State, local towns, and landowners. The watershed plan for this project was completed in the summer of 1961. After careful review by the House and Senate Agriculture Committees, upper Quaboag was authorized for construction last September.

The upper Quaboag project consists of a dike, some channel enlargement and eight reservoirs, three of which are multiple purpose. The work will also provide fish and wildlife habitat improvement, recreation, and flood prevention. The State plans to add recreation benefits to one reservoir, while the town of Leicester plans to add municipal water supply to another reservoir in the group.

There are three great ponds in the watershed that will be greatly improved because the water level will not be raised to a great extent in time of flooding.

The upper Quaboag watershed project is located in the western end of my district with work earmarked for Shaw

Brook in Spencer and Leicester, Turkey Hill Brook in Spencer, Meadow Brook in New Braintree, and Kittredge Brook in Spencer. The balance of the work will be done in towns lost to the Third District as a result of the congressional redistricting last year: Meadow Brook in North Brookfield, Sucker Brook in West Brookfield, Lamberton Brook in Warren, Horsepond Brook in Brookfield, and Rice Reservoir in Brookfield.

The project also calls for a concrete dike along the East Brookfield River in East Brookfield to protect industrial plants and stream channel improvements along the Quaboag, beginning in Warren and extending into West Brookfield to provide flood protection to industrial and residential areas at the Quaboag marshes and Quaboag and Quacumquasit Ponds.

The Suasco project with 7 dams and reservoirs when completed will provide flood protection and other benefits to a 31-town area extending from Shrewsbury to Lowell. As planned, Suasco calls for seven dams—one each in Shrewsbury and Westboro, two in Berlin, and three in Northboro.

The Suasco work is being carried out by the Middlesex and Northern Worcester County Soil Conservation Districts, the Massachusetts Water Resources Commission, and the Soil Conservation Service.

The Suasco watershed project is among the first to be approved for Massachusetts under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. When completed, the project will help reduce and control floodwaters at key points on the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Rivers and their tributaries. The project starts at the Assabet River in Northboro and extends to the junctions of the Sudbury and Concord Rivers in Concord, then to the Merrimack River in Lowell. In all some 377 square miles of watershed are involved with the flood prevention work designed to help these Third District communities, some of which were added to my district as a result of the redistricting last year: Maynard, Upton, Marlboro, Boxboro, Sherborn, Berlin, Littleton, Westford, Harvard, Clinton, Acton, Bolton, Holliston, Stow, Natick, and Hudson.

Other towns included in the Suasco watershed are: Carlisle, Lincoln, Framingham, Shrewsbury, Chelmsford, Sudbury, Grafton, Tewksbury, Weston, Ashland, Westboro, Billerica, Wayland, Southboro, Boylston, Bedford, Concord, Hopkinton, and Northboro.

The watershed program is one of several important Federal programs administered by the Soil Conservation Service. Another is the National Cooperative Soil Survey, which is helping to provide basic soils information to many of our towns on a cost-sharing basis.

Four towns in my district have initiated action to share costs with the Soil Conservation Service for the basic soil interpretations they need—Sterling, Millis, Littleton, and Acton. Of the 351 towns in Massachusetts, it is estimated at least half have urgent need for soils information.

This is a worthwhile program which deserves the support of the Congress, Mr.

Speaker. My bill would help to improve and strengthen this national program.

For instance, my district has about 790,000 acres and only 132,000 acres have been soil surveyed. Completed soil survey maps are needed right now in Massachusetts, but the mapping job for my State is currently projected for completion by 1985, based upon current appropriations.

A large number of land use and water problems are being solved by many communities in my State in cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service and the Soil Conservation Districts. It has been demonstrated that the skills developed in handling soil, land use, and water problems on farms can be applied directly in many cases to similar problems on nonfarmland. My bill would provide greater authority to the soil conservation districts and the Soil Conservation Service in making available their skills to the many communities in my State and in the Nation which could benefit considerably from these needed services.

As an illustration, I cite the town of Spencer in my district, which recently suffered the loss of its main industry through the relocation of a shoe factory to the nearby town of North Brookfield. Town officials have requested the Soil Conservation Service to provide water and flooding facts on a commercial development on great meadows adjacent to the Seven Mile River and Hare Brook near Route 9.

The town has a sewage plant in the area, which needs to be enlarged. The town has asked for information on the extent of flooding to be expected in the area after the upper Quaboag watershed project is installed. This information is needed to help control building in the area.

I have been assured that the Soil Conservation Service will make the necessary studies for Spencer as soon as personnel can be detailed to this work from other activities.

Under the provisions of my bill, the Soil Conservation Service and the Soil Conservation Districts would be able to cope more efficiently and rapidly with the many demands for technical assistance in land and water use problems reaching them from many communities.

The Soil Conservation Service is very active in Worcester County and agricultural conservation program work in this county represents the largest share of Federal aid to farmers in Massachusetts. In all, there are about 258,000 acres of farmland in the county. Farmers employ some 16,000 workers and do about a \$27 million annual business. Farming is a most important part of the Worcester County economic picture.

However, as in other urban areas, Worcester County farms are changing year by year. Recent farm censuses show that farm land has decreased about 100,000 acres in a 5-year period. Individual farms with an average \$27,000 value are growing larger and are largely mechanized.

The full text of my bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the

rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas, resulting in the discontinuance of farming operations on large areas of agricultural land and the consequent serious deterioration of such agricultural land and other land through erosion by wind and water, and shifting uses of agricultural and other land in other nonagricultural use areas, are causing severe problems concerning needed changes in the use of such land and the effects of such changes on the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas; and that it is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should cooperate with States and other public agencies for the purpose of providing assistance in planning for such changes in land use and for the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas, and thereby assist in preserving and protecting the Nation's soil and water resources.

SEC. 2. In order to cooperate with and assist States and their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation districts, regional, State and local planning boards and commissions, and other public agencies in planning for orderly adjustments in the use of land in the Nation's rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas and for the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, upon the request of the State or other public agency, to—

(1) make investigations and surveys in connection with the classification and mapping of soils in such areas;

(2) make studies necessary for the interpretation of such soil surveys or other applicable surveys made by or available to the Secretary;

(3) furnish technical and advisory assistance in connection with such planning; and

(4) obtain the cooperation and assistance of other Federal agencies in carrying out the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

COLLEGE EXPENSES SHOULD BE TAX DEDUCTIBLE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide a tax deduction for the expenses of higher education incurred by either full- or part-time students or their parents.

The rising costs of higher education prevent many capable students from continuing their studies. During the past decade, tuition fees have risen some 86 percent, putting such opportunities far beyond the reach of many unable to meet these expenses. The legislation which I have introduced would include deductions for the costs of ordinary living expenses as well as the cost of books and tuition.

College and university enrollment is expected to increase some 30 percent by 1965, and 66 percent by 1970. The impact of these figures can be readily seen in Florida, where we are building new facilities and enlarging present ones

to keep pace with our expanding industrial and social needs.

However, as a nation, we should not concentrate solely on technical education, but should strive to provide the facilities necessary to produce well-rounded citizens. Our national survival may well depend on this Nation's ability to train its most precious resource—brainpower.

Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that this legislation to provide tax deductions for education expenses would accomplish the desired results through rewarding individual initiative rather than relying on comprehensive Federal assistance. This principle seems more in keeping with our national goals, and by the adoption of this legislation I have introduced today we will achieve these goals efficiently instead of adding to our already overburdening programs of Federal spending.

CUBAN COMMUNIST SUBVERSION IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the threat which the Cuban Communist government poses to the Western Hemisphere is one of the most serious this Nation has had to face. But face it we must.

Those of us from the great State of Florida are keenly aware of this cancerous sore which festers only 90 miles off our State's shore. We have absorbed thousands of Cuban refugees fleeing from Communist tyranny, and particularly do the people of the Miami area see firsthand the misery and despair, the anguish and the heartbreak, of the people of this once proud and free land.

For these remarks I do not wish to dwell upon the tyranny of the Batista regime, only to say that what the Cuban people now suffer is far worse than anything seen under that dictatorship. And neither can be condoned. What we must deal with now is the present crisis, the existence of a Cuban Government under the domination of communism, an international godless plague.

I have said on many occasions that I fear far more the subversion which is promulgated by the Cuban Communist dictatorship than I do the remaining Soviet troops on that island.

For international communism has gained a foothold, and unless rooted out, will infest another Latin American nation, and then possibly another. This is the threat we face, and one which we must meet.

I was proud of our President when he pledged to the Cuban freedom fighters in Miami recently that their battle flag would be returned to them in a free Havana. This should be the pledge of all Americans.

Recent events have again brought into sharp focus the dangers of the subversive activities of Cuban communism in

the Western Hemisphere. These dangers challenge not only the United States, in its quest for peace and security, but every one of our Central and South American neighbors, and the entire free world.

For our Latin American neighbors are more vulnerable than we to these activities, which have as their objective the overthrow of governments and the installation of Soviet-dominated puppet regimes similar to that of Fidel Castro.

We in the Congress, and the American people, concerned as we are with the security of our great Nation, must maintain an awareness of the nature and scope of these activities. Toward this end, the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee recently held hearings on "Castro-Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere." I recommend highly to all Members that they study the report of these hearings.

For my part, I would like to point out some of the things I have learned recently about this threat, in the hope that such information might in some way contribute to the full realization of this threat.

First, I would like to remind my colleagues of some of the techniques of subversion which are being employed throughout the hemisphere by the Cuban-based Sino-Soviet Communist movement. Recruitment and training of new adherents to the revolutionary line are prime activities of Communist agents in every country in the Western Hemisphere, including probably the United States. Recruits are normally sent to primary training schools first, and then on a basis of performance and reliability, may be sent to further centers for training activities of all kinds: Leaders, orators and propagandists; experts in sabotage, espionage, and terrorism in all its forms; specialists in the handling of arms and radio equipment, in guerrilla warfare, and so forth. Recruitment is carried on preferably among students, teachers, workers, artists, and writers. Some selected few students of subversion are sent on to advanced schools, where courses may last a maximum of 3 years. These schools refine the skills and techniques learned earlier, and train the man or woman as a party functionary. On an even higher level, there are schools in Russia and other bloc countries where personnel are trained to occupy key posts in the party or other allied agencies.

The next Communist technique employed in Latin America is infiltration into previously selected organizations and institutes in order, progressively and methodically, to gain absolute direction and control of them. Infiltration is undertaken in any social class, in government agencies, social and cultural centers, student groups, labor unions, and even in armed forces. The priority and magnitude of that infiltration will depend on the facilities found, the environment in which action is taken, and the aim being sought.

Another Communist technique being used in Latin America as elsewhere is called psychological penetration. An effort is made to attract and convert

indifferent people by exploiting the contradictions present in every organized society and the justified longings to resolve them. Attractive material easily accessible to the masses is prepared, and the penetration is carried out through the constant utterance and repetition of slogans adapted to the situation, as well as the affirmation of carefully chosen topics.

Next, dislocation, or weakening of the social structure, is pursued by the Communists. Freedom to congregate, the right to strike, and other liberties granted by democracy are abused; laws are labeled as antidemocratic or dictatorial, and the authorities are criticized and attacked as being solely responsible for the situation. All kinds of arms are employed and offenses are perpetrated against individuals and public and private property, thereby inciting violent action on the part of the police or the Army, which serves the Communists' ultimate ends of portraying the regime as oppressive.

Finally, through a process of proper organization, a military apparatus of growing complexity is created. Action, or shock teams, are first created which engage in hand fighting, sabotage, or acts of terror. We have seen Communist efforts in Venezuela to pass from this stage to the next, that of organized guerrilla warfare, culminating in the takeover of strategic areas, and finally, the overthrow of the local government.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, all of these are the techniques of Communist subversion, and Cuba is the Western Hemisphere headquarters for training in these techniques. A series of schools and training centers have been set up there in which instruction is given not only to Cubans but to nationals from many other Latin American countries. There are perhaps a dozen of these schools in Cuba, some of them under Russian instructors. At least a thousand persons came to Cuba from Latin America during 1962 for training of this type. And as Mr. John A. McCone, Director of the CIA stated to the subcommittee:

In essence, Castro tells revolutionaries from other Latin American countries: "Come to Cuba; we will pay your way, we will train you in underground organization techniques, in guerrilla warfare, in sabotage, and in terrorism. We will see to it that you get back to your homeland."

"Once you are there, we will keep in touch with you, give you propaganda support, send you propaganda materials for your movement, training aids to expand your guerrilla forces, secret communication methods, and perhaps funds and specialized demolition equipment."

There have been organized, in addition to all this, groups whose purpose it is to facilitate the carrying of subversion to Latin America. Such groups as the Board of Liberation for Central America and the Caribbean, the Latin American Youth Organization, the Free Latin American Association, and others perform this function of spreading the Castro doctrine. A series of meetings, conferences, and congresses has been held in Cuba to give Communists and their sympathizers from other Latin American countries a good excuse to go to Cuba

for training or for strategy discussions and integration.

This is a grave problem, perhaps the most serious threat to the United States and the Western Hemisphere we have ever witnessed. It cannot be minimized, it cannot be swept under a rug. We must marshal the full resources of this Nation, and that of all Latin America, to meet this threat. So long as this threat of Cuban Communist subversion remains, this hemisphere is in grave danger. We must meet this threat with bold and vigorous action, for in my opinion, the free and abundant life which we seek for all men can never be achieved in this hemisphere so long as this threat remains.

ROGUE BASIN PROJECT FREIGHT RATE DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN MEAT AND LIVESTOCK

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] and myself, I wish to place in the RECORD a certified copy of Senate Joint Memorial 7 pertaining to the Rogue Basin project and House Joint Memorial 13 pertaining to the historic freight rate differential between meat and livestock. These memorials were enacted by the Oregon Legislative Assembly now in biennial session at Salem, the State capital.

Both these matters are of crucial importance to the State of Oregon. The Members of the Oregon congressional delegation are pleased to bring the memorials to the attention of this House.

ENROLLED SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

Introduced by Senators Chapman, Newbry, Potts; Representatives Back, Bazett, Branchfield, Dellenback and Redden

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Rogue Basin project has been authorized by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the Rogue Basin project is a comprehensive river basin development plan providing for the maximum feasible benefits from flood control, fishery improvement, irrigation, recreation, municipal water supply and power production; and

Whereas the present low water flow and present high water temperatures threaten the continued existence of valuable anadromous fisheries; and

Whereas repeated winter floods destroy valuable property and prevent development; and

Whereas the Rogue Basin is highly populated and a growing area primarily dependent on the timber industry; and

Whereas the timber production of the area is stable and its employment decreasing because of increasing efficiency; and

Whereas the need for a more broadly based economy and increased employment opportunity is urgent; and

Whereas the construction and operation of the Rogue Basin project would restore the fisheries, broaden the economy, increase employment in the State of Oregon and provide flood control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide for a supplemental appropriation for the Rogue Basin project in the amount of \$50,000 to be used by the Corps of Army Engineers for final planning in the fiscal year of 1963.

2. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide an appropriation of \$365,000 for the Corps of Engineers to be used for final planning, site acquisition and construction of the Rogue Basin project for the fiscal year of 1964.

3. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by senate March 12, 1963.

DALE A. HENDERSON,

Secretary of Senate.

BEN MUSA,

President of Senate.

Adopted by house March 15, 1963.

CLARENCE BARTON,

Speaker of House.

ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 13

Introduced by Representatives McKinnis, Flitcraft, Hansell and Senators Hopkins, Leth

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry is essential to the economy of the State of Oregon and the Western United States; and

Whereas a historic and economically vital formula on the cost of transportation of fresh meats as compared to livestock, westbound from the Midwest, has been destroyed by the imposition of freight rates discriminatory to livestock processing plants in Oregon; and

Whereas under this historic formula the rates for transportation of fresh meats were approximately one and one-half times higher than the rates for transportation of livestock westbound from the Midwest; and

Whereas due to the imposition of discriminatory freight rates the fresh meat freight rate has been undercut, to a present formula of one to one, which makes it prohibitive for Oregon packers to ship livestock from the fat livestock markets of the Midwest to Oregon for local slaughter; and

Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry of Oregon has already declined as a direct result of prior rate reductions forcing severe unemployment and loss of markets for livestock producers and feeders; and

Whereas the Public Utility Commissioner of the State of Oregon, the Director of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Oregon, the leaders in the meat producing industry, the leaders of management in the processing industry and leaders of labor in the meat handling industry, and allied fields, have gone on record to seek adjustment in these detrimental freight rates, without success: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States and the Honorable

Secretary of Commerce to take those steps as may be necessary to restore the historic freight rate formula that has existed between westbound livestock and meat and thereby prevent further economic hardship to the broad based livestock industry of Oregon which is threatened by undercutting freight rate practices now permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

2. The Secretary of State shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house February 14, 1963.

CECIL L. EDWARDS,

Chief Clerk of House.

CLARENCE BARTON,

Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate March 14, 1963.

BEN MUSA,

President of Senate.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest in recent weeks several theories that have been advanced on the manner in which the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery should be organized and operated. A matter of growing concern is the fate of the seven Veterans' Administration area medical offices, each presently responsible for the supervision of a group of VA hospitals, domiciliaries, and outpatient clinics located in several States. Just recently, the Director of each of these area medical offices was transferred with a small staff to the Veterans' Administration central office in Washington. Meanwhile, the staff of specialists and technicians making up the area medical office continues to function in its field location. How the Area Medical Director can supervise his staff of specialists from Washington more efficiently than was previously possible from an adjoining office is a mystery to me. I sincerely hope that this move does not represent the first step in the complete elimination of area medical offices.

I have been privileged to receive a communication from Adm. Joel T. Boone, former Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, expressing his views on this subject and the high quality of Veterans' Administration medicine in general. Admiral Boone is eminently qualified to speak on all matters affecting Veterans' Administration medicine. His background is rich with experience in the practice of medicine both on the field of combat under enemy fire and in peacetime in some of the finest naval hospitals in the Nation. Not only is he eminently qualified in the practice of medicine but he has proved to be an extremely capable administrator in his many assignments of increasing administrative responsibility in the

U.S. Naval Hospital System culminated by 4 years as the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration.

Admiral Boone is a native of St. Clair, Pa. He was educated at Mercersburg Academy and the Hahnemann Medical College in Philadelphia. He began a distinguished naval career in 1914, served in combat with the Marines in Haiti in 1915, and in France during World War II. For extraordinary heroism, conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity while serving with the U.S. Marines in actual conflict with the enemy in France in July of 1918, he was awarded the highest honor this Nation can bestow upon a serviceman, the Congressional Medal of Honor. He holds the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star with five Oak Leaf Clusters and the Purple Heart with two Oak Leaf Clusters for wounds received in action. As medical officer of the presidential yacht for several years he treated Presidents Harding and Coolidge. As White House physician, he attended President Hoover, and for a brief period, President Roosevelt. He has held posts as chief medical officer of a single ship as well as an entire fleet. He has directed the operations of a single hospital as well as all hospitals in a naval district. He has served as General Medical Inspector for all hospitals in the entire naval system. In 1947, Admiral Boone directed a medical survey of the coal industry.

This survey devoted to medical problems encountered by coal miners and conditions affecting health in coal mines has been responsible for improving conditions for workers not only in the coal industry but in many other industries as well.

Shortly after his retirement from naval service in December of 1950 Admiral Boone assumed the responsibility of directing the nationwide network of Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical facilities. During the next 4 years he devoted all of his many talents and boundless energy to making the Veterans' Administration hospital program the greatest system of high quality medical care this country has ever known.

Admiral Boone, in his letter, shares my concern lest the Veterans' Administration medical program which has been labeled "second to none" and which he played a prominent role in establishing, deteriorate in any manner.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 21, 1963.

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: In compliance with your request, I submit a statement herewith, dealing with the area medical directors and area medical offices of the Veterans' Administration.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate, of March 4, 1963, pages 3504-3507, published a speech by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, titled "Maintenance of Highest Medical Standards in Veterans' Administration," in which he, with obvious concern and at length, expressed an obvious deep concern as to an action taken by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in establishing offices in the central office of the Veterans' Administration

here in Washington for the seven area medical directors. Then on March 11, 1963, Congressman ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, made a speech in the House of Representatives in which he made special references to the area medical offices and the methods of function of the area medical directors and their respective staffs. The final paragraph of Congressman THOMAS' speech states: "The Administrator has recently moved the area medical directors and their staffs into Washington. This is a good first step, but does not go far enough. This layer should be eliminated entirely and the area medical directors and their staffs should be reassigned to the various hospitals, so they can practice medicine. The veterans throughout the country will profit by this move."

It would seem from the above statement that Congressman THOMAS is unaware that some members of area medical staffs are non-medical personnel and hence are not qualified as practitioners of medicine.

To one who knows, from long association with and experience in dealing with the Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program directly and indirectly, Congressman THOMAS' statement is shocking to me. Predicated on my knowledge and experience which has included day-to-day supervision and operation of the Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program for a statutory 4-year term of office, I can readily foresee that, if such a proposal were enacted, it would: first, seriously cause deterioration of the program and; then, destruction of it as a medical and hospital program, which is not excelled by any other medical and hospital program in the United States and, as far as is known, throughout the world.

My relationship with the Veterans' Bureau and the Veterans' Administration covers a span of 43 years. As far back as early 1920, when I was an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Navy following my duty with combat forces in France in World War I, one of my duties was a liaison officer with the then Veterans' Bureau. A request was made to the Surgeon General of the Navy by the then Chief Medical Officer of the Veterans' Bureau to release me from my duty with the Surgeon General for reassignment to duty with the Veterans' Bureau as the Deputy Chief Medical Officer. I declined this proffer of an administrative position outside of the Navy, but continued for the next 2 years in a liaison capacity with the Veterans' Bureau.

Over the years from time to time I had various and sundry relationships with the Veterans' Bureau and subsequently, when established, with the Veterans' Administration. It was on March 1, 1951, that I was sworn in as Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration. I had accepted a proffer of appointment very reluctantly, having been urged to do so from the highest authority in Government, against my wishes and desires, but I would add parenthetically that I am indeed immeasurably gratified that I accepted the position, for it gave me an opportunity to supervise the reputedly largest medical and hospital program in the world and require of me a most challenging and vital opportunity to serve again my country and the veterans of it, with many of whom I had served when they were in the Armed Forces in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

As the Veterans' Administration at the time of my appointment was under a senatorial investigation, to which Senator HUMPHREY made extensive reference in the Senate on March 4, 1963, he being the chairman of a subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate, I entered upon my duties as Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration when the place was "on fire," "exploding," and "under attack." I could not have as-

sumed these new duties at a more difficult and harassing period. It is not regarded as immodest to refer in passing to the adjustments successfully made in the medical and hospital program and the very substantial progress that was made during my 4 years of supervision of the program. I believe the record will strongly evidence that during that 4-year period the program was put on an even keel, and that substantial strengthening of the foundations of the program was attained, so that notable progress was able to be accomplished in the following 8 years under the able direction of my successor, Dr. William S. Middleton, who retired from that office February 28, 1963. He raised the therapeutic and educational measures to a high plane by his wide experience as an educator and by his knowledge and long interest in medical research. Instead of attacks on the program from various and sundry quarters and much criticism of it, as well from many varied sources when I assumed the office of Chief Medical Director in 1951, there is now no criticism to any substantial degree. There is valid evidence that the Veterans' Administration on medical and hospital program is now accepted as a way of life. Recently an article was published in the Atlantic Monthly and more recently excerpts of it in the Reader's Digest by a young physician whose only contact with the Veterans' Administration was as a resident in three hospitals for a period of a few months. The refutations of the aforementioned article by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Gleason, and the recent Chief Medical Director, Dr. Middleton, explode any validity to the articles. On the contrary, the Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program is praised and acclaimed, and, because of its accomplishments and attainments, it has become the guidepost in medicine.

The initial and modern organizational structure of the Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program was developed and put in operation by the then Chief Medical Director, Maj. Gen. Paul M. Hawley, Medical Corps, U.S. Army, retired. The then Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was Gen. Omar N. Bradley, U.S. Army. The modern program was formulated and established in 1946 and has, therefore, been in operation 17 years. General Hawley was succeeded by Dr. Paul B. Magnuson as Chief Medical Director, who under General Hawley had been Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research and Education. He took a vital part in the concept and formulation of the modern program and contributed very importantly to it. I succeeded Dr. Magnuson and, as I have said, I in turn was succeeded by Dr. Middleton. We four physicians covered a continuous span of 17 years as Chief Medical Directors.

To my personal knowledge, General Hawley, Dr. Magnuson, Dr. Middleton, and I are absolutely opposed to the December 3, 1962, decision of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to locate the seven area medical directors and two members of their staffs in central office with the majority by far of their staffs remaining in the field offices of the area medical directors in their respective assigned geographical areas. Each of us feels that such a move will, quite the contrary to the Administrator's public announcement, make for less efficiency in operation and will not affect economy but will increase the cost of the operational functions of area medical directors and add to their exacting labors and further disperse their geographical responsibilities. The convictions of us four former Chief Medical Directors, predicated on experience, would seem valid when there are to be maintained two sets of offices for the area medical directors, which will require them to travel more and enforce multiplying communication expenses to carry out their wide range

of functions throughout their areas and to and from central office. I have not been able to ascertain any medical advice that has been utilized in the decision made to establish offices for the area medical directors in central office.

The Veterans' Administration medical and hospital program, and I might add that it includes the broad program of hometown medical care, is a national program and not in any sense a local one. The hospitals and clinics constitute a system of treatment centers. The domiciliary program is also a part of that medical system. Veterans' Administration hospitals and clinics are not isolated community institutions. They are in marked contrast to a private, community, university, fraternal, religious, or any other operated hospital. The Veterans' Administration hospital and clinic and domiciliary and the hometown care program, which reaches practically every hamlet of the Nation and rural areas, must be a coordinated program and one supervised and directed other than according to the whim of an individual hospital director. An army cannot be run by a company, brigade, regimental, or division commander acting independently, but they must be under central supervision, direction, and control. If you had each individual hospital director of a Veterans' Administration hospital acting independently, there would be in existence a comparable detached organizational structure like the Congolese or Haitian armies, as I knew the latter in 1915, organized and directed under multiple, separate chiefs, unrelated one to the other.

Returning to Congressman THOMAS' proposal, there must be an awareness that budgetmaking—a very vital procedure—as applied in the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery and its subdivisions, begins in individual wards and sundry offices of a Veterans' Administration hospital and clinic. The initially foreseen requirements then are reviewed by the chiefs of the various services; then by the hospital or clinic director; the area medical director makes the analytical comparisons and recommends adjustments of each medical facility's budget submissions in his area; in turn, the budgets are transmitted to central office where the Chief Medical Director analyzes, screens, and modifies the budgets from the field and consolidates them together with the budget requirements for the operations of his subdivisions of central office before they are forwarded to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The Administrator and his budget staff review the submitted budget from the Department of Medicine and Surgery and make an overall budget for the Veterans' Administration which is then submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration and submission to the Congress. It will, therefore, be seen that the budgets of all the various field medical facilities and the central offices of the Department of Medicine and Surgery must be a coordinated budget. From the beginning of its formulation until final review and adoption, many modifications take place in it, predicated on area and other overall broader analysis by officials in higher echelons with wider viewpoint than an individual hospital director who cannot, naturally, but be influenced by local desires and requirements as he is able to appraise them. The area medical director has the responsibility, with his knowledge as the area field coordinator, to review the budgets uninfluenced by individual hospital appraisalment. He makes recommendations for adjustment in the individual hospital budget up or down. His screening, reviewing, and making recommended modifications of individual hospital or clinic budgets prepares them for central office consideration.

Dr. Middleton and I have observed in the past that area medical directors are "the eyes and ears of the Chief Medical Director

in the field" and as the coordinators of the Department of Medicine and Surgery field activities. I do not believe I ever went into the various Veterans' Administration areas without having the respective area medical directors accompany me to the medical and hospital facilities within and throughout their areas. I was very dependent on the knowledge they possessed and their familiarity with and acquaintanceship with the institutions, the members of staffs, the universities, the deans and faculty of the medical schools in their respective areas with which the Veterans' Administration is affiliated, with the sundry consultants, and with the adjacent community life in the areas where Veterans' Administration hospitals are located; also with local and State veterans' organizations, chamber of commerce groups, church groups, and volunteer people who serve in various capacities in the medical and hospital field programs. The area medical directors and their staffs and offices are in close contact with the local and State medical and dental societies which together with the medical and dental schools create the atmosphere for and assist vitally in professional recruitment for the Veterans' Administration. In many instances the area offices' staff contacts the families of patients cared for in clinics and institutionalized in the Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliary facilities in their areas. They have a definite relationship with the extensive hometown care program which is a service of inestimable value to veteran patients who are entitled to such service. The area medical offices are readily available to investigate complaints of disciplinary infractions and to ascertain information of a wide variety and nature. Area medical directors were indispensable to me in bearing my heavy responsibility as Chief Medical Director. In a large measure they provided information and a knowledge needed in the conduct of my high office. I am thoroughly convinced that I could not have functioned without them, dispersed as they are throughout the Nation.

It has been gratifying to me to have heard Mr. Gleason express his belief in and the need for area medical offices and that he not only supports the existence of seven, but that he would favor an increase in the number. He granted that, as an example of inadequate coverage, the area medical director with headquarters in San Francisco had too large a coverage (its area is from Canada to the Mexican border and besides the States of Washington, Oregon, and California; it includes the States of Nevada, Utah, and Arizona). Experience has demonstrated that this area should be divided into two areas. When the Booz, Allen, & Hamilton management consultant firm of Chicago made a study of the Veterans' Administration in 1951, it recommended that there be established 20 area medical offices. As Chief Medical Director, I felt 10 should be the maximum. Six was the original number. Some time subsequent to the Booz, Allen, & Hamilton study, and additional area medical office was established.

Due to circumstances unfortunately arising in recent weeks and months, I have reason to be very deeply concerned as to the continuance of the superb medical care provided for veterans as has been now attained. If the medical and hospital program is not maintained on the highest level, the best trained and most competent professional personnel will not be participants in it. It is foreseen that medical and dental schools would not continue their highly effective affiliations with the program. Were this to happen, there would follow the termination of the residency and other outstanding teaching programs; Veterans' Administration medical research would vanish and the program would revert to an earlier deplorable

quality of medical care of the veterans, such as preceded the modern program established in 1946. Should that reversion in medical care eventuate, the ill veteran would be cruelly victimized. The progressive advances in medical science, so materially assisted and promoted by the Veterans' Administration, would not only be severely handicapped, but real damage to it would be a consequence. The integration of private and governmental medicine, as applied at the Veterans' Administration, is unique. Wherein there was skepticism when such a combine was created, time has proved its wisdom, and its success as a medical and hospital program has been acclaimed. This wedlock in medicine has justified the claim that Veterans' Administration medicine is second to none. It will require positive action upon the part of those who have the power and authority to require that that descriptive phrase is a reality in every sense of its meaning.

I am sure you will agree that the present Veterans' Administration medical and hospital program must be safeguarded and provisions maintained for its function on the present high plateau.

You well know of my devotion and dedication to the veterans of our country. When in 1956 at the American Legion national convention, in Los Angeles, I was awarded its Distinguished Service Medal and in the final declaration of my prepared response to the presentation address made, I said:

"I have many times pledged the veterans of this country my support—not in mere words but in positive action. I believe the record will evidence that I have stood firm as one of their constant champions. I here again pledge to you that I shall remain faithful—with you—to our association as comrades-in-arms in every deserving cause pertaining to the American veterans. Standing before you today is a most meaningful and memorable experience for me.

"With the new honor you have bestowed upon me comes greater responsibility. With each honor I have been fortunate to receive over the years, I have been ever conscious of my added responsibility to give a better and fuller account of myself to my countrymen. I, here now, in the presence of this great assembly of patriotic Americans, so pledge myself so long as God gives me strength and life."

With my kindest wishes, I am,
Very sincerely,

JOEL T. BOONE.

DR. JEROME B. WIESNER: EXPERT SCIENTIST AND EXPERT WITNESS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of the legislation which created the Office of Coal Research, I was particularly interested in this week's hearings conducted by the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. Such a review of the operations and activity of the Office of Coal Research is important in alerting Congress to the necessity of intensifying the coal research effort. At the same time, Office of Coal Research personnel and participating organizations and their employees may be assured that Congress has confidence in

their efforts to develop new and expanded uses for coal.

I thank the chairman and those of the subcommittee who devoted so much of their time to the hearings. Attendance by members, many of whom represent constituencies far removed from coal regions, indicated a general desire to assist in the resurgence of coal and with it improvement of economic conditions in depressed mining areas.

The legislation setting up the Office of Coal Research was fashioned and nurtured by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 86th Congress. It had the unanimous support of the committee, whose membership at that time included the present Secretary of the Interior. All of us—and every other Member of Congress who had a voice in its passage—are interested in the success of the coal research program. The testimony presented this week gives every evidence that this hope will be realized.

Mr. Speaker, one witness to whom I should like to pay special commendation for his lucid and forthright testimony is Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, director of the Office of Science and Technology. He presented a brief but inclusive statement pointing out the necessity of coal research and development. He pointed out that only an infinitesimal amount of research expenditures have been applied to research on America's most abundant energy resource as compared with the totals—by both government and private industry—directed into other fields of science and technology.

In response to questions, Dr. Wiesner was never evasive. No equivocation. No oratorical embellishments. Under unanimous consent, I include his written statement in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY DR. JEROME B. WIESNER

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am pleased to accept your invitation to appear before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining during your hearings on coal technology and prospects. I should like to point out at the beginning that I am not here to discuss coal research in detail. It may be possible, however, for me to shed some light on broader energy research and development considerations now before the country in which coal plays a highly significant role.

Under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962, establishing the Office of Science and Technology, I am available to advise the President with respect to the review, integration and coordination of major activities in science and technology. Hence, I share the responsibility for looking broadly at the needs for research and development in the energy field to assure a balanced research and development effort that will best serve the national energy needs in future years, making the best use of natural, human, technological, and economic resources.

In response to recommendations submitted by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the President in mid-February directed that a comprehensive interdepartmental study be undertaken of the development and utilization of our total energy resources, in order to arrive at a judgment as to the most effective allocation of our research and development efforts.

The study is to be concerned with such matters as the possible effects of major research efforts on the economics of various energy sources or on improved transmission methods for energy; the size and characteristics of future demands for energy; possible

price trends for fuels; and available alternative technical approaches to the problem of supplying the long-term energy requirements of the Nation.

Some of the questions we shall be trying to answer include these: What is the general rationale for investment of research and development funds? On what basis can research and development priorities be assigned? Under what conditions is such investment economically justified? What guidelines should be used to determine balance in the total national energy research and development program?

At a more specific level, we shall of course be looking for those research and development opportunities which seem to offer the most attractive possible payoffs, in both the short and the longer range.

The Interdepartmental Energy Study is under the direction of the Secretaries of Commerce, Defense, and the Interior; the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Federal Power Commission; and the Directors of the Bureau of the Budget, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and Technology, and the Office of Emergency Planning. I am the chairman of the steering group, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers is the vice chairman.

The study will of course be conducted in full awareness of the other important studies either recently completed or now underway by a number of organizations, including the Interior Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, and the Federal Council for Science and Technology.

As the Administration confronts this whole major question of development and conservation of energy resources, it is acutely aware that the amount and allocation of Federal research and development in the energy field will affect the efficiency of various components of our energy system, and, consequently, the rate and pattern of our national economic growth. We would like to know more than we do, for example, about where the most fruitful opportunities may lie in generation methods, high voltage transmission, coal pipelines, gasification and liquefaction of coal, recovery of petroleum from oil shales and tar sands, the use of integral trains and other improvements in transportation and the possible use of superconductors in generation and transmission and equipment.

Inasmuch as we have only just embarked on the interdepartmental energy study, I have had little occasion as yet to review specifically the state of the art in coal technology and prospects for research and development in this field, as compared with efforts in other facets of our energy system. My Office has of course been generally aware of the work of the Bureau of Mines and the Office of Coal Research in the Department of the Interior.

The amount of coal research—supported by some \$11 million per year of Federal funds and about \$9 million of private funds—is small when compared with research and development expenditures in civilian atomic power (\$250 million per year) and in oil and gas (\$300 million per year). As I indicated earlier, the interdepartmental energy study should throw fresh light on this question of allocation of research and development resources. However, it is my impression that financial support is not the only significant factor in coal research. Among other factors that need to be taken into consideration are: availability of research manpower and means for diffusing technological innovation through the coal industry and related enterprises.

As far as the direction for coal research is concerned, my present impression—subject to review as the interdepartmental energy study proceeds—is that development of economic liquefaction and gasification processes, as well as more economic transportation methods, both for fuel and electricity, would produce the greatest economic benefits for the coal industry. In this context, I am encouraged by the philosophy of the Department of the Interior whose coal research program aims at investigating the technical-economic feasibility of a mining and manufacturing complex whose end products—beside coal—would also include liquid and gaseous fuels and other chemical byproducts. Such systematic treatment of coal as a raw material to be processed into a variety of end products could lead to a new, broader, and invigorated concept of the coal industry.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Wiesner's appearance was so refreshing that I decided to look into the background of this unique type of witness. I find that his extraordinary background, and his educational, industrial, and governmental experience easily qualify him to be so deliberate and specific on any questions which may be put to him.

In studying an article devoted to Dr. Wiesner's life and accomplishments in the New Yorker magazine, I am led to conclude that there could very likely be a wide crevice between his and my political and economic philosophies, yet his testimony this week convinced me that here is a sincere and knowledgeable public servant who is a far cry from the ordinary bureaucrat whose testimony invariably is based on the need for more funds, more personnel, and more authority for his own office.

My first acquaintance with Dr. Wiesner's work was through his February 20 statement to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. I found it to be terse, lucid, and to the point, with emphasis on commonsense in the conduct of the Atomic Energy Commission's civilian nuclear power program. I concluded at that time that the coal industry of this country might be in for more favorable treatment as a consequence of Dr. Wiesner's activities, not because he is looking primarily for new media of assisting an oppressed industry, but because of his objectivity and understanding of the energy resources, requirements, and potentials of our country.

Dr. Wiesner told the Joint Committee that he has been directed by the President to chair a steering group charged with the responsibility of conducting an interdepartmental energy study. Members of Congress who represent constituencies where conventional fuels are important economic factors will look forward to the progress and completion of this study, particularly because Dr. Wiesner has pointed out that the last AEC report to the President did not take into consideration the possible effect of additional research efforts on the economics of nonnuclear energy sources or on improvement of transmission methods for energy produced by either nuclear or nonnuclear means.

As I observed during the Mines and Mining Subcommittee hearings this week, if the discovery of coal in America

had been delayed for two centuries, it would be much easier to obtain appropriations for research into this magic fuel. The country has been enamored of possibilities offered by the atom and for 15 years Treasury funds have been made available for the purpose of finding a method of producing cheap electricity.

Before inserting the Wiesner statement on atomic energy, I should like to mention parenthetically that the magazine article to which I have referred, mentioned that President Kennedy's Special Assistant for Science and Technology is married to a former resident of Johnstown, Pa. Since Johnstown is also my hometown and is in the 22d District of Pennsylvania, my research into the background of Dr. Wiesner was all the more fruitful:

The above-mentioned statement follows:

TESTIMONY BY DR. JEROME B. WIESNER BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, U.S. CONGRESS, SECTION 202 HEARINGS, FEBRUARY 20, 1963

Mr. Chairman, members of the Joint Committee, I am pleased to accept your invitation to testify at this year's "202" hearings on the development, state, and growth of the atomic industry.

I would like to point out that the larger problem of research underlying the development and utilization of natural resources, including energy resources, has engaged the attention of the Federal Council for Science and Technology. Under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962 establishing the Office of Science and Technology I am available to advise the President with respect to the review, integration, and coordination of major activities in science and technology. Hence, I share the responsibility for looking broadly at the needs for research and development in the energy field to assure a balanced research and development effort that will best serve the national energy needs in future years, making the best use of natural, human, and economic resources.

You have asked me to comment specifically on the report on "Civilian Nuclear Power," prepared by the AEC last year at the request of the President. I should like to do that and then to discuss briefly some plans for following up on that study. This is a very useful report, representing much effort and thought on the part of the Commission and the other groups whose studies it reflects. The report proposes a pattern for nuclear power development, several aspects of which I feel are generally appropriate.

For example, it seems clear that breeder reactors will be essential to utilize our uranium resources efficiently. Since breeders can eventually multiply the energy available from uranium manifold, this opportunity for long-range conservation of nuclear fuels should, of course, be explored. There is important emphasis in the AEC report on the development of this technology.

It is probably also true that a highly selective development effort on certain converter reactors is appropriate during the interval before breeders become commercially available.

Drs. Seaborg and Haworth have discussed these aspects of the report in detail, so I would like to concentrate my observations on a broader point: the relationship of atomic energy, as discussed in the AEC report, to other energy sources.

In transmitting the report to the President, Chairman Seaborg pointed out that the Commission had concentrated on nuclear power questions, and did not consider it appropriate to cover in that report the possible effect of additional research efforts on the economics of nonnuclear energy

sources, or on improved transmission methods for energy produced by either nuclear or nonnuclear means.

As a result, the President has before him a highly interesting and significant report, but one which needs to be viewed in the broader context of our total energy picture.

Also available are recently completed studies which relate to the energy question by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, and the Federal Council for Science and Technology. A study of the electric power requirements has additionally been undertaken by the Federal Power Commission.

Following his receipt of the Atomic Energy Commission report, the President requested recommendations for the most effective way to consider the questions which were left unanswered by the Commission. In addition, the President requested recommendations for dealing with the broader economic questions which are implicit in the Commission's report and the other reports, such as the size and characteristics of future demands for energy, possible price trends for fuels, and available complementary technical approaches to the problem of supplying the long-term energy requirements of the Nation.

In response to recommendations submitted by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the President has now directed that a comprehensive interdepartmental study be undertaken of the development and utilization of our total energy resources, in order to arrive at a judgment as to the most effective allocation of our research and development efforts.

The participants in this interdepartmental energy study are to be the Secretaries of Commerce and the Interior; the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Federal Power Commission; and the Directors of the Bureau of the Budget, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and Technology, and the Office of Emergency Planning. I am to be the Chairman of the steering group, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers is to be the Vice Chairman.

As the administration confronts this whole major question of development and conservation of energy resources, it is acutely aware that the amount and allocation of Federal research and development in the energy field will affect the efficiency of various components of our energy system, and, consequently, the rate and pattern of our national economic growth.

Among the questions which need to be answered is one of major interest to this group, i.e., what degree of urgency the Nation should attach to nuclear power development, in the light of the projected availability of conventional energy resources, which should last well into the next century.

We also need to have some indication of what improvements in availability and economical use of nonnuclear fuels might result from increased investment of research and development funds. We would like to know more than we do, for example, about where the most fruitful opportunities may lie, not only in nuclear and other generation methods, but in high voltage transmission, the use of superconductors in generation and transmission equipment, very large conventional or nuclear plants, coal pipelines, gasification and liquefaction of coal, recovery of petroleum from oil shales and tar sands, and the use of integral trains and other improvements in transportation. We are also interested in the related problem of desalination of water and how this might affect the economics of power generation, both nuclear and nonnuclear, if purified water and power are produced together.

I am sure that the results of this examination cannot affect the basic need for long-

term preparedness to meet energy requirements through nuclear power, nor can they affect the fundamental importance of conservation of resources which the AEC has so explicitly recognized. It is our hope, however, that this study will provide a perspective to judge both the desirable level of effort and programs proposed by the AEC and other Government agencies in the development of our energy resources.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I took this time to discuss H.R. 5131, the Youth Conservation Corps bill, which the Committee on Education and Labor recently approved. The bill shortly will be before the House Committee on Rules.

On March 31, 1933, the Congress responded to President Roosevelt's message asking for power to create a Civilian Conservation Corps and on April 5 the President established it by Executive order. There had been no precedent for the establishment of a Corps of this type in American history. In that message the President stated:

I propose to create a Civilian Conservation Corps to be used in simple work, not interfering with normal employment, but confining itself to forestry, the prevention of soil erosion, flood control, and similar projects.

Now 30 years later, we face a specialized unemployment problem of our youth. We do not have as many people out of employment today as we had back in 1933 but the unemployment in the age group between 16 and 21 perhaps is greater today than in 1933. In December 1962, we had in excess of 700,000 young people between the ages of 16 and 21 that were not in school and were unemployed. An 800,000 figure would perhaps be more accurate because there are no figures for the unemployed youngster who does not go about looking for work but we all know there are many in this particular group. Twenty-six percent of this unemployed group of youngsters are high school graduates. Of the dropouts in the 1960's it has been estimated that 2½ million of these youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 will not have completed the 8th grade. The unemployment rate among this age group is more than three times the unemployment rate in the adult population.

For several years many of the Members have been exerting every effort to enact legislation patterned after the old Civilian Conservation Corps, particularly the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman BLATNIK, and the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Congressman SIKES. This year legislation was introduced by the gentleman from Florida, Congressman SIKES, and the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman BLATNIK, along with many other Members in the Congress including myself, to authorize the establishment of the Youth Conservation Corps which we feel is the best and most economical method of meeting this unemployment problem among the youth of the country, and at the same time will advance the conservation and recreational pro-

grams in our national forests and national parks. This legislation also authorizes State and community youth employment programs for State and local public facilities.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD at this point an analysis of both titles I and II prepared by the U.S. Department of Labor analyzing the principal provisions of S. 1 and H.R. 5131, as amended by the House and Senate committees, and letters from the National Education Association, American Personnel and Guidance Association, Department of Rural Education of the National Education Association, and the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, urging approval of youth corps legislation:

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF S. 1 AND H.R. 5131 AS AMENDED BY HOUSE AND SENATE COMMITTEES

The bill contains two titles—the first of which would establish a Youth Conservation Corps; the second, State and community employment program. Both programs are designed to provide modest paying jobs to the increasing problem of unemployed youth 16 through 21 years of age. Authorized program levels are in approximate accord with the President's January 1963 budget message for first year of operation. The House bill authorizes \$100 million; the Senate version authorized \$120 million.

THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

1. A Youth Conservation Corps is established within the Department of Labor for the purpose of performing needed conservation work under the direct supervision of the Federal conservation agencies.

2. Young men 16 through 21 will be eligible for enrollment in the Corps for a minimum period of 6 months. Reenrollment will be permitted up to a maximum of 2 years. During their enrollment they will be paid \$60 per month (slightly higher on reenrollment), receive board, lodging, clothing, and other necessities.

3. Training and basic educational skills will be provided through arrangements made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with local school authorities.

4. The House bill provides an allotment formula based upon the male population in the age group in each of the States. The Senate version provides that 50 percent of the enrollees are to be selected on the basis of population figures and 50 percent to be selected by the Secretary on the basis of high unemployment. Selection of the enrollees will be made by the State employment services which in turn will endeavor to find jobs in private industry upon the conclusion of the enrollment.

5. The Corps will be administered by a Director, nominated by the President, acting through an interdepartmental committee consisting of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, and (in the House version) the General Services Administration. The Director of the Corps will represent the Secretary of Labor.

6. Appropriations in the two versions differ. The Senate bill has a first year appropriation of \$60 million, with subsequent years to be determined by the Congress. The House version sets maximum appropriations of \$50 million the first year, \$100 million the second year, \$150 million the third year, \$200 million for the fourth, and thereafter to be determined by the Congress. For the first

¹ These programs are to be distinguished from proposals for a Domestic Peace Corps which will be manned by adult volunteers whose special talents and educational qualifications will be utilized to provide leadership to local volunteer service.

year the number of enrollees will not exceed 15,000; thereafter the number at one time shall not exceed 60,000.

STATE AND COMMUNITY YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

1. Through the use of 50-50 matching grants, public or private nonprofit agencies will be permitted to pay the costs of programs for the employment of youngsters for useful full-time or part-time work not now being performed by regular employees. The funds are available for any combination of useful work linked with schooling or training, or special school programs including work-study programs.

2. Young men or women between the ages of 16 through 21 are eligible for jobs under the program.

3. The program is designed to depend on local initiative. Thus local groups such as educators, welfare officials, and private agencies will together draw up plans for employment programs. These plans will then be submitted for the approval of the Secretary of Labor to assure compliance with requirements set forth in the bill.

4. Employment opportunities authorized by the program would include service in schools, hospitals, libraries, welfare agencies, children's homes, courts, in public programs relating to park improvement, playgrounds, and in private community activities such as the Visiting Nurse Association, Boy Scouts, and so on. Amendments to the administration's bill, made both in the House and the Senate versions, provide additional moneys for the establishment of Youth Conservation Corps type programs by States on State parks and forests.

5. The House version of the bill appropriates \$50 million the first year, \$80 million the second, and \$110 million the third year, the program to terminate thereafter. The number of enrollees is not stated but would depend upon the makeup of individual programs and the size of appropriations. The Senate bill provides for a first-year appropriation of \$60 million, with the subsequent 4 years to be determined by the Congress. The Senate bill version provides that the enrollees shall not exceed the equivalent of 60,000 enrollees during the first year, and thereafter the number determined by the appropriations.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.

HON. CARL PERKINS,

Chairman, General Subcommittee on Education, House Education and Labor Committee, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: It is encouraging that the Youth Employment Act, which you are considering as H.R. 5131, has made the progress it has toward legislative enactment, and I hope that the Congress will proceed now without delay to final passage.

The National Education Association regards this legislation as promising an important contribution toward the problems of our disadvantaged youth, so many of whom have dropped out of school without adequate preparation for life. The future for most of them will be bleak indeed unless we can find some way of retrieving these lost talents.

We are impressed with the educational benefits contemplated in this proposal—the requirement in title I, providing for a Youth Conservation Corps, that State and local educational authorities are to establish educational programs, in cooperation with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the maximum extent possible, and in title II the provision for local area employment which may provide the incentive needed by many to stay in school or return to school, or to acquire useful work experience.

The problem to which this legislation addresses itself is, we think, one of the most serious before the Nation today and one which will require action on many fronts for its resolution. There are 11.6 million young people in our high schools this year and, if recent experience is our guide, one-third of them (more than 3.5 million) will not graduate.

Measured against the size of the problem, the Youth Employment Act cannot be considered a panacea, but surely it will be worth the effort to make a start, and a good start, toward its solution.

Sincerely,

HAZEL BLANCHARD,
President.

AMERICAN PERSONNEL AND
GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.

HON. CARL PERKINS,

Chairman, General Subcommittee on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Because of the urgency of the situation I am writing you again about the Youth Employment Act of 1963 (H.R. 5131). The time for action on this important social and educational matter is now. Perhaps never in our Nation's history has such a large segment of our young men and women faced so bleak an employment outlook as today. Efforts at solving this perplexing social problem are long overdue. H.R. 5131 will not provide all the help that is needed, nor will it solve all the problems. But, it is an important first step in putting forth a positive plan of action. There are several very important reasons why this legislation is so badly needed. May I relate to you again the major strengths of this bill as they occur to this association.

OPPORTUNITY

Many of the young men, 16 through 21, who are unemployed today, have never held a job for an extended period of time. They have never been out of the very city that holds them captive. Many are completely unaware of the world about them—much less the great challenge and opportunity that is America. They badly need an opportunity for gainful employment in order that they can lift their horizons beyond the narrow concrete canyon that now is home to them. For a young man out of work for extended periods of time, a chance to work may be the greatest boost he will receive in his lifetime.

WORK IN NATURAL RESOURCES

The opportunity to work as provided in this bill will be a great support to thousands of young men. The additional benefits from title I—the Youth Conservation Corps—with its provisions for healthful outdoor training and employment is highly commendable. The need for development and conservation in our parks and forests has been stated so well by experts in the field that it should only be called attention to here. These young men can be given a real sense of social contribution by working in the beautiful parks and forests of this Nation. Many of them have never seen the scenic wonders of our land and the very opportunity to learn and earn in this setting should accrue a great blessing to both this Nation and the young men involved. Both natural resources—youth and our land and forests—are important.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

The recent manpower report of the President stated that the unemployment rate in 1962 for boys 14 to 19 was about 13 percent and 9 percent for those in their early twenties while men 25 or over had an unemployment rate of 4 percent. This is an appalling situation. The truth is that things are not going to get better with the passing

of time. These youth need more education and opportunities for employment now. Both are important. The lack of education, for many, is the basic cause of their unemployment. This bill makes an attack on this dual problem. These men need special educational programs for their age group and maturity level. Among them are many who can be skilled technicians or creative artisans if given the chance. They need a lift to get back on the right track of education again—while they work and earn. For many thousands of young men who can take advantage of this act the education benefits can prove to be equal to or more important than the employment opportunities.

An important aspect of this educational program will be the counseling provided for the enrollees. These young men need to be made aware of their human potential and the present and future opportunities that are available to them in this highly technical and complex world in which we live. A strong professional counseling program in this Youth Employment Act will give greatest possible meaning to the education and the training.

SOMEONE CARES

A young man out of school and out of work—a part of a core of long-term unemployed (15 weeks or more)—begins to wonder if his neighbors, his city, State or Nation won't reach out to support his desire to be a useful productive American citizen. Basically, these young men want to work, but many (and the number is growing) simply cannot find work with their educational skill and maturity level. They must be given a chance. This Nation must demonstrate to these hundreds of thousands of unemployed youth under 22 years of age that someone does care whether they have the opportunity for useful and productive employment and a fresh start on an educational program. The social and economic devastation of this prolonged unemployment can be very critical for these young people. This Nation needs the help of these young men, and these young men need the help of this Nation.

We urge you to continue to provide the strong leadership this bill needs for successful passage. Your interest and past support places thousands of Americans in your debt.

Cordially yours,

ARTHUR A. HITCHCOCK,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,

DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.

HON. CARL PERKINS,

New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: Congratulations on your leadership in bringing H.R. 5131, the Youth Employment Act, to the attention of the Congress as you are doing today.

Rural youth and young adults are often the victims of our changing economic and social structure. The chronic inadequate financing of public education has been particularly devastating in rural areas. This condition, coupled with the decrease in opportunity for work on the farm because of increased mechanization, has resulted in a migration of unskilled rural youth to urban areas, where they too often join the ranks of the chronic unemployed.

While as a rural group we obviously applaud the purposes of title I of H.R. 5131 providing for a Youth Conservation Corps, we are equally enthusiastic about title II, the local area youth employment program. Title I is limited to opportunities for young men. Title II would provide opportunities for both young men and young women. Our society requires increasing vocational competence from all of its citizens, not only

for the benefit of society, but perhaps more importantly for the self-respect and self-fulfillment of the individuals concerned. We believe that service in the Youth Conservation Corps can be a fine experience for young men. We commend the authors of this bill for their concern for conservation of natural resources, a special interest of our department. But we emphasize that a youth conservation program cannot be complete if it ignores those young people who will spend their lives in the urban areas and who will profit most from on-the-job public service employment training programs. We urge, as we did last year, that the committee not fail to see all of the youth because of the trees.

We are particularly pleased that H.R. 5131 contains the explicit provision that training and basic education skills will be provided through arrangements made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the local school authorities.

The department of rural education, NEA, representing the county superintendents of this Nation, supports H.R. 5131 and urges the Congress to approve the bill as presented. We believe this is a realistic approach to the present problems of youth employment.

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. ISENBERG,
Executive Secretary.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR
HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, RECREATION,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, General Subcommittee on Education,
House Office Building, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: The American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation urges you and your committee to support and call for the early enactment of H.R. 5131, the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

Our association was organized in 1885. It has over 34,000 members and is a department of the National Education Association. It is also the largest professional organization in America serving the fields of health, physical education, and recreation.

We feel that the two titles of this bill—one providing for a Youth Conservation Corps, and the other for a local area youth employment program—are equally important to make possible the greatly needed opportunities for youth employment. The useful work on projects which would be accomplished under the provisions of this bill would also contribute greatly to the conservation and development of natural resources throughout the Nation.

We are especially pleased that section 104 (2) under title I provides that enrollees of the Youth Conservation Corps may be utilized by agencies responsible for developing, managing, and protecting recreational areas. The increasing shortage of recreational areas and facilities is a critical national problem which must be solved in order to provide adequate recreational opportunities for all citizens.

We are also happy to see that section 104 (4) under title I provides that to the maximum extent practicable, educational programs shall be provided by State and local educational authorities under agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Our association urges the support of your committee in calling on the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 5131 without delay.

Sincerely yours,

JACKSON M. ANDERSON,
Assistant Executive Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, some of our friends on the other side of the aisle have suggested that a Federal program aimed to provide employment to the young men and wom-

en of the country is an expensive way to meet the present problem facing these youngsters. They propose instead a substantial increase in the size of the vocational education plan on the theory that those who are unemployed need skills before they become capable of getting jobs.

I do not think that anybody can find me in second place on behalf of the cause of vocational education. These past 2 weeks, indeed, I have been the chairman of a subcommittee examining the needs of vocational education and listening to the overwhelming testimony in its behalf—testimony, in fact, from administration witnesses who have said that vocational education has been neglected in the struggle for the local education dollar; has been receiving the least able of the students; has been making out with obsolete machinery and with salary scales which are unable to compete with modern industry. I have, moreover, introduced H.R. 4955 which would aid vocational education to an even greater extent than the aid proposed by the administration. I have in my State and, indeed, in my own district one of the greatest vocational schools of the entire Nation, the Mayo Vocational School, and my most ardent wish is that all Americans have the opportunity to attend an area vocational school with the reputation and record of accomplishment which Mayo has demonstrated almost since its founding. Only very few States, North Carolina, Louisiana, California, and Connecticut have a sufficient organization of public vocational schooling to do the job Mayo is doing for my district. To rectify these deficiencies will require an enormous commitment of public resources.

But I think we should ask ourselves whether vocational education is the answer for the 800,000 young men and women between 16 and 21 who are this very day out of school and looking for work. The Secretary of Labor testified that there was an additional 200,000 who were out of school and not looking for work because they knew the task was futile—they lacked the qualifications which their experience had already told them were necessary before an employer would consider them for employment.

Bear in mind that the 800,000 of today will be on the increase tomorrow. In 1960 the monthly average, apart from vacation months, was 450,000, about one-half of what it is today. During 1963 the first wave of postwar births will become 16 years of age. In this very year 3,700,000 young boys and girls will become 16 years of age compared to the 2,700,000 who become 16 during 1962. Thus, for those who will drop out, who will start looking for jobs at 16 we are certain to be presented with a sudden new increase in the number of such youngsters.

At the very moment in time when the flood of new entrants into the labor force confronts us, another event is occurring in the manpower field. All of us know that the farm boy is being driven into the city because of the rapid technological developments taking place in agriculture. We all know that the number of odd jobs, unskilled jobs if you will,

is decreasing. We know that the youngster who might have been an elevator operator or an errand boy finds such opportunities increasingly scarce because of the advance of automation. The Secretary said we are facing a future where the unskilled jobs will be done by machine. Department of Labor projections for the next 15 years show clearly that in a steeply rising labor force the number of unskilled jobs likely to be available will remain stable whereas all the growth in the labor force will be absorbed in the skilled or semiskilled areas.

We have had disastrous spring floods in Kentucky and in many other States in the country. When one swollen river meets another and the two combine, the confluence of these rivers flood the land below and it is this kind of situation which I am trying to describe. It is this kind of situation which committee members from the other side of the aisle during discussions of the Youth Employment Act are attempting to solve by vocational training, as though this institution could handle the vast problems of youthful unemployment in the immediate future.

Given 10 years of development of school construction, of rising teacher salaries, of recruitment of manpower, in short a crash program for education plan, some of the job of saving wasting manpower might be accomplished, but only under these circumstances.

But the task immediately ahead cannot be done solely by vocational education and their leaders, as I will describe, say as much. The job ahead must deal with existing conditions and predictable ones of high youth unemployment. The school dropout picture, reflecting over a period of years considerable progress when applied to the increasing supply of youngsters, shows the actual number of dropouts remaining constant. Moreover these youngsters are dropping out of vocational schools as well as regular schools. The problem is that the courses being offered are insufficient to insure their attention. They are not motivated for learning to work—their experiences in school or in their environment have turned them away from the path to a productive livelihood. Good vocational schooling for youngsters requires levels of accomplishment in a host of related subjects comparable to a high school degree.

The Manpower Development and Training Act passed last year has to date approved projects which total 30,000 trainees. When the matter was checked recently it was discovered that approximately 25 percent of the total were for the age group 16 through 21, the topic of our concern this afternoon. Many of these youngsters were eligible for the adult training allowances because they were already heads of families and had been in the labor force 3 years. Perhaps more important are the difficulties which the Department of Labor encountered in stimulating special programs for youth, the kinds of programs which the Congress asked the Secretary of Labor to give his special attention in view of the kinds of unemployment figures which I have already described. To

date hardly a half dozen of such programs have been developed covering less than 500 trainees. The Manpower Development and Training Act and the Area Redevelopment Act are neither of them geared to the broad range programs required for our youth. They are chiefly used for those who have become unemployed and require retraining in order to resume beneficial and satisfactory employment in a new job.

The Secretary of Labor and numerous other witnesses made the point that what most of those youngsters who are now unemployed needed was actual experience in work, the kind of experience which enables an employer when considering the employment application of an applicant to ascertain for himself from the previous employer what he can expect. He wants to know whether the applicant has worked regularly, understands the discipline of promptness, of fitting in with the operations of others on the job. The vocational education programs do not give such answers. The Manpower Development and Training Act to the extent that it permits on-the-job training will give such answers to the employer who is cooperating in giving training, but for this employer the trainee is already his own prospective employee.

In quite different ways the two programs proposed by the Youth Employment Act provide unique experience to the persons for whom they are devised. In the case of the Youth Conservation Corps the money spent can be considered well spent for conservation purposes. The \$4,000 per year per enrollee, despite some losses in efficiency, compares very favorably to the productivity of a regular employee performing similar conservation work, and if such is the fact the benefits to the young men who will be in the program will become a valuable by-product. The healing values of camp experience, of work in a constructive purpose is the testimony of the old CCC and many of the persons who today deal with youngsters in the camp programs of many States.

The State and community employment programs on the other hand will be able to relate additional schooling with actual work experience. The work study programs and experiments in many school districts have proved their worth and such programs will receive substantial support when this bill is enacted. Indeed many youngsters will be able to receive vocational education for part of the day and work at a constructive, useful job financially supported by title II of the Youth Employment Act. In this very clear way the rebuilding of vocational education is related to activity under this bill but at the same time quite clearly complementary to it and in no way overlapping in its benefits.

Mr. Speaker, training under the vocational education program meets the needs of the fairly able kid, but only reaches to a limited degree the type of youngster we are trying to reach under the Youth Corps legislation.

Vocational education programs in general do not satisfy the needs of a sixth-, seventh-, eighth-grade school dropout, until this type of youngster has taken

some camp training where he will be given an opportunity to test his aptitude and preference for various types of work. Then he may be given related training to the type of work most suitable to this particular youngster and from there take vocational training.

Much of the vocational training is largely post high school. Title VIII of the National Defense Education Act, training highly skilled technicians is largely a post high school program. The Smith-Hughes Act and George-Barden Act, as far as home economics and agriculture are concerned start with the ninth grade, and go through some post high school work. In trade and industrial education, most of the programs start in the 10th grade. Many of these programs are likewise post high school. The distributive occupations which have to do with merchandising, retailing, and wholesaling on a cooperative basis, usually require 10th grade and go through high school, and much of this is post high school.

I have gone to the trouble of lifting from the vocational education hearings the testimony of a group of experts representing American vocational education, who appeared before the General Subcommittee on Education on Wednesday and Friday of last week. They are Dr. Milo J. Peterson, president of the American Vocational Association; Dr. William B. Logan, professor of education at Ohio State University and member of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education; Mr. James Patton, assistant superintendent of public instruction, Kentucky Department of Education; Dr. Burr E. Coe, director, Middlesex County Vocational and Technical High School of New Brunswick, N.J.; Dr. Mayor D. Mobley, executive secretary, American Vocational Association, Washington, D.C.; Dr. C. W. Patrick, president of San Diego Junior College, San Diego, Calif.; and Dr. Albert Jochen, assistant commissioner of education, vocational division, Trenton, N.J. These gentlemen are experts in the field and their testimony was to the effect that the dropout would benefit immensely from camp experience.

I think the Members of the Congress will be interested in the views of these outstanding vocational experts on the proposed Youth Corps legislation. These gentlemen support the youth camp approach and give their reasons. I have lifted out of the record the pertinent part of the testimony of these gentlemen, and under unanimous consent include them in the Record at this point. These statements are taken from the stenographic transcript of hearings, General Subcommittee on Education, March 27, 1963, commencing at the top of page 258, and extending through page 273:

Mr. PERKINS. I will address this question to all of the speakers.

On these 700,000 dropouts primarily from high school and grade school between the ages of 16 to 21 years, assuming that you had these expanded facilities today, how many of these dropouts do you figure that you may be able to train or retrain?

This is problematical, we all know it, but you people are specialists in this field and

we have to get some views of the specialists. I would just like to get that in general. I want the comments from all of you, any of you.

Mr. PATTON. Could I make a comment on that? I want to back up a bit to discuss the dropout generally as it applies in Kentucky, our home State.

At the present time, or this last year, we only had 14 vocational schools, 1,700 dropouts. On the face of that we had about 37 percent, generally, 37 to 40 percent from year to year dropping out of school.

You can see just how small a dent we are making on it at the present time.

Of course, we need the facilities and equipment to do the total job. But I visited the Kentucky Business, the institution that serves the delinquents and I found more than 400 people in that institution and in the interest of the committee that were there at the institution, we found that everyone we talked to despised the school that they last attended. They didn't like the school, they didn't like the teacher. They would become a dropout and then a delinquent and then confined to an institution.

Now, it stands to reason that there is a large group of these people that could have been salvaged in the work camp situation.

I am old enough to have been able to find out and to have experienced the outstanding contribution the CCC camp made for many of our youths in Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. You feel with this kind of dropout they are usually unqualified to enter vocational education and the CCC or something patterned after the old Civilian Conservation Corps would be satisfactory?

Mr. PATTON. Yes. The very fact you are subjected to discipline and go to bed at a certain time and you associate with the group and you would develop certain work habits and it is certainly beneficial as a prerequisite to any education.

Mr. PERKINS. You would say that would be a prerequisite to vocational education?

Mr. PATTON. It would be.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to hear the comment of the gentleman here from California, just comment on that one point.

Mr. PATRICK. I would agree, in general, with the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky, and it seems to me that the expansion of the program of vocational education into areas—do you want us to expand on both ends of the spectrum? We talked this morning about great need for technical education and there is also a need for expansion in the lower level of vocational education, the service occupations and semiskilled occupations that have had to be filled by the completely unskilled man and now requires skills.

It would seem to me, and I am sure that the expansion of the vocational program at those lower levels would reduce considerably the number of youth that might need to be served by such a camp, but the failure to do both of these things in the face of any major lack of full employment will create idle youths, which we know, in our urban communities, can be a devastating and dangerous program.

Mr. PERKINS. But the first thing with an unemployed youngster who does not have the background to enter vocational education, a job will usually put an entirely different light into that youngster's life; am I correct?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes, sir; there is no question about that. We are constantly aware of that and we are, I think, convinced we can do more in vocational education to help some of these less able youngsters and the provisions in 4955—there are provisions that may make it specifically possible to help these specially or socially handicapped groups that might not otherwise have been accommodated in our past programs since we are in the central area of vocational training.

Mr. PERKINS. I understand one of the greatest drawbacks, perhaps "handicaps" is the better terminology—to the so-called manpower legislation enacted last year is the functional illiteracy problem they are running into in administering the program to get more of these youngsters and I am just speaking about the youngster, to get more of the youngsters into training.

Mr. PATRICK. This is equally true of the adults too, Mr. Chairman. I am more familiar with what we have been doing to remedy illiteracy in adults. This has been a major problem in our own community.

We sometimes don't like to face these facts but there are a significant proportion of people who are functionally illiterate in some of our major urban communities and in some of our enlightened States such as California.

We have continued to have a major problem in adult education in reaching these people. The year before last the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego published a booklet at their expense urging these people to come back to evening schools. Many of them were recent dropouts. Half of the high school graduates at one of the adult high schools has dropped out of the regular schools within the last 3 years.

The chamber of commerce felt they had to spend the money to urge people to attend adult education because the surveys conducted by the Department of Labor, in which we cooperated, revealed that a significant amount of unemployment was simply due to functional illiteracy of these people and we have tremendous support for this kind of people from both management and labor in our community where we have highly technological industries in the aircraft, missile and electronics fields which simply can't use these people.

Mr. PERKINS. From experience, the 16-year-old dropouts we find are unqualified under the present setup to get into vocational education and 9 times out of 10, they don't want to go back to school or some other school where they have already dropped out, am I correct in that statement?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes, I would agree. I also feel that in some instances this is due to a lack of vocational programs in occupational—I would almost call it occupational programs in the schools in which he has been attending.

We can remedy some by increasing the programs and there will still be an additional corps of the individuals to whom you will refer for some other kind of work experience, job experience, camp experience, that it will be extremely beneficial.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Mobley.

Mr. MOBLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention, if I may, for the sake of the record, that in your bill, H.R. 4955, on page 7, item 4, describing what money can be used for this, as one of the things you have vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps, that require training programs adapted to the special needs of such persons.

I can conceive of a program that would be, or that some of this money could be used for the youth who are enrolled in the domestic corps, whereby once they get work, then through persuasion of the appropriate officials working with that particular program, they would be induced to enroll in vocational programs and here you are making it available. You are making money available that can be used.

Mr. PERKINS. Do you not think the type of youngster I am talking about, Mr. Mobley, who has dropped out, say, 17 years of age and assume he has an eighth grade diploma and is loitering on the streets and not doing anything and his habits are bad, do you not think if he took camp training for 6 months or a year and in connection with that camp training got some kind of related training he is interested in, automobile mechanics, or

masonry, and if he did some masonry work under appropriate supervision, do you not think that when he had completed his enrollment and with that experience, then you have developed that youngster to the point that he is better qualified to meet just what you are talking about under this vocational educational framework?

Mr. MOBLEY. I agree most wholeheartedly with that.

I would like to remind you, like Mr. Patton I am old enough to remember the NYA program and the OCC program and I had a lot to do with it. We cooperated wholeheartedly with those agencies when in existence and they did a lot of good. There is no question in my mind about that.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Peterson, I would like to have your comments.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there is much I can add to what has been said except to concur and add special emphasis to this type of training or experience or change of environment for the type of individual you were describing.

I think as a special need which requires a special circumstance to correct, if it is ever going to be corrected, it is not going to be done by putting them back into the same situation or even into a similar one in a different school in the same community. There has to be a saturation point. He has to change his attitude. He has to develop some different ideas and he is not going to do that if you just let him be where he is.

I think that would be the part that strikes me as the most significant in this program.

Mr. PERKINS. You cannot think of any better way to do it than a camp program and conservation work?

Mr. PETERSON. When you think of the young man from an urban area and I think it is safe to assume less than the most desirable part of the urban center, a complete change of environment that this provides can't help but be beneficial.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Logan, I want your comments.

Mr. LOGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to refer to a quotation given in the panel report at page 5, comment from the study made by Wilbur B. Brookover and Sigmund Nozal, "A Sociological Analysis of Vocational Education in the United States":

"Reference to your comment on skilled training and reading, writing, and arithmetic, skills in reading, mathematics, and other general educational fields are essential for acquiring specific vocational competence at the higher levels of education needed for many occupations."

There is a longer quotation than that here, but I will be glad to turn this over to the clerk.

But during the study made by the panel of consultants, the committees visited one of the high schools in the United States and I would prefer not to identify the specific area right at the present time. We saw there some very bad conditions in classrooms of people who were ill prepared for going out and getting a job and holding a job but the job being done was excellent, but if those boys could have been taken out to the wide open spaces and taken out of the atmosphere of the area in which they were housed, I think it would have been greatly beneficial to them.

We saw an excellent job being done by teachers there. We saw them teaching the ruler, by referring to the large spaces and the small spaces, if you please, instead of an eighth of an inch, a quarter of an inch—they said "the large spaces" and "the small spaces." And they were able to raise the level of the skills of those young men considerably.

But on the other hand, it was costing this school system \$20,000 a year just to keep the doors of the building open. That is not up-keep, if you please.

Mr. PERKINS. Assuming that this camp program, at the most, even if you had to provide new housing, would only cost \$4,000 per enrollee, would you say that was a good investment in this type of a dropout that we are talking about?

Mr. LOGAN. It is an investment in people and when you can make a person, raise him up through the proper application, bring him up to the level that he comes back and holds his head up and he lives as an acceptable citizen in the community and is proud of what he is doing, I would say it is a real good investment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN. I was interested in the comment made about previous experience in training of youth in these camp situations which was made by you, I think. You do not anticipate, I presume, there would be any problem today in providing adequate vocational instruction for the scale of program that we are contemplating here?

Mr. MOBLEY. Yes, there would, unless we can get more money. The vocational funds today are pledged right down to the last penny.

I think if Mr. PERKINS' bill is enacted into law and money is made available, there will be no trouble.

I would like to give you, if I may, an experience we had in my home State. I worked very closely with the head of the NYA back all through the years that it was in operation. Mr. Jones, now of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was in charge of the program in my home State at the time and we worked very closely. We worked on a program whereby these young people were brought into centers for work. They worked a half of each day and then we gave them vocational education and general education. Some of them needed to read and write, learn to read and write, some were acquiring skills at the same time and it was a very fine program.

It was a very fine program. We trained hundreds of people and at the same time they learned good work habits.

Mr. BROWN. But there is the type of thing that is contemplated in the title II section of this youth employment bill, these so-called local areas employment.

Mr. MOBLEY. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. And I am very interested to know you have had experience and I presume, therefore, you see no mechanical difficulties if the money can be provided to provide the type of educational program we are talking about.

Mr. MOBLEY. Yes. That is one reason I called attention to this provision in Mr. PERKINS' bill, because it provides the money for doing this and we can vary it. The language is such you wouldn't have to surrender the standards as you have in some other courses. You can develop the program to meet the particular needs.

So I anticipate no trouble at all in that respect.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you.

Mr. PERKINS. Any further questions?

Mr. BROWN. Not right now.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, Mr. Patton, you wish to further comment on this question? You have had experience in this, am I correct?

Mr. PATTON. When I was director of the State vocational program. We had tremendous responsibility for attempting to adjust the young man who comes to school so that he would be ready to accept vocational training and the 8 years that I participated there in the study of the people that completed this, we had a higher percentage of dropouts from that vocational school among the very young that were not ready for such training.

Now, if these people had had a chance, let me say many of them had been roving the streets and had developed a poor attitude toward school and someone had gotten hold

of them and said if they would come into the vocational school probably something would be done. But he could not, we were not in a position to break down that attitude and break down that social culture that they had been living in in the short period of time to get them ready for vocational training.

So if they had had a work experience situation like the camp proposal that you are thinking about, it would probably have salvaged many of these young people that we were unable to do anything with at that particular time.

Now, if we had had a larger counseling staff and if we had had sufficient funds to put them into an orientation program for a period of months to give them individual attention, we might have been able to hold them but we didn't have that kind of facilities, we didn't have that kind of leadership, we didn't have that kind of personnel.

Now, if this bill could be enacted into law, and if your camp bills were enacted into law, I believe we can begin to make a dent upon this social problem of the youth of this country, but otherwise, I think it is going to be a cancer that is going to eat the heart out of America unless we come to grips with it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Peterson.

Mr. PETERSON. I would like to make this further comment. As we think ahead to the implementation of this type of program I think we must come back again to the fact that in order to do this job we have to have the kind of provisions for vocational educational education so that we will have a qualified corps of instructors to do the vocational training and counseling that will be needed.

But to do one without the other, I think you will fail in achieving the objective of either.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Mobley.

Mr. MOBLEY. I would like to make this comment. I studied your youth opportunities bill, and we are very glad indeed that you have as one of your provisions that any vocational or educational work that is carried on incidental in connection with on-the-job training, would be done through consultation and working with the HEW and through State and local educational authorities.

I think you know that most educators don't agree on too many things but there is one thing they do agree on, they don't want the Federal Government running the schools.

Mr. PERKINS. May I say to you, Mr. Mobley, it is the intention of the committee, and Mr. Brown is on the committee, to wholeheartedly see that the Federal Government does not run the schools. This is to be worked out with the State educational people and 9 times out of 10 it would be the vocational educational people in the State and, if not, it would be the State department of education. The bill so provides.

Mr. MOBLEY. Yes, and I want to commend you for having that clause in the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. That provision will remain in the bill. I can visualize where the vocational educational people, assuming that the Youth Conservation Corps bill is enacted, will play a very important role in developing that youth so he can make a contribution to the country and help expand the economy in the long run.

Mr. MOBLEY. Mr. Chairman, could I add one other thing?

You were mentioning about the cost. One of the things I think we must always keep in mind, too, is unless you salvage a youth they may cost you a lot more than \$4,000 a year in terms of crime and juvenile delinquency.

Mr. BROWN. That is a good thought. It just occurred to me, as you were discussing it, that it is very well known you can go into our penal institutions and acquire very quickly certain skills and attitudes that are

very difficult to overcome and it seems to me with vocational training and the healthful atmosphere we are contemplating in some of these programs, it will have the opposite effect and make useful citizens out of these people.

Are there any other comments from any of you gentlemen on this?

I am not sure what the chairman proposes to do about continuing the testimony but he will be back in a minute.

Mr. LOGAN. May I make this comment? In regard to giving instruction for these people who are handicapped in various ways, no matter what it might be, that type of instructor that you get is not easy to find and he is hard to train. It takes a long time to prepare him for this, because he not only has to know how to work with the skills, but develop those skills in an entirely different manner, in which we already have textbooks prepared to give him guidance and so forth, and he also has to know the psychological facets of working with these kids that many times are not written down in books.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, I have been very much concerned in California, about the development of programs which would involve these handicaps or marginally employed people and it is necessary to have a high degree of skill to accomplish this job and frequently it takes a shelter type of situation, which is not normally available. Yet if we make the effort to utilize these resources, we are going to tap a potential which is not a total dead-weight and cost to society and put it into production.

Mr. Speaker, following are also statements of Dr. Albert Jochen, assistant commissioner of education, vocational division, Trenton, N.J., taken from his testimony before the General Subcommittee on Education, March 29, appearing in the stenographic transcript of hearings commencing on page 439 and extending through page 445; also his statement beginning on page 453 and ending on page 454:

Mr. PERKINS. I am thinking about the youngster 16 or 17 who has never had a job. He is unemployed. He has a sixth, seventh, or eighth grade education. There are no courses in your vocational school, I mean there are no training programs there for that type of youngster under present facilities?

Mr. JOCHEN. Yes, sir, there are, but they are very limited. In the city of Trenton we have one program in the garment industry area, it has to do with the needle trades, double needle, single needle, closing machines, and that kind of thing. These people are referred by the Employment Security Division to the schools and we call it a type C.

Now, there is a possibility under the George-Barden Act of conducting type C programs. Our problems in New Jersey are these. Our problem is that at the present time we are reimbursing the local district for shop teachers' salary only because we have no other funds. According to the law, we could reimburse every vocational teacher, but we are so limited in Federal funds that we can only reimburse the shop or laboratory teacher and we are down now to where we are reimbursing at 6 percent of his salary. We don't have any money.

Mr. PERKINS. You say, though, any assistance you give these school dropouts, 17 or 18 years of age, sixth, seventh, eighth grade education, is very minor.

Mr. JOCHEN. It is; not because we want it to be but because of circumstances, financial.

Mr. PERKINS. But assuming one of these youngsters had dropped out of school at sixth grade level, 17 years of age, you may say that he dropped out of vocational educa-

tional school, would you not suggest that that youngster be put into a different environment and enrolled in a camp for a period of 6 months or a year and find out while he is in the camp what particular trade he is perhaps interested in and may take some related training in camp, and then after he came out of that period of enrollment with some new work habits and this related training, that he would be much more adaptable to vocational training of this type?

Mr. JOCHEN. I would think that that would certainly be worth experimenting with and looking at.

We have a Johnstone Training Center where they are doing some research at the State level in this area.

However, it is limited to youngsters who have gotten into trouble, they have become delinquent.

Mr. PERKINS. I am talking now about the youngsters who have dropped out of school, at the seventh or eighth grade level, where there are no jobs available. Would you suggest that camp life, enrollment for a period of 6 to 12 months, doing conservation work in the forest, and maybe some mental work, and taking some basic educational training in the meantime would be perhaps the most useful program that you could provide for that youngster to get him back on the road to get an education?

Mr. JOCHEN. Well, I would certainly feel that this would be most important to try. We have done some work with these people. You have an economic factor, you have a sociological factor. If they were brought back into the same environment, many times without giving them an opportunity of changing that, this could be very harmful.

I would want to see, too, what I believe in this sense, that the program, if they were in the camp, was really and truly realistic in terms of the need of these people so that they would not again be frustrated by failure.

Mr. PERKINS. Be well-planned work?

Mr. JOCHEN. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Under park rangers and supervisors who really know their business?

Mr. JOCHEN. I certainly would like to see it tried. I would not mind making contributions in that direction if necessary.

Mr. PERKINS. You remember the old Civilian Conservation Corps, do you not?

Mr. JOCHEN. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. What is your idea of a corps of that type for youngsters and dropouts in school for a camp patterned after the CCC school?

Mr. JOCHEN. I think if I could organize, do a lot of good planning in developing the curricula and the socioeconomic kinds of things you want to train these people in and the social adjustments and develop it carefully and get the right kind of people running it, to me this is really wonderful. It might be the first time that some of these people had ever been out under trees and worked.

If you have ever been up to Cornell University and walked through Enfield Glen, you still see carved into the sides of the walls there CCC, No. so and so. I often thought this probably was the first time a youngster was ever out under the sky, he made something that he enjoyed that otherwise would never be there.

This glen is a beautiful thing. I have wondered if we could not look up some of those people and find out from them what they thought of the education and training they got under the program.

I also feel this way, though, that I would not want such a program to make the people locally feel now that the obligations that they really should have are not to be continued. In other words, too frequently you know we are very glad, we say, well, now, somebody else is taking care of this and we don't have the problem any more.

That would not be true. I think there should be close tieup.

Mr. PERKINS. The responsibility would still be here. I think when that youngster gets some training in this camp, gets some experiences in the camp from camp life, that that would qualify him to take vocational education in something he is interested in and prepare himself for life and make a great contribution to the economy of the country. Those are my personal views.

Mr. JOCHEN. I worked in the NYA, which was a little bit like the CCC. I have seen some of the CCC camps, so I am not unfamiliar with what was done to these people. It literally improved their health and outlook.

We fail to recognize, some of us, that just eating habits are not the same. There are some nationalities who do not ever sit down as a family and eat. You eat when you are hungry. There is a little food cooking all the time.

I think they have to see some of these other things. They also have to be taught the importance of understanding the ethic and the sociological backgrounds of their parents so that there is a closer and warmer feeling there because you live in one world at home and when you go to school you are in another world lots of times. The two worlds should not be too far apart so that you build a barrier between the youngster and his family.

I would hope that we would recognize this in the program. If I wanted to destroy democracy the first step I would take is lick the home. I would break up and disintegrate the home and then I could more easily destroy democracy.

I would hope whatever we do in the CCC or the Youth Camp, it would strengthen the home, would build toward stronger homes, because to me these are the foundations upon which democracy is built.

Now maybe I can jump some of this Mr. Chairman; it will be in the Record even if I don't read it.

Mr. PERKINS. I think you are giving the committee here wonderful testimony, especially with all your experience and background in the field of vocational-technical education.

Digressing just for a minute, how many youngsters, I am speaking of the dropouts, do you feel that you have enrolled in your vocational educational schools in New Jersey with sixth and seventh grade education, if any?

Mr. JOCHEN. Out of 34,000 almost 3,500 youth and adults, and I would have to give you a calculated guess.

Mr. PERKINS. Now I am speaking of the dropouts, sixth and seventh graders.

Mr. JOCHEN. But whether they are youth or adult.

Mr. PERKINS. No, just the youth and sixth and seventh graders, unemployed.

Mr. JOCHEN. Mr. Chairman, I would say that we don't have more than probably 60 in the whole State in such programs at the present time which are type C programs. There might be 60 to 70 such students.

Mr. PERKINS. Thank you very much.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Are you contemplating merely the kind of work the young people did during the existence of the Conservation Corps, or planning some kind of training and also going into industry to see that when they are trained they get jobs?

Mr. PERKINS. We are contemplating work very similar to that which was performed during the days of the Civilian Conservation Corps, such as conservation work along with related training and

other appropriate educational and vocational training.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I was afraid of that.

Mr. PERKINS. They will get related training. They will get vocational education, and basic education where it is needed.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Are you making it very clear that this has no relation to the International Peace Corps?

Mr. PERKINS. We are making it clear that this work has no relation to the International Peace Corps.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I hope you do make that very clear.

Mr. PERKINS. It is entirely a domestic corps, and we cut the pattern under the old Civilian Conservation Corps and under the National Youth Administration for these programs under both titles 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the Youth Conservation Corps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'BRIEN of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, like most of you I lived through the big depression during the 1930's and along with you I can testify how that period was not just an economic depression—it was also a period of depression in the hearts of men; a period of dried-up hopes and wasted abilities.

Our Government in that period wrestled mightily with the many economic and human problems of that day. The New Deal period was one of the new starts, new plans, new efforts. Some of these worked wonders, others worked not so well. Some were received eagerly by a desperate citizenship, others were received with misgivings and often made the butt of many a popular joke or ridiculing statement.

But there was one venture on the part of the planners of that period which was received with acclaim, and which I have yet to hear criticized. That was the Civilian Conservation Corps, the CCC.

The CCC enjoyed a status in the minds of people then that perhaps no other government agency could equal, not even the popular and valuable National Youth Administration.

The CCC was never associated with the leafraiders of other projects of that period. The CCC was spoken of as the "Tree Army," for on its introduction that is what we were told it would do—using Army equipment, clothes, and blankets—an army of our dispossessed youth were going to go out and plant trees.

But the CCC did much more than plant trees and instead of being a pseudo army, those men became men whose dignity had been reclaimed, whose hopes had been restored. They came home on furloughs, and I remember well the popular comments of that time upon seeing tanned, khaki-clad boys come home and showing in their very walk what had happened to them. They had earned a few bucks, they often had learned a new skill, most important they had found

that the country cared, and they wanted to tell about what they had been doing.

What did they do? What they did still stands in Texas. They changed the face of many parts of our State. They put in roads where no roads existed before, they ditched land which never before had this treatment. They went into the Big Bend country on the Rio Grande long before that area became a national park and put in trails and opened up the splendors of that mountainous country of Texas which stands 3,000 feet above Denver, Colo. They built simple, useful things that still stand and are being used in the State parks of Texas.

You asked me why I am excited by this bill and why I extoll these virtues of the old CCC. It is because you can drive around my State and still see the evidence of the good works those young men did. Now, I submit to you that whenever organization and a little help can create things that stand and are useful and are enjoyed by two generations of our people, no one can say this is a public waste.

I have every reason to believe that a renewal of the concept and program of the CCC as proposed in this H.R. 1890, and in my own bill on the same subject, H.R. 1918, will result in the same kind of good works as we had 30 years ago. I believe, also, that the American public will embrace and support this program.

It is particularly good that the concept of this proposed program has been broadened so as to provide in its title II for a program of local area employment. This is necessary, if for no other reason, in recognition of that fundamental change that has come about in our country in the last 30 years with the shift of our population from rural areas to urban centers. This bill recognizes that any "tree army" of the future can be well engaged in helping to chop out some of the underbrush that surrounds areas of deficiency in our public services.

This is more of a youth development bill than anything else, and I support it.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I think that both sides of the aisle now recognize that the time is past due for some type of remedial action to at least stem the swelling tide of youth unemployment.

I doubt that many, regardless of political philosophy, will take issue with the President when in his recent manpower report he said:

One of every seven youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 now out of school is also out of work. Both lack of work opportunity and lack of suitable preparation are involved in this situation—and are combining to spread frustration and disillusion among large numbers of young people.

The area of disagreement, I believe, is how to meet and solve this growing problem.

Some of our Republican friends say that the solution lies in an expansion of the Manpower Development and Training Act passed last year, and in an expanded program of vocational training. By and large those who propose this approach can see little or no merit in the Youth Employment Act, because they contend, nothing in this proposed legis-

lation will train our youths to qualify them for jobs in this age of rapid technical advance and automation.

And, in a limited sense—a very limited sense—this is true.

But, it is also true that not all of our youth—and not all of us here in this Chamber—have the necessary aptitude for this type of training, even assuming we have the educational background for it.

Job training, like education in general, is hard to evaluate. It depends on many things—intangibles—such as ability, aptitude and initiative, to mention but a few.

In the final analysis, only economic expansion will sharply increase job openings and provide adequate employment opportunities, including opportunities for many of our youths who are now rejected from the work force because of a lack of adequate job skills. The President, of course, has recognized this, and this is why the Congress now has before it proposals from the administration for tax cuts and tax reforms and for better educational opportunities.

An equally important part of the administration's package is the Youth Employment Act—because it will do something now for some of the 7.5 million youngsters who, statistics tell us, will drop out of school in this decade without having graduated from high school.

Experience under the Manpower Development and Retraining Act and under some State and local training programs seems to indicate that many of our unemployed have not had the necessary basic education to benefit either from retraining or from what we understand as vocational training.

I recently read that in some of the State programs, authorities follow the principle of avoiding the jobless who have records of being unable to hold any jobs. To the extent that this may be true, what chance does such a program offer a youth who cannot get a job because of his lack of skill?

The two-part program—the Youth Conservation Corps and the community youth employment program—contained in the Youth Employment Act of 1963 offer a present hope for at least a limited number of our unemployed youth.

In a very real sense, this legislation, if enacted, will provide work opportunities in areas that can be training grounds for future employment.

We know this is true in the Youth Conservation Corps program because of our highly successful experience with the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's. And, on the basis of expert testimony we have every reason to believe it will be true in the community youth employment program.

Also, on the basis of what the experts tell us and what we know from experience, this legislation will give those youngsters fortunate enough to participate in these programs some practical work habits coupled with actual job experience and not infrequently a realization of the importance of further education, either at the vocational level or

possibly in completing high school and even going on to further studies in college.

As I view it, the Youth Employment Act is necessary to serve a group who now through no fault of their own cannot take advantage of other aids, such as vocational training and the various retraining programs. It is part of a package which is as important as any other and without it, all of us—especially those who could benefit from it—will be the losers.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to note that the youth employment bill has become a matter of renewed interest in this session of Congress, and am particularly pleased that this interest should be heightened by the 30th anniversary of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Between 1933 and 1942 this conservation program employed over 2½ million young people. The present Youth Conservation Corps section of the bill offers some of the same advantages.

This legislation can make a good start on the solutions to two major American dilemmas—conservation of our great resources and youth unemployment. On the one hand, we have nearly one-third of this great Nation which is still owned by the Federal Government—and on the other hand we will have 2 million unemployed young people between the ages of 16 and 21 by summertime. This bill brings the conservation needs of the one factor into some sort of balance with the labor availability of the other.

Much was said at the House and Senate hearings on this bill about city slums, juvenile delinquents and the needs of city and urban area youth. Rural youth faces some of the same problems. There are now over 250,000 rural school dropouts, and this number is decreasing. There are also young people from rural depressed areas who need extra training if they are to become taxpayers instead of tax users. In many sectors of farming, new methods and machinery have forced young people off the farms where they learned unskilled jobs in the first place. In short, some of the problems facing our rural youngsters can be met by this bill.

I note that in addition to the general work to be undertaken by the Youth Conservation Corps, there will be educational classes and programs under the auspices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Trades and skills such as plumbing, painting, welding, radio, surveying, machine operating, masonry, and game management are some of the likely profits of this bill, if the success of the CCC can be used as a yardstick.

While it is probably true that only a limited number of enrollees will gain specific skills from the Youth Conservation Corps, it is also true that others will find doing useful work improves their disposition toward getting further training and becoming useful citizens in the labor market. Title II of this legislation will permit States to participate in the conservation of State, county, and local lands, which come to over 110 million acres across the country. It will also

permit States to lighten the load of local youth unemployment.

There seems to be little doubt in anyone's mind as to the moral and social benefits of this proposed program. But let us look at the other side of the coin—money. Will this program pay for itself in dollars and cents? I believe that it will, partly in immediate benefits and partly in accrued benefits over the next 30 years.

The Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture estimates that this Nation loses over \$1 billion per year from forest fires—this figure includes watershed damage as well as timber loss. The Forest Service also estimates that the Youth Conservation Corps could reduce these losses by 10 percent—or a saving of just over \$100 million per year. The total saving in the life of the Corps, as now envisioned, would be one-half a million dollars, or more, that is enough to defray a goodly portion of the cost. The rest of the cost might well be defrayed in 30 years by the new timber that is planted while the Corps is in action. Even now, timber that the CCC planted is being harvested. I have confined my example to a narrow field, but as you are aware, there are other immediate and accrued benefits from such a program that can be determined in dollars and cents.

Title II offers an opportunity for local communities to form a hard core of young people working for community improvement. In rural areas there is just as strong a need for this kind of work as there is in city slums. Many potential spots for timber farms are now simply lying fallow while they could be put to a great conservation use.

In conclusion, gentlemen, let me say I am convinced that this legislation is much needed. We are working for its speedy passage—so that some of the brunt of this coming summer's unemployment among youth can be borne more easily.

Mr. Speaker, in short, how we live and what we have in the year 2000 is being shaped today—we must therefore make every possible effort to conserve our two greatest assets—human and natural resources.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have joined Congressman CARL PERKINS and several others of my very distinguished colleagues to request today's 2-hour special order on the Youth Employment Act of 1963 to bring before the whole Nation the deplorable and unwholesome unemployment situation which is driving large numbers of our young people to discontent, dismay, and all too frequently to criminal destruction.

As Attorney General Kennedy recently pointed out:

Acts of crime and delinquency are common among youth frustrated in their search for success in customary channels.

The current figures on high school dropouts and youth unemployment have a direct bearing on the appalling rise in the juvenile delinquency rate. Drop-out figures just for the year 1961 are staggering. In the fall term of that year there were 10.8 million students enrolled in grades 9 through 12 of our public and nonpublic schools. Of these

10.8 million students, a fantastic 2.5 million dropped out during the year. Our annual dropout rate per 1,000 students, according to the 1961 figures, reached an incredible apex of 40 percent. Perhaps even more illustrative, and probably even less known, is the fact that annually 900,000 of our high school seniors drop out of school before graduation.

In direct relation to these distressing statistics on school dropouts, the figures on overall youth unemployment have been spiraling. Right now the level of youth unemployment in the Nation is more than twice the national average. And in my own State of Minnesota, where the total rate of unemployment is 8.2 percent, the rate of youth unemployment is a disordinate 20 percent.

Previously, in societies where youthful disturbances erupted, there were sufficient diversive channels open to the youngsters so that their discontent and misdirected energies were soon constructively used by the society. The system of apprenticeship took young men off the streets and taught them a trade toward which they soon began to develop the pride handed down from generation to generation. The guilds provided an appropriate inlet for youthful vitality and talent and an excellent outlet for the products of these two.

Yet in 20th century America there is no such specific and obvious method of deploying the potentialities of a large segment of our young people. This poses a distinct paradox in a country which has long been noted as a land of opportunity for all. Time was when any man who had the proper ambition and a sufficient amount of aspiration could achieve great things. Many of our humblest citizens have given us our proudest heritage; many of our most underprivileged have risen to contribute to the whole Nation. The opportunities were abundant.

But the America of today is far more complex and much more industrialized than the little Nation which boldly declared its competence for freedom to an imperial master, and then rose to take that freedom. Today's America still offers vast opportunities, but she offers them to men who have long had the freedom to expand their knowledge and to improve their knowledge and to improve their methods of producing. In other words, she offers opportunities today to those whose experience and skills have kept pace with her national growth and achievements. As Attorney General Robert Kennedy remarked in his testimony before the House General Subcommittee on Education:

The opportunities to work are just as great and challenging today as ever before. But to get the same chance today, requires greater knowledge and greater skill.

Unfortunately, not all of our people have kept pace. All too often our young men and women, minimally educated and inexperienced, have found the doors to opportunity shut in their faces. They have felt unneeded and unwanted by their communities and by their country. They need training, motivation, and above all, they need hope. We must

show them that this Nation has need of them and has a place for them.

Once before when our society experienced great social unrest and lack of direction, especially among the young, America had the imagination and the ingenuity to meet the challenge immediately and directly. I refer, of course, to the establishment of the CCC during the darkest days this country has ever undergone—the depression days of the thirties. Despite the enormity of the challenge they provided, our young people found themselves cared for and provided for by a concerned Nation. During its years of operation—from 1933 until 1942—the CCC not only provided food, shelter, and clothing for the discouraged young men who were idly roaming the country and contributing to its problems, it more importantly provided them with an incentive to learn marketable skills, to seek further education, and ultimately to become constructive members of society.

As an educational adviser to the CCC, I personally saw the excellent effects the corps had on its enrollees as well as the profound contribution made to our national conservation program. One of my good friends, Frank E. Smith, Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has sent me a most informative letter, which I ask permission to insert at the end of my statement, outlining the benefits accruing to the people of Tennessee and the Nation from CCC work in just that one area. These statistics could be multiplied over and over and the examples of national benefits which could be drawn from the length and breadth of this country.

The work of the CCC gave us a heritage which has increased in value over the years. CCC's planted 3 million acres of trees, cleared 4 million acres of wooded land, and saved millions of acres of grassland from erosion. They made our national parks and forests places of refuge and refreshment for millions of our citizens to enjoy.

But since 1942 we have been letting this priceless investment decay. We have reaped the pleasure provided by the CCC, and we should preserve and increase that inheritance for our own children. Today the \$13.2 billion reserve of conservation projects which has been accumulating represents a dual opportunity for us: First, to allay the youth unemployment problem with which we are faced by putting some of our energetic youngsters to work on these conservation programs; and, second, to offer to our Nation's children a heritage of health and beauty through a completed conservation schedule.

Public works in conservation have many economic impacts. They are concentrated in rural areas where other kinds of employment are lacking and where underemployment is high. They can be started rapidly and stopped if labor shortages develop. Most of the purchasing power is released in small communities where it has a large proportional impact. Because of the increased resource productivity, assets of value for permanent community im-

provement and more future employment are created.

And, of course, we cannot forget the young men and women not geographically situated so as to take advantage of the experience and stimulus provided through conservation programs. We must provide them with opportunities to further their education and their vocational training so that they will possess sufficient experience and skills to meet the challenges provided by today's labor market. Urban technology, by abolishing the only jobs they might be able to fulfill without previous training and experience—has deprived our mid-century American young people of an essential ingredient for developing maturity—the opportunity of learning and performing constructive and meaningful work. The challenge we must meet in the 1960's is that of using our national inventiveness, which we have long applied to making life easier, to make life more hopeful for those who have been adversely affected by the changes in industry and society.

I firmly believe that the Youth Employment Act of 1963 is one excellent mode of meeting this challenge. I ask that all of us in the Congress rally in full support of the sons and daughters of this Nation. Now that the need is apparent and the initial step of the remedy so clearly defined, I am hopeful that the Congress will speedily offer our young people the deserved promise of a productive and significant future by swiftly approving the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,

Knoxville, Tenn., March 1, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: At your suggestion, I have prepared an evaluation of the Civilian Conservation Corps program in the TVA area. During the nine years of operation of the CCC program, a number of camps were assigned to the TVA, at one time as high as 25, and a variety of work was carried on. I think one of the most significant results of this program is the fact that the average gross return to landowners from timber sales is going to be at least one million dollars per year. Not many years will be needed to repay the entire cost of the CCC program in the area.

One of the principal items of work was a large-scale reforestation program specifically aimed at eroding land generally considered worthless at the time. The TVA-CCC tree planting resulted in the following:

Private land reforested.....	70,000
TVA land reforested.....	40,000

Total acres reforested..... 110,000

Of this 110,000 acres, 73,000 acres are still in young stands of growing timber today. The difference in acreage is caused by a number of reasons, including land-use conversion, fire, insect and disease, and the planting of improper species for the site in use.

There are many lasting benefits to the region from the plantations established by the CCC, however. Some of the more important ones are:

INCOME FOR LANDOWNERS—\$1 MILLION EACH YEAR

CCC plantings are just now reaching the age (25 years) where landowners are receiving significant dollar returns. Based on

averages developed from intensively studied individual cases, they are now producing wood from thinnings, worth about \$5 per acre per year to the landowner. Projected over a 50-year rotation, average gross return per acre per year is computed to be \$15. Therefore, 73,000 acres of CCC plantations are returning, or will return, to landowners \$1 million per year.

BASE FOR INDUSTRY—NEW PAPERMILLS

Two paper companies have built plants on the Tennessee River in the past 10 years at a capital investment of \$144 million. An important consideration in the location of these mills was the extensive area of established pine plantations. Each year CCC plantations can be expected to yield 73,000 cords of wood for the paper industry, resulting in manufactured products worth about \$7,300,000. (During a recent 5-year period, one mill paid \$200,000 for some 60,000 cords of wood thinned from 6,400 acres of TVA land planted by CCC crews.)

JOBS FOR PEOPLE—730 NEW FULL-TIME JOBS

Foresters estimate that each 1,000 acres of planted pines create the base for 10 new full-time woods and industry jobs. Trees planted by the CCC are therefore providing year-around employment for 730 men. This means over \$3 million to the region's industrial payroll.

SOIL EROSION CONTROL

A 1961 survey showed almost 95 percent of the CCC plantations effectively controlled erosion.

REFORESTATION IDEA PROMOTED

In 1934 tree planting was a novel idea in the Tennessee Valley. Landowners were skeptical. Persuading them to reclaim eroded lands was often difficult, even though it cost them nothing. Early CCC plantings, and the obviously good results, were effective advertising. The idea spread and the reforestation rate accelerated. Landowners gradually assumed responsibility for doing the job. To date they have reforested 633,000 additional acres in valley counties.

EFFECTIVE FIRE PREVENTION

Woods burning was a common practice in the valley in the 1930's. An estimated 10 percent of the total forest land burned each year. The problem was an uninformed and unsympathetic citizenry. Growing, green plantations became a powerful influence in changing attitudes toward fire control. One very effective aid was tree planting. Landowners who owned tree plantations developed a desire to protect them, and this interest gradually spread from plantations to natural stands of trees. Today the annual burn is less than one-half of 1 percent.

Cordially,

FRANK E. SMITH,
Director.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, the 31st of March, marked the 30th anniversary of an event which by its inception has had far-reaching implications for our Nation. The event of which I speak was the signing of legislation by my father, then President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, creating the Civilian Conservation Corps. Today it gives me a great deal of pleasure not only to participate in saluting the creation and accomplishments of the CCC, but also to discuss our present need for similar legislation such as that presently pending—the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

Most of us can easily recall those dark and dreary days of the early 1930's. Our country was involved in an agonizing struggle to preserve itself from collapse; unemployment, with its resulting by-products, was rampant, and no one dared

to venture a guess as to how much longer chaotic conditions would be tolerated by the people without a catastrophic eruption on their part.

It was these unprecedented problems which moved President Roosevelt to remark, in his first inaugural address on March 4, 1933:

The only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes efforts to convert retreat into advance.

The state of affairs at that time demanded dynamic leadership and imaginative programs. As a result, the Civilian Conservation Corps was born amid a great deal of skepticism. But as was expected, the skeptics were proved wrong.

From its creation on March 31, 1933, to the day of its termination on June 30, 1942, the CCC had enrolled about 3 million young men. It had achieved its objective of training unemployed young men for private jobs while restoring the country's depleted natural resources through the advancement of an orderly program of useful public works. Over 1,500 camps were established to carry out the projects planned by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, projects such as structural improvements, transportation improvement, erosion control, flood control, irrigation, drainage, forest culture, forest protection, landscaping, and numerous others. As a result of that labor, we are today privileged to enjoy the benefits and pleasures of our national parks, forests, and recreational facilities. I should also like to mention incidentally that it was my great privilege during 1937 and 1938, while serving as secretary to the President, to count among my duties the task of coordinating among the various departments the work of the CCC, which was at that time under the able leadership of Mr. Robert Fechner, Director.

While today we rightfully applaud the contribution of the CCC, we would be derelict in our responsibilities to our children and the generations unborn should we not take some action to meet our current critical conservation and youth unemployment problems. On the one hand our conservation needs range from improving streams, stocking fish, check dams, planting of trees, food and cover planting to improvement of truck trails, access roads, service buildings, and recreational facilities. It has been estimated that it would cost over \$11 billion to make these improvements. On the other hand, unemployment among our youth runs 2½ times the national average, and approximately 7½ million will be leaving school during the 1960's without graduating. Furthermore, in 1962 there was an average of about 700,000 youths between the ages of 16 and 21 who were out of school and out of work.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of our youth is incredible, in view of the fact that we pride ourselves on being an affluent society. It took great vision and courage to meet the conditions of the 1930's. Are we not equal to the occasion now? The enactment of the Youth Employment Act will prove that we are.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, one cannot discuss the problems of our youth without paying tribute to the outstanding efforts of my good friend and colleague the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK. His recognition of the specific problems facing the young people of our land and his determination to seek their solution in a sound and rewarding manner has been a constant source of inspiration to all of us who are charged with this responsibility.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on General Education on which I have the honor to sit with him, on the great leadership that he has given in the preparation of this much needed legislation, the youth employment bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD the text of the following statements by the following Members: The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SENNER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STAEBLER], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, We are gathered here today to ask ourselves what we can do for the youth of our country. We are convoked here this afternoon to determine whether we can answer the challenge of the young man out of high school and looking vainly for work; the plaint of the teenage girl who wants to contribute to society but who finds the doors shut coldly in her face; the reproach of the frustrated teenage lad whose only avenue of expression is rebellion that ends in crime; the indictment of a generation whose creativity, productivity, and aspirations are barricaded by the walls of inertia, indifference, and automation. We are convened today to measure our inventiveness, our wisdom, and our courage against the crisis of youth in the sixties.

In their cold, relentless way, the oft-cited statistics relate the tragic tale of young boys and girls who desert the schoolroom; who become immersed in wrongdoing; who find only half a job, or, still worse, no job at all; and whose plight finds no sympathy, no champion, no hope. Can we relegate to some dark, musty corner of our collective national conscience the youthful delinquent, the laborer without work, the schoolboy without education?

Can we afford the price of our inaction? We are paying a heavy fee in welfare cases, in unemployment compensation, in correctional institutions. But the greatest burden we bear is in the inestimable loss to our present and future society in the productive talents that go untapped and in the stifled idealism of youth that goes unchanneled. If the mortgage of the past is awesome, then the price of redemption cannot be too great.

In an earlier crucible of national need, a man of great fortitude and vision set in motion a program of urgent and imaginative response to the needs of a people in despair. Now more than a generation has elapsed and we are again faced with a dilemma of national proportions. We are challenged to offer hope and to present opportunities. The youth of our country demand and I urge that the Congress speedily proffer our young people the deserved promise of a productive and significant future by swiftly approving the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, unemployment is tragic for all, but its impact is especially heavy on those advancing in age and young people trying to enter the labor force for the first time. Too few of us realize that unemployment hits our young people, between 16 and 21, in far greater proportions than any other group in our population. Imagine the plight of the untrained, unskilled youngster wanting a job—who wants to be self-supporting, who wants to make a contribution to society—but who finds the door closed to him. It is very disquieting to see the effect these repeated rejections have on a youngster taking his first venture into the working life of our complex society. Today's youngster out of school and out of a job is faced with staggering economic and emotional problems. We just need to scan a few statistics to see the situation we presently face, a situation which is growing in alarming numbers daily.

Out-of-school youths between the ages of 16 and 21 comprise 7 percent of the labor force but 18 percent of the unemployed.

During this decade some 26 million youngsters will enter the job market. It is estimated that 7½ million of these youngsters will have dropped out of school without having graduated from high school.

Providing job opportunities for these youngsters is one of the major domestic economic-social problems of this day. Without proper guidance and help these youngsters are likely to fall into a life of dependency and waste. With proper guidance and help these youngsters can become responsible, self-supporting citizens who will make a major contribution to their community and to our economy.

We have yet another resource which is suffering from years of neglect—our natural resources. Since the end of the CCC days there has been accumulating a tremendous backlog of work that must be done to save our great natural resources. There currently exists an \$8 billion backlog of conservation work.

If these untrained, unskilled, out-of-school, out-of-work youths are given the

opportunity to work on conservation projects in our national forests and parks, public lands, Indian reservations, reclamation lands, and fish and wildlife refuges, we will have made a substantial contribution to the Nation's most important resource—our youngsters. And the youngsters will have made an equally substantial contribution toward the conservation of the Nation's natural resources. After 6 months of healthy outdoor work these young boys should have a sense of accomplishment and a solid foundation to become responsible self-supporting citizens. Their first-hand work experience on conservation projects will have given them the variety of skills, the maturity, and the responsibility needed in today's society to find a respectable and suitable job. These youths will then be ready and able to compete effectively in a labor market in which their special training and experience will be appreciated.

Other youths between 16 and 21 could make a very satisfying contribution to local public service activities through work in schools, libraries, hospitals, welfare agencies, playgrounds, and other community projects. While contributing to the community work in such an environment would likely inspire the youngster on to additional education and training on a more professional level.

Legislation is most urgently needed to unite the creation of job opportunities for unemployed youngsters with the pressing need for conservation and development of our natural resources.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in his Chicago speech some 10 days ago, the President said that:

The No. 1 domestic concern of the United States is going to be in the 1960's the question of jobs, jobs for a tidal wave of men and women who are going to be hitting our labor market in the next 5 years. It is a concern which requires the united effort of all of us.

Perhaps, we can get a better idea of this "tidal wave of men and women" to whom the President refers when we realize that about 2½ million young men and women—in the 16-to-21 age bracket—will join the labor force each year during this decade.

These 26 million youngsters will represent an increase in the work force of 40 percent over the 1950's, and, as the President said:

A greater number than this country has ever had to absorb and train in our history.

Now, no one needs to dwell on the difficulty in finding jobs in today's labor market. In this age of technological advance, and with automation, computers and other electronic marvels, a college degree is no longer the guarantee to a job it once was. But what about those youngsters coming into the labor market who have been limited to a high school education, or the 7.5 million of our youth who have not finished high school, including the some 2.5 million who have not even finished grade school.

If left to their own devices, and all too frequently this seems to be the case, we know pretty well what will happen. In the last decade juvenile delinquency cases in the courts more than doubled.

Arrests of youths increased 86 percent, until they numbered 1 million arrests a year in 1960.

Now, no one contends that any single program will resolve the problems of unemployment, particularly the problems of youth unemployment. But, the Youth Employment Act of 1963, together with the President's proposals for tax reform and tax reduction, the programs of aid for distressed areas, for retraining, and the proposals of increased vocational training will go a long way toward meeting the need.

It seems to me that the group we are trying to reach in the Youth Employment Act of 1963 is a special group. For the most part, it is made up of young men and women who have achieved little or no success, either in school, their home, or in their community. Their only success is the failure they have achieved, with the result that they are fearful of attacking any responsibility, let alone a job.

They need to learn how to work, how to take orders, how to get along with their fellow man and how to carry out an assigned task. These things which we consider as elementary breed self-confidence and give these youths the encouragement many need to go back to school, to take up some type of vocational training or to profit from the several programs available for retraining.

In my opinion, the incentives offered by the Youth Employment Act for further education cannot be overstated. The National Committee on Youth Employment has estimated that in 10 years a minimum of 2 years of junior college or a technical school training will replace the high school diploma as a basic requirement for work.

This estimate would seem to be borne out by a survey of the Department of Labor, indicative that job opportunities in such areas as farming, mining, construction work, and manual labor are declining while jobs in the scientific and technical fields continue to expand. Greater opportunities can be expected for teachers, social workers, statisticians, draftsmen, mechanics of all types, servicemen and repairmen.

This listing points up one very important fact. Automation has and will no doubt continue to decrease work opportunities in exactly those fields in which unskilled youngsters once found jobs—often their first jobs.

Today's youth unemployment problem poses, as the President has said, one of the most expensive and most explosive social and economic problems now facing the country.

The Youth Employment Act may very well furnish for those fortunate enough to participate, the bridge to better citizenship and to a status of taxpayer rather than tax recipient of the tax dollar.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that on the eve of floor consideration of the youth employment bill, we note that the 30th anniversary of the signing of legislation by President Roosevelt creating the Civilian Conservation Corps.

I well remember the days of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and the CCC

boys who came to Arizona with the program from many Eastern States.

Many of them stayed in Arizona, and some are now leaders in their communities. Just offhand, I can think of school superintendents, newspaper editors, and sales executives, who first came to Arizona with the CCC's.

The work they did still stands as a monument to the program. Many forest roads were built by these boys which would have been years in developing without their work. Their work in national parks and monuments in Arizona was a great push forward for the national park system, and I am sure many of the CCC boys had their first acquaintance with the end of a shovel in fighting forest fires in northern Arizona.

Youth unemployment is now as serious a problem as it was during the 1930's. This fact was brilliantly outlined by the President during his message to this body on the Nation's youth.

The Youth Employment Act will give many thousands of currently unemployed young people a chance to find employment, and to acquire skills and work experience that will give them a solid start in their working lives.

Personally, I believe that even with this act, we, as a nation, are doing too little too late. A dollar spent for constructive pursuits is better than a dollar spent for corrective measures.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this subject which is of tremendous importance and which should be of great concern to all Members of this body.

I am strongly in favor of the administration's bill, based upon the President's recommendations, the Youth Employment Act of 1963. I am hopeful that the Congress will proceed with speed and diligence to take favorable action on the measure, so that its programs can be put into effect as soon as possible. I introduced House bill 2396, to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, and urged the House Committee on Education and Labor to approve the administration's bill, which also provides for a Youth Conservation Corps.

It is a tragic fact that there is a "lost" generation growing up in our great country with no skills and little hope; it is estimated that today there are about 700,000 young people looking for jobs, and jobs are unavailable to them. New York alone has at least 32,700 boys aged 16 to 23 years who are so discouraged at the "lack of opportunity" that they have given up looking for work. This year, 3,800,000 young people will be coming into the labor market. It is expected that 26 million new young workers will enter the labor market in the 1960's, an increase of 40 percent over the 1950's, a far greater number than this country has ever had to absorb and train in our history. We are told that already workers under the age of 25, although they comprise less than one-fifth of our labor force, constitute more than one-third of our unemployed.

The President recently stated that youth unemployment poses one of the most expensive and explosive social and

economic problems now facing our country. We know that the jobless rate is always highest among the unskilled. A high percentage are school dropouts, who need the opportunity to work if they are to be saved from a life of delinquency and crime. These out of school and out of work young people wish to become useful and necessary members of society. We must spare no efforts to assist our young people over the period of adjustment when they have stopped being students but have not yet found their place as workers. Mobilization for Youth on New York's Lower East Side, which operates under grants from the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, has proved conclusively that youths want to work; they much prefer employment to idleness and the evils created by idleness; they need to feel useful and wanted.

The problem is nationwide and so extensive that a Federal program, Federal leadership, and Federal funds must be provided. State and local agencies cannot provide all the help required. Communities cannot meet the problems alone; the fullest Federal assistance possible must be given if we are to meet the problems in a constructive manner and if we are to develop and conserve the human resources represented by the army of young people now denied employment and usefulness.

The Youth Conservation Corps has aroused great interest among school and youth officials as well as the youth of our Nation; it would put young men to work in our national and State forests, tackling the huge backlog of needed conservation work. They would also receive weekly training and basic educational skills would be taught. The local area youth employment program would provide a method for increasing employability of young men and at the same time would give them useful work to do.

Many thousands of young people exist under terrible conditions in the slums of our cities; many belong to minority groups and suffer from discrimination and total lack of job opportunities; they live without hope and their futures are bleak. Certainly, these countless young people must be given a helping hand and hope for a brighter future, the gratification brought by employment, and the opportunity to take their places as working, respected, members of their communities. When we take a boy out of an atmosphere of defeat and slum existence and furnish him with the guidance of people who care about him, we provide him with hope and incentive.

To what avail is it to create for ourselves a strong Nation from a military standpoint when we permit our very foundations to crumble—for the future strength of our Nation is truly dependent upon our youth; our young people are our future. It must be our aim now to help and save our young people from idleness and feelings of rejection and futility, to direct them along the path of industrious living and good citizenship, to give them pride in their heritage as citizens of our great Nation.

Our duty is clear; this Congress must take favorable action on the Youth Employment Act without delay.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that the Members of this Congress will recognize the critical need for the Youth Employment Act of 1963 just as the 73d Congress gave approval 30 years ago to the Civilian Conservation Corps which accomplished so much for the good of the Nation. During the years of its existence from 1933 to 1942, the Civilian Conservation Corps helped meet two of our greatest national needs: the protection and preservation of our youth and our natural resources. Today, we are again confronted with a tragic waste of our young people, our lands, and forests, and we must take positive action to salvage these precious resources.

There are many complex social problems facing young people today. The world is changing at a pace never before experienced. The years preceding adulthood are, it seems to me, even more crucial and bewildering today than they were for you or me.

The period of youth is after all a brief turn of the carousel when you reach for the golden ring—only the stakes are infinitely higher. Instead of trying for a free ride you are reaching for your life. So much concerning your social, economic, and intellectual development and attainments in the years to come depends upon the opportunities and experiences you encounter at this time.

A little good fortune during the formative years will often be felt for a lifetime. The same is true of a little misfortune. The main purpose of the Youth Employment Act, I believe, is to supply a little more good fortune and at least a little less misfortune in the lives of those among our Nation's youth who are in need of help along these lines.

All of us are familiar with the appalling and alarming statistics on juvenile delinquency, unemployment rates among youth, and school dropouts. These are serious problems now, and their dimensions are bound to increase in the immediate future with the population tidal wave that is about to sweep across the 16- to 22-year-old age group. We can expect to have three-fourths of a million more 16 year olds in the country this year than we had in 1962, or an increase of over 25 percent, and the increase in this age group will be maintained for the decades ahead owing to the stepped-up birth rate we have had since World War II.

For these reasons, effective measures must be taken now at all levels of responsible authority to eliminate as far as possible the situations which are the occasions for the development of problems involving juvenile delinquency, dropouts, and the rest in our increasingly complex machine age. The youth employment program would give our young people training and job experience and hope for the future.

I would like to emphasize that I envision the programs provided by the bills—both the Youth Conservation Corps provided in title I and the local area youth employment programs in title II—not as methods of handling juvenile delinquency problems, but as furnishing means to prevent them. The experience of the CCC in the 1930's bears out the

result that can be achieved in this regard. It seems almost inevitable to me that an idle youngster from the city streets will benefit physically, morally, and spiritually from the experiences and training he will receive as a member of the Youth Conservation Corps proposed by this legislation. For some it will provide not only worthwhile health activity, but direct them in establishing principles of self-discipline and self-reliance—opportunities which might not otherwise visit them.

The local area youth employment programs established under title II of the bills have a little different purpose. In these programs emphasis will be placed on making it possible for youth—both boys and girls—who might otherwise drop out to continue in school.

The local community employment programs will, like the YCC, result in benefits both to society and to the youngsters who are employed. They will be working in hospitals, libraries, and public and private welfare and recreation agencies, doing jobs that in most cases would not otherwise be done. There are ample safeguards that only worthwhile types of employment will be undertaken, that regular workers will not be displaced, and that just compensation will be paid to the young people employed.

The Civilian Conservation Corps proved a sound investment; so will the YCC. It has been said before, but it bears repeating: our youth truly are the first resource of the Nation. We cannot afford not to make a sound investment in their future. As the President stated in his message on the Nation's youth:

This Nation—facing increasingly complex economic, social, and international challenges—is increasingly dependent on the opportunities, capabilities, and vitality of those who are soon to bear its chief responsibilities.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, during the 1960's about 7.5 million American boys and girls will drop out of school before graduation from high school. Almost one-third of these are not expected to graduate from grade school.

This situation constitutes a major problem in American society. Corrective measures must be taken to meet it.

One major step toward alleviation of this situation is contemplated in the Youth Conservation Corps program. It will give several thousand young men hope for the future, and a sense of accomplishment in learning how to work and live together in the out of doors—getting the feel of the sky and the trees and the water—learning self-respect and learning to respect others.

One great difficulty faced by social workers throughout the country is attempting to rehabilitate young people in tenderloin neighborhoods. These young people in great proportion have dropped out of school, have never held a job, never learned how to work, even if they had a job. Because of the conditions of their upbringing, they are resentful, hopeless and antisocial.

This era of rapid technological change has brought with it increasing demands for skill, education, and technical know-how from the youth who are now and

will be entering the labor market in ever increasing numbers.

Under the existing condition of 6 million unemployed in the United States, the proportion of young people out of work is far higher to the total number of unemployed than among older groups. This would be true, even if we had full employment. There will be thousands of youngsters facing the future, undereducated, undertrained, and lacking proper motivation to improve their lot because of the conditions of their lives spent in a jungle world.

What could be a more hopeful beginning step to meet at least part of this total problem than to give thousands of our young men the upbuilding experience of helping to learn how to work, to learn that the work he is doing will motivate him to seek further training and education, after having spent his tour of duty in helping to upbuild the natural resources of his own country?

What better way of showing these youngsters that their country cares for them as part of the precious human resources of the oncoming generation, as well as for the land and water heritage which he has helped protect for his own and his children's use and enjoyment?

There is a need today for the Congress to realize that it has a major responsibility for America's youth and for America's resources. Passage of this legislation, in my opinion, will constitute a long forward step in the proper demonstration that Congress has the vision and foresight to move now.

It is my strong conviction, that the Youth Conservation Corps will make for itself a record of achievement that will emulate that of its predecessor—the Civilian Conservation Corps.

It is also my strong conviction that the success of this modern CCC program will be such as to make it imperative to enlarge it from its pilot status and spread its benefits over many thousands more young men who will make their contributions now and in the future to strengthen this Nation's democratic institutions as workers and citizens.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join a large number of my colleagues in sponsoring the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

The Youth Conservation Corps and Hometown Youth Corps proposals are good news for the 23,000 Minnesota young people who are out of school and out of work. I hope my district, Minneapolis, will be among the first to qualify and take advantage of this bill when it becomes law.

Congress must enact a tax cut as first priority action for stimulating employment. A growing economy will do more than anything else to help youth find work. Second, President Kennedy's program for educational improvement will upgrade the skills of our young people. The Youth Employment Act is a third vital step this Congress can take to help.

MINNESOTA GOVERNOR'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH ENDORSES YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT

The Minnesota Governor's Advisory Council on Children and Youth has

passed a resolution endorsing the Youth Employment Act.

They report that the rate of unemployment among young people in Minneapolis is 20 percent, compared with an overall rate of 8 percent unemployed in the State. The jobless rate for youth is 2½ times higher than the average.

The advisory council has 256 members from throughout the State. The council resolution stated:

Only immediate action can prevent further deterioration in the character, moral fiber, and attitudes of these young people. Adoption by Congress of the Youth Employment Act is one important step that can be taken to aid the out of school, out of work young people.

SENATOR HUMPHREY, REPRESENTATIVE BLATNIK HAVE PUSHED FOR THIS LEGISLATION FOR YEARS

I am proud that two fellow Minnesotans have spearheaded the drive for this legislation for many years. JOHN BLATNIK introduced a version of this bill as H.R. 1 on the opening day of this session, January 9, 1963. In the Senate, HUBERT HUMPHREY introduced this bill as S. 1 last January.

WHAT TYPE OF JOBS?

Senator HUMPHREY's statement at the committee hearing in February answers a very important question—what type of jobs will be available to the enrollees in these programs? Let me quote the Senator:

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, jackhammer 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.

Those who sign up for jobs with the local public service agencies would find work available as secretaries, hospital and laboratory technicians, kitchen assistants, playground workers, gardeners, truckdrivers, office helpers, athletic instructors, maintenance employees, according to Senator HUMPHREY.

In both cases the bill provides that a program of training and education would supplement the work program.

SELF-CONFIDENCE AND SELF-RESPECT FOR YOUTH

Jobs in the Youth Conservation Corps or in the Hometown Corps for these young people will give them self-confidence and self-respect. They will learn responsibility and punctuality. They will learn how to work with others and how to take orders. This work experience will improve their chances of holding steady jobs on their own.

Up to 60,000 youths could enroll in the Youth Conservation Corps and many thousands in the Hometown Youth Corps. The YCC would be employed wholly on Federal projects in national parks, reservations, and forests. The local employment programs would be initiated by the State or local community.

Mr. Speaker, we need this bill, and I hope that the House will soon have the opportunity to act on it.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago on March 31, 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt signed the legislation creating the Civilian Conservation Corps. Today, 30 years later, much of the work that was done and the trees that were planted are part of the resources of this Nation; today, many of the boys who were taken from the streets and farms to do this work are constructive and important members of our society. The saying, "The evil men do lives after them; the good is often buried with their bones," does not apply to the Civilian Conservation Corps. Its benefits in both human and natural resources have repaid its cost manifold in the years since 1933.

Shortly we will be asked to consider a modern counterpart to the Civilian Conservation Corps. There are many who will say that the need for such a bill today is not what it was in the 1930's; that conditions have changed; that what was permissible in the depths of a national depression is not advisable in times of relative prosperity.

The fallacy of these arguments lies in the inevitable inability of some of the opponents of the new program to understand the pressing needs of the future as they are reflected in the society of today.

It is true that we do not have the mass unemployment of the 1930's, and certainly we hope we never do again. But we do have unemployment of a far more insidious type; it is the unemployment of youth. This unemployment is insidious not only because young people are involved; it is dangerous and destructive because so many of these idle youth will never be really employable.

These youth will not be able, in many cases, to find work even of the most menial type. The reservoir of unskilled jobs in this country is rapidly running dry. It requires a far higher level of training today to get and hold a decent job than it did at the time the Civilian Conservation Corps was operating.

Those who object to the new program generally agree with this; they say the new legislation is useless because it does not provide enough training in specific skills.

There is reason for concern over this argument. But the gentlemen who raise it miss a vital point: you cannot train a person who has no desire to be trained. It is the unfortunate fact that in many of our large cities, and many of our rural areas as well, there is a growing group of young Americans who have, in effect, given up. They have never had the surroundings or the family background to give them the desire to stay in school, to undertake the necessary training that will make them constructive citizens. These are the young unemployed, unemployables. There are perhaps a million or so of them.

It was the restless surge of unemployed and relatively hopeless youth that formed the backbone of Hitler's storm troopers; it is this same aimless and often rootless group in our country which accounts for much of the crime and delinquency.

This new revival of the CCC is aimed at this group of our youth. It would provide not so much employment as the de-

sire for employment; not so much training as the motivation for training. If a reasonable number of these young people, in a new, healthy, and more stimulating environment, develop a desire to improve themselves and become constructive citizens this legislation will have served its purpose. Once the desire for improvement is there, other legislation, including present proposals for vocation education, will be needed to supply the refined skills so much in demand in today's labor market.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, we need this bill very badly. The chief trouble right now is that it barely scratches the surface. If only 15,000 young men are provided for under the Youth Conservation Corps title of the act, this will mean only 4 per county in the State of West Virginia. In some respects, this takes on the aspect of scholarships.

However, it may be that getting the camps ready and starting the program on a sound basis necessitates such a modest start. In any event, I am completely sold that this program—no matter how small—must get started, and I am confident it will, in the future, prove to be one of the big factors in making a dent in our youth unemployment problem.

The problem of youth unemployment is just as serious in the rural areas as it is in the urban areas of the Nation. During the period between 1950 and 1960 when the State of West Virginia lost 7.2 percent of its population, a total of 145,131 persons, many West Virginians became alarmed to realize that of these 145,131 persons, 28,572 were our young people between the ages of 18 and 21. In 1960, we had in West Virginia 22.8 percent fewer young persons in the 18 to 21 age bracket than we had in 1950.

I believe the principle of the Youth Employment Act is the most thrilling development since the establishment of the Peace Corps. It may not be as important as education legislation. But youth employment certainly comes a close second to education.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk in these halls about fiscal responsibility. It occurs to me that the most irresponsible thing we could do fiscally would be to sit on our hands and fail to take measures to save what could be a lost generation. The fiscally responsible thing to do is to invest a small amount in a program which will pay rich dividends in a stronger America, as our young people develop a sense of responsibility, new skills, and help not only improve our natural resources, but also learn the great lessons of service to their home communities.

I have cited one figure often, but I believe it illustrates the plight of our young people in West Virginia. I might say that I first got an inkling of this while listening to the then Republican Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable Cecil H. Underwood, in a provocative address to the Huntington Elks. Right after the Korean conflict, West Virginia paid a bonus to its Korean war veterans, and when it came time to mail out the checks, it was discovered that 44.3 percent of the bonus checks went to out-of-State addresses—thus indi-

cating that the cream of our young work force was leaving West Virginia because they found superior economic opportunities elsewhere.

Today, West Virginia has developed into a laboratory to determine whether the American economic system can flourish. Although nationwide in the past 2 years, the high school dropout rate declined, in West Virginia the dropout rate in the high schools rose. Not only that, but the national dropout percentage for 1962 was 30.2 percent and for West Virginia it was 40.1 percent.

Recently, the Secretary of Labor reported a very ominous figure: in West Virginia, unemployment of male youths between 16 and 21 in April 1960 was 19.4 percent. The national average in this age bracket is only 10.8 percent. Unemployment in this age group in the Nation is $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the national average, but in West Virginia it is $4\frac{1}{2}$ times the national average.

The Youth Employment Act would offer our young people hope for the future and would give them a chance to perform useful activities which would benefit both themselves and their State. The Federal land in West Virginia totals 950,000 acres, and State-owned land 220,000 acres. We have 19 State parks, 9 State forests, and 12 hunting areas.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that this measure receives overwhelming approval. On this 30th anniversary of the Civilian Conservation Corps I urge my colleagues to mark this celebration by uniting behind the Youth Employment Act.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, March 31, 1963, marks the 30th anniversary of signing of legislation by President Roosevelt creating the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Once again we draw from the ideas of that ever great American, the late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who 30 years ago signed the Emergency Conservation Act (48 Stat. 22) creating the Civilian Conservation Corps. President Roosevelt, signed this act in the presence of Senator Walsh, and Representative Ramspeck, who had piloted the act through Congress. President Roosevelt stated the proposal of his program as follows:

This Nation asks for action, and action now. Our greatest primary task is to put people to work. This is no unsolvable problem if we face it wisely and courageously. It can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the Government itself, treating the task as we would treat the emergency of a war, but at the same time through this employment, accomplishing greatly needed projects to stimulate and reorganize the use of our natural resources.

Again on March 1, 1962, another great American, President John F. Kennedy in a message to the Congress said:

As our population expands, as our industrial output increases, and as rising productivity makes possible increased enjoyment of leisure time, the obligation to make the most efficient and beneficial use of our natural resources becomes correspondingly greater. The standard of living we enjoy, greater than any other nation in history, is attributable in large measure to the wide variety and rich abundance of this country's physical resources. But these resources are

not inexhaustible, nor do they automatically replenish themselves.

While the Nation's imagination seems to have enlightened our youth to the idea of working without regular pay in the underdeveloped nations, through the program of a Peace Corps, it is regrettable that it has somewhat cast a shadow on another important proposal for harnessing the energies of our youth, through a Youth Conservation Corps on our homefront.

Today as then a similar crisis exists. There are over 469,000 young men from 16 to 20 unemployed, and by 1965 we shall have 40 percent more persons under 20 in our labor force. By then an additional 800,000 young people will be job hunting. In February 1963, the jobless rate for all ages was 6.1 percent, whereas for those in the 14 to 19 age bracket it was 15.6 percent—more than twice the national average.

These statistics add up to trouble—a shocking waste of young lives and a scandalous waste of the taxpayers' money in fruitless efforts to seal off non-rehabilitatable young people from the rest of society. And with the crop of war babies now coming of age, the problem becomes ever more acute. More and more young men are in the 16- to 20-year age bracket, and more and more of them who are dropping out of school cannot find employment.

Young men who have dropped out of school and cannot find jobs find it all too easy to end up in trouble. Trouble not only for themselves, but trouble for society.

The economic waste from this unemployment, although serious, is insignificant compared to the damage which may be done to the jobless individuals and to society. Are we to ignore our most important resource, a human resource, our American youth?

In the past 19 years, our population has shot upward at a tremendous rate. The demand for recreation areas has spiraled with it. The projected estimated needs for wood and wood products by our growing population for the year 2000 indicates a record high demand. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Board reported that while population is booming, recreation land is dwindling.

Recently the Department of Agriculture announced that within a few short years, approximately 50 million acres of agricultural producing land will be retired. Foresters estimate that another 275 million acres need replanting to become productive again and to provide against flood and erosion. Some 300 million acres of farmland need rebuilding. Are we to rehabilitate?

Mr. Speaker, wise investment in a resource program today will return vast dividends tomorrow, and failure to act now may be opportunities lost forever. Our country has been generous with us in this regard, and we cannot now ignore her needs for future development.

The Youth Conservation Corps provided for in title I of this bill—H.R. 5131—now being considered would make worthwhile contributions in the improvement of our land and water resources as well as our human resources

as represented by our unemployed young men. Both types of resources are very much in need of our attention. We cannot afford to fail to at least make a start this year on this program which is designed to do something worthwhile in enhancing both our natural resources and our human resources for our and their benefit.

There has been some criticism of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's by opponents of the proposed Youth Conservation Corps. I believe these critics have not been fully informed regarding the accomplishments of the CCC. In my State of Montana there were an average of 24 camps in operation throughout the 9 years of the program. The results of their work are still evident in many places, and glowing comments are frequently heard regarding the good that program did for the young men enrolled in it and the worthwhile conservation work they accomplished. More than 22,000 young men from the State of Montana and enrollees from other States obtained beneficial work experience coupled with on-the-job and other training to better prepare them to make a living and contribute to society as a whole.

We still have a big backlog of worthwhile work to do on the federally owned conservation lands of this Nation to protect them, put facilities on them, revegetate and otherwise make them more productive for the multiple uses for which they are adapted—all for the benefit of the people of this country.

In my State there are 16,635,000 acres of national forest land administered by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture and nearly 9 million acres administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

These 25,500,000 acres of Federal land would provide a very large reservoir of work suitable for YCC enrollees.

The development program for the national forests for the 10-year period 1963-72 includes an estimated workload of high priority jobs suitable for YCC enrollees amounting to 29,000 man-years. This would provide employment for 10 years for 2,900 enrollees on national forests alone.

The work would consist of such things as timber stand improvement and reforestation, construction and maintenance of recreation facilities, seeding of rangeland, construction of fences and stock water facilities, erosion control and other watershed improvement work, improvement and development of wildlife habitat, fire hazard reduction, construction and maintenance of structures for fire and general purposes, and road and trail construction and maintenance. This backlog of work is inventoried and ready to undertake in amounts dependent upon the size and locations of youth corps camps.

Some of this work would produce returns in one form or another almost immediately. Others would result in increased financial returns in 10, 20, or more years to the Government, local industry, local labor force, and local busi-

nesses in general. Local businesses would gain from the patronage of fishermen, hunters, and families seeking recreation from the improved facilities which would be constructed by enrollees. City and farm and ranch users of water should benefit from the improved watershed conditions created by erosion control, range seeding, tree planting, and other special watershed work.

The work, the camp and outdoor atmosphere, the on-the-job training, and other training and knowing that something worthwhile is being accomplished should fire the imagination and ambition of a high percentage of the young men enrolled in this program. These young unemployed men need our support. Let us give the YCC program a chance to be of help.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago almost to the day, the Civilian Conservation Corps was created to provide employment opportunities for the youthful unemployed of the thirties. In addition, its purpose was to do needed developmental work to improve our soil, water, range, and forest resources. The CCC had a life of over 9 years, extending from April 1933 to June 1942—6 months after Pearl Harbor. Every State in the Union benefited from this program. More than \$76 million was spent in my State of Washington, and I am sure our soil, water, and forest resources were improved in value by an amount equal to, if not exceeding, this figure. In addition, more than 40,000 enrollees from the State of Washington and many young men from other States occupied at some time the 43 camps in my State. They benefited tremendously from the work experience and training received during their period of enrollment.

Today we are considering, in title I of H.R. 5131, a program called the Youth Conservation Corps. The need and opportunity for improvement work on our soil, water, range, and forest resources are great. The unemployment and training needs of our young men of 16 to 21 years of age are also very great. Enactment of the bill would go far toward accomplishing both objectives.

In my State of Washington, on our national forest lands, amounting to 9,668,000 acres, there is an estimated 22,000 man-years of high priority resource development and protection project work that could be accomplished by a Youth Conservation Corps program. This would provide employment for as many as 22,000 enrollees for a period of 10 years.

The work would consist of such things as timber stand improvement and reforestation, construction, and maintenance of recreation facilities, seeding of rangeland, construction of fences and stock water facilities, erosion control and other watershed improvement work, improvement and development of wildlife habitat, fire hazard reduction, construction and maintenance of structures for fire and general purposes, and road and trail construction and maintenance. This backlog of work is inventoried and ready to undertake in amounts dependent upon the size and locations of youth corps camps.

A good share of this work would be timber stand improvement and tree planting which can be expected to return substantially more over a period of years than the cost of the work. The construction and improvement of family type recreational facilities and improvements in fish and wildlife habitat are other very important types of work on the national forest land in Washington which could be performed by YCC enrollees. The expenditures made each year in the local communities by the families using these facilities are expected to equal the cost of the initial construction. The revegetation of rangeland and such other work as fence construction and livestock water developments can be of considerable benefit to the local livestock industry. Soil erosion control and other special watershed work planned for enrollees, coupled with tree planting and range seeding, can make major contributions to our water resources. The fire hazard reduction and construction and maintenance of fire control and general purpose facilities would be of important assistance in protecting from fire and in managing the valuable timber, recreational, wildlife, range, and watershed resources of the nearly 10 million acres of forest land in the State of Washington.

What I have said about work and training opportunities on national forest land in my State and the benefits to our land, water, range, and forest resources is equally applicable to many other States and also to conservation lands administered by the Department of the Interior. The benefits to the youth of the Nation will accrue to every State in the Nation.

Our State in 1961 passed a youth conservation corps bill. The State of Washington is in a position to cooperate with the Federal Government in the employment of young men for improvement of our natural resources.

It established itself as a project which provided useful work for many of our unemployed youth. It rehabilitated boys and it has enhanced the value of our State.

I might mention that Howard Martin of Camas, Wash., now a member of the State Parks and Recreation Commission, testifies to the effectiveness of such a youth program. He was a member of the Civil Conservation Corps in the 1930's. He said in a letter to me:

I wish the old gang could go back to Minnesota with me and see what the millions of trees look like today, that we planted in the thirties. I had this pleasure 5 years ago.

On July 16, 1961, the Seattle Daily Times carried a lead editorial. Its title was "Wasted Years of Youth." The editorial pointed out that our Nation was facing a problem which was growing more critical each year. The numbers of our young people are increasing rapidly. The opportunities for gainful employment are not increasing as fast. I should like to quote some paragraphs from that editorial:

Unemployment is tragic at any age. But in the case of youth, the long-range effects—the acquiring of habits of aimlessness and shiftlessness that could persist a lifetime—could be especially detrimental.

Action on this problem should not be a matter of partisan politics or something to be put off until an election year.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, this country of ours has two great natural resources. One is our forests, parks, rangeland, wildlife areas and other public lands—222 million acres of land that provide recreation and outdoor experience for millions of people. The second is the talent and energies and potentialities of our young people, upon whom we must depend to keep strong the values and progress our history as a free people has brought us.

But these two natural resources, without which we cannot advance or even maintain the bases of our strength and economy, are being wastefully neglected at the time we need them most. While we give attention to many other projects, we shunt off into the lowest priority category the glaring needs of our physical and human resources, which are the real building material of this country.

Thirty years ago this month, with a different set of national priorities, an ambitious undertaking was set into motion to link together the problems of these two resources. When the Civilian Conservation Corps was set up in 1933, no one dreamed of the popular success and tangible achievements that would come out of its 10 years of existence. There were literally millions of young people—the "unwanted" of a feeble economy—who were out of school and out of work, with no place to go, nowhere to turn. Many of the more than 2 million of these people who went into the CCC literally went on to become leaders in our business, industrial, and political community. The lives of virtually all of them were changed. They came from varying backgrounds, but they all found certain things in common in the CCC—new degrees of self-respect, pride in accomplishment, confidence in their own ability, and a sense of being part of a growing and broadening process. Practically every boy who spent time in a CCC camp came out a better man, with more self-confidence in himself and more skills.

In addition to developing the human resources of 2 million young men, the CCC accomplished a major task in the development of our precious and irreplaceable natural resources. CCC enrollees planted nearly 3 billion trees, built 1 million miles of roads and trails, constructed over 85,000 miles of telephone lines, erected 4,000 fire towers, and 100,000 buildings and bridges. More than 4 million acres of forest land were improved as a protection against fire. The value of this work on public land alone has been estimated by forestry and park officials at more than \$1.5 billion. This is a staggering achievement; a monument to a farsighted program that will stand for years.

Today, many of the problems that prompted the establishment of the CCC are mounting again. The passage of time has seen our conservation needs spiral, as our natural resources drop in the national list of priorities. There is a backlog of needed and useful conservation projects that are programed and

mapped out of close to \$8 billion. We cannot undertake all of these projects at once, as pressing as they are, but we can surely, by turning the public spotlight upon them, demonstrate the urgency of many of them. Let us look at some of these conservation needs. We need the reforestation of 28 million acres, the establishment and refurbishing of recreational facilities on National and State parks, timber stand improvement for 140 million acres, the expansion of fire protection for 200 million acres, brush clearing and revegetation over large parts of 200 million acres of Federal grazing districts and forest lands, and the establishment of wildlife habitat and structural improvements on wildlife refuges. This is by no means an exhaustive listing of needed projects. If we neglect our natural resources and ignore basic conservation, we will pay the toll of this neglect for centuries to come.

The neglect of our natural resources, as appalling as it has been, does not approach the gross neglect of our human resources. The relentless advance of automation has brought not only benefit but hardship as well, and few groups feel the brunt of this as much as our young people. Unemployment has risen to intolerable levels throughout the country, and deserves the greatest attention we can give it. Unemployment among the youth of our country has become a major boil on the body politic. In Detroit, for example, it has been estimated that close to 30 percent of the young people between 16 and 21 are unemployed. A survey in Detroit found that 3 years after the graduation of the class of 1958 of one of our public high schools, 48 percent of the graduates had not managed to find any employment whatsoever.

George Edwards, Detroit police commissioner, who then was a justice of Michigan Supreme Court after serving 5 years as a juvenile judge, had this to say:

The young man who leaves high school with no place to go in terms of employment loses some of his own self-respect. He gains a great deal of hostility toward the society in which he lives if that society does not make useful employment available to him. These two things put together may well be sufficient to push him over the line from the ordinary useful citizen who obeys the law into the youthful hoodlum who becomes the real "I hate everybody" kid whom we dealt with over and over again in the juvenile courts.

One need not take great pains to dramatize this situation. It is a drama which should not be played out on the street corners or in the courts. Let us go back from the garish headlines and the grim statistics about youth and look further at the experience of the CCC. A 1938 study entitled "The CCC Through the Eyes of 272 Boys" states in its conclusions the opinion that:

The values which these 272 boys received from their camp experience 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. * * *

The experience of the CCC showed also that there were more than psychological benefits from the service. CCC "graduates" found a much easier time securing employment than did those young men who did not take part. Studies have shown that employers found them better and more skillful workers. CCC work was not merely manual labor; surveying, carpentry, and machine work were only a few of the skills gained by CCC enrollees.

It is neither nostalgia nor the rosy view of retrospective vision that prompts this praise for the many achievements of the CCC. There was a massive need for the program, and it met that need in an outstanding way. There is, I submit, an equal need today. The "social dynamite" of the out of school and unemployed youth is a fact that should prod us into immediate action. The unmet conservation needs of our natural resources is also a fact. The CCC coupled these needs in a dynamic and successful program. The Youth Conservation Corps should be an equally ambitious successor.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues from so many different parts of the country—East and West, urban and rural—in support of a Youth Conservation Corps. Coming from eastern Oregon, an area that is rich with natural resources that could so profitably utilize the conservation efforts of these young men, I have a particular reason to be a strong advocate of this measure. I am a sponsor of the legislation in this Congress just as I was in the 87th Congress. But I think my colleagues will find that members from urban areas advocate this legislation just as earnestly. I want to emphasize that the YCC bill encompasses a two-way program: increased opportunities for our young men combined with sound investment in our priceless resource heritage—a program that will return double dividends in the form of enriched lives and the more complete use of our human resources, in addition to the more efficient and economic management of our material resources of land, wood, and water.

Even since last year there has been a very decided and noticeable shift of sentiment in favor of this proposal. More and more people realize the tremendous need for a YCC program. I want to particularly commend our colleague from Kentucky, the Honorable CARL PERKINS, for the leadership he has shown in building the record for this legislation. Congressman PERKINS and his subcommittee have done a very effective job in shaping the details of the legislation. The bill that has been reported out of committee, H.R. 5131, is different from the original measure introduced. Many of these changes were the result of the subcommittee's holding long hours of hearings where they heard spokesmen for a variety of viewpoints.

The problem of unemployment among our young men has reached a point of urgency not experienced since the thirties. Young men from 16 to 21, the age group that would be affected by this legislation, make up 8.6 percent of the male civilian labor force while having an unemployment rate of 20.7 percent. About 700,000 of our young men are now out of school and out of work. I want to point out that these are February 1963 figures and so in no way reflect the great numbers of young men who normally look for jobs in the summer. The problem will become worse and not better. We can expect 26 million young men and women to enter the labor market in the 1960's as compared with 19 million in the 1950's. Of these 26 million, 7½ million are not expected to finish high school. They will pile up helplessly against the rising barriers to unskilled labor in our ever-advancing economy.

I consider this legislation to have the greatest economic importance. We on the Ways and Means Committee are now wrestling with the difficult question of restructuring the tax system to give our economy the stimulus that is needed to attain the proper rate of sound economic growth. These problems are technical and complex and the decisions to be made require a great deal of time. But even after the tax program is passed, the economy will need time to react to the new stimuli and the changed conditions. A Youth Conservation Corps is a program we need now.

A YCC program has not only economic but social urgency. Jobs have become increasingly difficult to obtain because of automation and the great influx into the labor market of young men born during the war years. It is not surprising that juvenile delinquency has greatly increased in the last few years when so many boys who have left school have been unable to get work. This program would help bridge that gap between high school graduation and the first job. The YCC would provide training and educational services to better prepare these young men to obtain jobs when they complete their enrollments. As one who grew up in the Pacific Northwest, I have had firsthand knowledge of outdoor living. I can assure my colleagues that it is not a romanticism to say that to live and work in our beautiful mountains and forests contributes to a person's health, both of mind and body.

Countless people in my district, who got their first start in life in the old Civilian Conservation Corps, have told me that they strongly advocate a similar program as an ideal way to help today's young men to get started on the right track. Though inspired by the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's, this bill is an altered version of the old CCC designed to meet the problems of today. I would want to emphasize that this is not a program urged because of sentimental memories of the past, but because of the urgent needs of the present. Recent pilot programs in my own State testify to the great success that such a program would have. The 1961 session of the Oregon Legislature passed legis-

lation similar to this bill that aided our counties in setting up summer programs where young men could do conservation work in our parks and forests. Numerous county officials, juvenile judges, and county commissioners, have written to tell me that this pilot program has been a great success and have urged that we institute such a program on the national level.

The need for conservation work is just as pressing, if not more so, than 30 years ago. Since the 1930's we have had a tremendous increase in the use of our national forests alone. The number of visitors has tripled in just the last 10 years. As the Civilian Conservation Corps did in the past, the Youth Conservation Corps would work on developing recreation areas, planting trees, building dams, brush removal, and the countless other needed conservation measures. In my own State of Oregon we had nearly 28,000 young men serving in the average of 51 CCC camps that were in existence during the thirties. In trips through my own congressional district I often come across examples of the lasting conservation work that these young men accomplished.

The Interior and Agriculture Departments who are responsible for the management of our natural resources have outlined the great backlog of much-needed conservation work in which young men could very effectively participate. As just one example, the Department of Agriculture has informed me that 43,000 man-years of work are needed in just the national forests in my own State. I would add that much work is also needed in State parks and forests and the other types of Federal projects such as national parks, reservoirs and Indian reservations. My colleagues know that I have consistently fought to expand the Federal Government's role in resource conservation. In the past I have urged increased appropriations out of the Treasury for conservation activities because I felt they would help guarantee our Nation's future security and prosperity while returning dividends in the form of increased Government revenues. The effective conservation and management of our natural resources is an area that we have too long neglected. In a YCC program we have an opportunity to start meeting the present backlog of conservation work which is estimated to cost \$12.2 billion dollars. Very frankly a YCC program would help to accomplish vitally needed conservation work at much lower costs.

In summary this is a desirable program just on a cost-accounting basis. But a Youth Conservation Corps would return double dividends by conserving both our material and human resources. I consider this to be a sound and imaginative program—one in the best tradition of our Nation's approach to vital problems.

In view of these vital needs, I want to urge my colleagues that they work for speedy enactment of as strong a YCC program as possible. We have a great opportunity here to help in the conservation of our national resources, but there is no doubt that a Youth Conserva-

tion Corps would help in conserving an even more important national resource—our youth.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself to a grave national problem, the gathering storm represented by millions of young people between the ages of 16 and 21 who are neglected in our "affluent society." Unemployment among this group is practically three times the national average, which is itself a burden upon our society. In December 1962 there were 1,200,000 boys and girls from 16 to 24 years of age who were looking for work. For most of these, it has proved a fruitless search. An economy with as large a residue of unemployed adults as ours cannot easily find places for those young people with few skills and little training.

Unemployment at any age for any person is demoralizing, frightening and embittering. For youth who experience prolonged joblessness or a series of dead-end jobs broken by long periods of unemployment, it can only create attitudes, work habits, and loss of motivation which can deeply affect a young person throughout his whole adult life. Dr. James Conant has graphically pointed out this problem by saying:

I am deeply disturbed by the implications that widespread unemployment among the youth of our big cities has for the future of our society.

Although the causes of juvenile delinquency are complex, and there is no one solution, employment opportunities are clearly important. A youth who has dropped out of school and never has had a full-time job is not likely to become a constructive citizen of his community. Quite the contrary.

As a frustrated individual, he is quite likely to be antisocial and rebellious and may well become a juvenile delinquent. The adverse influence of the street is largely a consequence of gangs of such youths, out of school and unemployed.

I submit that the existence in the slums of our large cities of thousands of youths age 16 to 21 who are both out of school and out of work is an explosive situation. It is social dynamite.

I believe that a constructive and imaginative solution must be started now, if we are not to reap a bitter harvest among our young people.

Mr. Speaker, the district I have the honor to represent has no great forests, no expanses of lakes and wildlife and ranges. It would be, I think, a great benefit to thousands of young people whose lives and outlooks are bounded by concrete to participate in a program of needed conservation work similar to that undertaken in the past by the Civilian Conservation Corps. The CCC was an ambitious experiment that fully justified the hopes of all those who helped start it. One example of this justification is provided by a man who was closely connected with the CCC during its whole life, and who is now the Director of the National Park Service. Conrad Wirth, in his final report to Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, said that:

Working out of doors, regular hours, and plenty of good, wholesome food did wonders for the boys at one of the most critical growing periods of their lives.

The impact of outdoor life upon young people, I think, cannot be overstated. A recent study in Minnesota, comparing

delinquent youths who participated in a forestry camp with a matched group remaining in a more conventional correctional institution, reports significantly greater improvement among the campers. I do not suggest that a program comparable to the CCC should be thought of as a solution to the complex problem of juvenile delinquency, for it is bound up in the whole fabric of our society. But I do feel strongly that applying the energies and talents of our young people to the many unmet conservation needs that abound across the country can contribute to both their development and the development of our natural resources.

A recent study conducted for the New York City Youth Board reveals that New York City has at least 76,800 out-of-school and unemployed youth. Difficulty in finding and holding jobs hits most heavily school dropouts and young people in minority groups, particularly Puerto Ricans and Negroes. A local area youth employment program, if instituted on an adequate basis, could help many of these young people find work. But giving these youngsters a job outside of their present environment for a period of 6 months to 2 years can go a long way toward giving them a self-reliant outlook on life and the beginning of skills that can help them gain later employment. Anyone who has traveled through our magnificent national forests and parks can understand the effect doing hard and useful work in them would have upon young men accustomed to roaming through the streets of cities where the doors of employment remain closed. The experience of the CCC camps of the 1930's demonstrates how boys were made into men who became useful and productive members of society. The work that needs to be done is there. Since the CCC built recreation facilities and roads and trails, much of this construction has undergone substantial deterioration. The almost tenfold increase in the use of these facilities, coupled with the lack of funds and manpower in many areas to maintain them, has meant that a tremendous backlog of rehabilitation work has accumulated. In this kind of outdoor atmosphere the socially useful and productive nature of this work can benefit thousands of young men.

Mr. Speaker, April 17 will be the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the first CCC camp in the George Washington National Forest in Virginia. Thirty years ago the whole of American society was out of focus, and the need for the CCC program was obvious. Today, our general affluence tends to shield from our vision the soft spots in our society. It is hard for many people to comprehend the meaning of our hard-core social problems, which cannot be wished away or pushed out of sight. In the 1930's the impact of idleness on the young people was readily apparent, and the CCC as a solution was easy to understand. Thirty years later the need for a similar approach to the problem of youth unemployment should be apparent to all except those who believe that idleness is voluntary. We have a choice as to how we will meet this problem. We can spend our money for unemployment compensation for young people, for

courts, law enforcement agencies and penal institutions; or we can spend it on a constructive program to attack our unmet conservation needs utilizing the energies and talents of our young people.

In its 9 years of existence the CCC provided immeasurable benefit to both our natural resources and our young men. To the 3 million young men enrolled in CCC camps, it offered discipline, the experience of healthful and body-building outdoor living, and training in a wide variety of skills. The success of many of the CCC enrollees in obtaining jobs after their camp service is directly attributable to the skills they picked up in the camps. The lasting benefits of the CCC—the millions of acres of trees planted, wildlife protected, the thousands of trails, bridges and campgrounds built—are impressive evidence of the intrinsic worth of the CCC program. The program also had lasting benefits that are not so tangible. These are the human assets reaped by the 3 million CCC graduates. Let me refer again to the words of Conrad Wirth, one of the Nation's great conservation figures, who said:

Working in the open, with nature, brings optimum beneficial results to an individual which are almost impossible to obtain elsewhere. It builds the body and the mind; it teaches the basic principles of existence; and it creates an understanding of what must be done to protect and properly use natural resources.

No one program can completely excise the cause of youth unemployment and the social ills that attend this unemployment. It will take a variety of imaginative and boldly conceived programs to treat both the roots and the branches of the problems afflicting our youth. The CCC showed to the Nation one constructive avenue into which the energies of young people could be put. A modern version of the Corps, designed to meet the needs of our vast and expanding number of unemployed youth, can accomplish a great deal in the conservation of both our natural and our human resources.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent as well to insert in the Record the text of an excellent and informative statement by a former Member of this body, the Honorable Frank E. Smith, now Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, with respect to the operation of the CCC program in the TVA region.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,

Knoxville, Tenn., March 1, 1963.

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: At your suggestion, I have prepared an evaluation of the Civilian Conservation Corps program in the TVA area. During the 9 years of operation of the CCC program, a number of camps were assigned to the TVA, at one time as high as 25, and a variety of work was carried on. I think one of the most significant results of this program is the fact that the average gross return to landowners from timber sales is going to be at least \$1 million per year.

Not many years will be needed to repay the entire cost of the CCC program in the area.

One of the principal items of work was a large-scale reforestation program specifically aimed at eroding land generally considered worthless at the time. The TVA-CCC tree planting resulted in the following:

Private land reforested.....	70,000
TVA land reforested.....	40,000

Total acres reforested..... 110,000

Of this 110,000 acres, 73,000 acres are still in young stands of growing timber today. The difference in acreage is caused by a number of reasons, including land-use conversion, fire, insect and disease, and the planting of improper species for the site in use.

There are many lasting benefits to the region from the plantations established by the CCC, however. Some of the more important ones are:

Income for landowners, \$1 million each year: CCC plantings are just now reaching the age (25 years) where landowners are receiving significant dollar returns. Based on averages developed from intensively studied individual cases, they are now producing wood from thinnings, worth about \$5 per acre per year to the landowner. Projected over a 50-year rotation, average gross return per acre per year is computed to be \$15. Therefore, 73,000 acres of CCC plantations are returning, or will return, to landowners \$1 million per year.

Base for industry; new papermills: Two paper companies have built plants on the Tennessee River in the past 10 years at a capital investment of \$144 million. An important consideration in the location of these mills was the extensive area of established pine plantations. Each year CCC plantings can be expected to yield 73,000 cords of wood for the paper industry, resulting in manufactured products worth about \$7,300,000. (During a recent 5-year period, one mill paid \$200,000 for some 60,000 cords of wood thinned from 6,400 acres of TVA land planted by CCC crews.)

Jobs for people; 730 full-time jobs: Foresters estimate that each 1,000 acres of planted pines create the base for 10 new full-time woods and industry jobs. Trees planted by the CCC are therefore providing year-round employment for 730 men. This means over \$3 million of the region's industrial payroll.

Soil erosion control: A 1961 survey showed almost 95 percent of the CCC plantings effectively controlled erosion.

Reforestation idea promoted: In 1934 tree planting was a novel idea in the Tennessee Valley. Landowners were skeptical. Persuading them to reclaim eroded lands was often difficult, even though it cost them nothing. Early CCC plantings, and the obviously good results, were effective advertising. The idea spread and the reforestation rate accelerated. Landowners gradually assumed responsibility for doing the job. To date they have reforested 633,000 additional acres in valley counties.

Effective fire prevention: Wood burning was a common practice in the valley in the 1930's. An estimated 10 percent of the total forest land burned each year. The problem was an uninformed and unsympathetic citizenry. Growing green plantations became a powerful influence in changing attitudes toward fire control. One very effective aid was tree planting. Landowners who owned tree plantations developed a desire to protect them, and this interest gradually spread from plantations to natural stands of trees. Today the annual burn is less than one-half of 1 percent.

Cordially,

FRANK E. SMITH,
Director.

Mr. BRADENAS. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to include in the

RECORD the text of an article from the magazine *Business Week* of February 16, 1963, entitled "Coming: A Crisis for Young Workers."

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

COMING: A CRISIS FOR YOUNG WORKERS

Imagine two locomotives careening toward each other at full speed. One represents the economic trends that have reduced job opportunities for young workers so drastically that unemployment among them is now twice the national average. The other represents the 26 million young workers who will enter the labor market before 1970. The two are about to collide—with potentially alarming results for both the Nation's economy and its politics.

SOBER SURVEY

The sober source for this sensational picture is a Labor Department manpower study, prepared for the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy. Most of its background material is well known: the overall growth in unemployment levels; the rise in long-term unemployment; the concentration of unemployment among the blue collared, unskilled, and nonwhite. But where the study looks into the future, it contains dynamite.

Between 1960 and 1970, the number of working youngsters aged 14 to 24 is expected to increase by more than 6 million—compared to an increase of less than 400,000 during the previous decade. This will bring the total number in this age group to 26 million. Yet in 1962 the unemployment rate for worker in this age group was about double the national average of 5½ percent.

In effect, almost every trend in the labor market is now operating to the young worker's disadvantage:

The shift from blue- to white-collar jobs, related to the shift from goods to services in the economy. The proportion of all workers in goods-producing industries fell from 51 percent in 1947 to 42 percent in 1962.

The shift from unskilled to skilled jobs within the blue-collar segment. Technological innovation has tended to upgrade jobs where it did not abolish them.

The shift from farm to nonagricultural jobs. Farm employment dropped more than 3 million between 1947 and 1962.

NO ENTRY

The net result is a scarcity of those bottom-rung jobs that were once the young worker's traditional entry into the labor market. Today's high school graduate with no special training finds few unoccupied jobs he can step into and use as a stepping stone to the next job up.

The high school dropout is in an even worse position—an estimated 30 percent of all youngsters beginning work in the 1960's will be dropouts.

On the other hand, those occupations that are growing fastest—the professional and technical specialties—require so much training that a person is out of the younger worker class before he begins work.

Moreover, the huge sums spent for research and development (\$14 billion in 1960-61 compared to \$5 billion in 1953-54) will accelerate these trends.

STIFF CHALLENGE

As the Labor Department sees it, the country will need:

Some 13 million more jobs by 1970 to keep up with labor force growth alone.

Two million additional jobs annually to offset technological advances.

This is a stiff enough challenge for an economy that has averaged only 258,000 in annual job growth for the past 5 years (464,000 new nonfarm jobs minus 206,000

lost on the farm). But, in addition, the new jobs will have to be matched up with a labor force bulging in those categories hardest to employ—principally young workers. Or else.

History, rather than the Labor Department, suggests alternatives; the depression, Hitler's Germany—created in great part by unemployed young Germany. Presumably such possibilities underlie President Kennedy's proposed Youth Conservation Corps. The chances are they will underlie many political and economic moves before the decade is over.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, these youngsters who are out of school and out of work and who are discouraged because they are virtually unemployable will benefit immensely from the Youth Conservation Corps. They do not intend to go back to school where they have already dropped out. They need to get away from their environment in many instances, and the chance to break away from depressing environments for a new life in conservation work will attract many boys who cannot be reached otherwise. These youngsters will have an opportunity to live in a well-regulated camp and to work in many fields. They will be in camps operated under direct leadership of forest and park rangers, wildlife management specialists and our soil conservationists. The bill should be passed at the earliest possible date.

THE APPROPRIATIONS BUDGET FOR 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority leader in debate on the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior alluded to the fact that there is a Republican task force which has been organized for the purpose of undertaking to reduce appropriations in the budget for the next fiscal year.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that on March 4 the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] issued a press release in which he announced that a House Republican task force had found ways to cut as much as \$15 billion from the budget. On March 5 the Washington Post published this account of the group's press session.

I quote:

A House Republican study group announced yesterday it has found projects costing \$10 to \$15 billion which can and should be cut from appropriations requested for next year. The group of senior GOP members of the Appropriations Committee told a news conference that their study of the budget, assisted by Maurice H. Stans, Budget Director during the Eisenhower administration, showed such cuts both feasible and urgent.

The Post account then identifies the gentleman from Ohio as the source of the statement.

And then added, and I quote again:

The Republicans did not specify where cuts should be made. They said they had compiled a list but did not want to appear to be prejudging testimony still to be given before the Appropriations Committee.

The Post then adds this statement:

House Speaker JOHN McCORMACK suggested that Republicans submit a bill of particulars.

Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the House and others on this side of the aisle have been asking for a bill of particulars every day since this statement was made. But all we have been able to get are claims that the budget can be cut up to \$15 billion. We have seen a vague letter from former President Eisenhower encouraging budget cutters, but we have received no bill of particulars.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman made reference to this Eisenhower letter which has gotten rather wide circulation. I think it might be well that somewhere this should be made a part of the Record. I would like to refer to it, if the gentleman will permit me. One of the many things that former President Eisenhower mentioned was the defense items in the budget. This morning in the Washington Post in a column written by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Walter Lippmann, that whole matter is discussed. I will quote just one paragraph from Mr. Lippmann's article. He said:

On the first question, that the defense budget should be cut from the Kennedy level to the Eisenhower level, the General must know that the prospects are poor. For defense, this Congress wants to spend more, not less, than do President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara. Congress would be horrified at going back to the Eisenhower level. Indeed, the controversies which are raging around the "McNamara monarchy" all originate in his refusal to spend money that certain officers, politicians, and contractors want to have spent.

The article continues:

General Eisenhower knows that. He learned it when he was President, and his valedictory on television will long be remembered for its warning that "in the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex."

The other item mentioned in former President Eisenhower's letter, and I have it before me, is the space program, and he used the expression, if I remember it correctly, that this was a "spongy" request—whatever that means.

I have here the Evening Star published as of today, Washington, Tuesday, April 2. The headline is:

Reds Fire Moon Research Shot

Then the article goes on:

Space vehicle due at target (meaning the moon) in 3½ days.

Then it goes on to describe this vehicle which weighs over 3,000 pounds. The essence of this, as I see it, is that we should cut back, according to President Eisenhower's letter between \$10 and \$12 bil-

lion. I say that probably the net result of it would be to give the Soviet bloc a commanding superiority in the whole program of space research.

I do not believe this administration or, for that matter, the American people, want to do that. The Eisenhower administration spent \$180 million more than was spent in the 8 years of the Truman administration despite the fact that the Korean war was fought during the administration of President Truman.

With all the conversation about debt, the Eisenhower years increased the national debt by over \$20 billion. I will say that these Republican budget directors ought to be well-qualified because one of them presided over the biggest peacetime deficit in history in the Eisenhower administration which approached almost \$13 billion.

One of the other matters this Eisenhower letter talks about is children. I do not find anyone who does not relish talking about children. I have three children and two grandchildren. I want most of all for them to live in a free country; I want them to have the opportunity to participate in a free society.

When we talk about children, one of the real problems confronting this Nation today involves young people; and the idea that we turn our backs on them and do nothing seems to be part of the Republican philosophy and has been as long as I have been around here. That certainly, as I can see it, is not helpful to the children of the country.

I am told that today there are 46 million people in the United States under the age of 18 years, and that within a very few years there will be 70 million under 18 years of age. We have an unemployment rate ranging almost to 6 percent, but when you look at the young people, the unemployment rate is much higher than 6 percent; it is way above 6 percent.

So I say it is very easy for the Republicans to use these catch phrases, but it is pretty difficult to support positive and constructive programs.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana, and I would ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana may incorporate the articles to which he made reference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the article by the distinguished journalist, Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post of Tuesday, April 2, is as follows:

MONEY AND THE MOON

(By Walter Lippmann)

General Eisenhower has gone on record in favor of a cut of \$10 or \$12 billion in the Government's authority to make contracts which will be paid for as the missiles and the ships and the like are manufactured. While this is unlikely to make any substantial reduction in this year's spending, it would make a substantial difference in later years. General Eisenhower does not himself specify what the cut should be, being as he says out of touch with the details. But he takes his figures from his

last two budget directors—Messrs. Stans and Brundage.

Although it is not likely to happen, it would be most enlightening if Messrs. Stans and Brundage would present their recommendations in detail and engage in a bout of reciprocal questioning and answering with Mr. Gordon, the present Kennedy budget director. Unless something of the sort can be arranged, the country will be subjected to conflicting assertions which never meet head on. This will add to the befuddlement which so far has been the outstanding production of this session of Congress.

But even without such a confrontation of views, there are in General Eisenhower's letter to Representative HALLECK two very large and very important statements of policy. One is that the defense budget can be reduced down to something like the last Eisenhower defense budget for fiscal 1962. General Eisenhower does not support, because he thinks it unnecessary, the Kennedy enlargement of our strategic and of our conventional forces. It would be interesting to hear him argue, not merely assert, this very important proposition.

General Eisenhower's second difference of policy is on the program to put a man on the moon and get him back again before 1970. This is, as he says, a crash program which is spectacular but too costly. Here too is an issue which ought to be debated.

On the first question, that the defense budget should be cut from the Kennedy level to the Eisenhower level, the general must know that the prospects are poor. For defense, this Congress wants to spend more, not less, than do President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara. Congress would be horrified at going back to the Eisenhower level. Indeed, the controversies which are raging around the "McNamara monarchy" all originate in his refusal to spend money that certain officers, politicians, and contractors want to have spent.

General Eisenhower knows that. He learned it when he was President and his valedictory on television will long be remembered for its warning that "in the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex."

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled Secretary of Defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the know-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control. If Mr. McNamara is overwhelmed, General Eisenhower can give up for lost any serious notion that military spending will be cut back.

As to putting a man on the moon, the real question, I believe, is not whether it is too expensive. The real question is whether the country would support a gigantic research and scientific exploration in outer space if it were not prodded by the fear that the Russians will get to the moon first and lured by the prize of being the first ourselves to get there. What General Eisenhower thinks, so it seems, is that we should "demonstrate commonsense" about the prod and the lure. We should spend less and take more time and let the Russians win the race to the moon if they can afford it.

No doubt the winner in the race will have great prestige and to many people the world over, he will look temporarily like a superman. But as the first man on the moon is followed by the second man on the moon, winning the race will be not much more than a 9-day's wonder. Most emphatically, it will not decide the course of history.

What does matter greatly is that since we have the technological capacity we should promote the research and the exploration

into the nature of the universe. We do not know what we shall learn when we can place our laboratories and our instruments out beyond the envelope of the earth's atmosphere. But we shall know more than we can know now about the reality of which we are a part. In physics, chemistry, and biology we may be opening up a new world.

It is one of the melancholy facts of political life that the good is not often sought for goodness' sake. Men are not easily moved to serve so great a purpose as the revolutionary increase of knowledge. So we have to be prodded by the fear of being second and lured by the desire to be first.

Mr. Speaker, the article in the Evening Star of Tuesday, March 2, to which I referred earlier is as follows:

REDS FIRE MOON RESEARCH SHOT—SPACE VEHICLE DUE AT TARGET IN 3½ DAYS—3,130-POUND CRAFT SENT UNMANNED OFF PLATFORM IN ORBIT

Moscow, April 2.—The Soviet Union today fired a 3,130-pound interplanetary research station toward the moon, Moscow radio reported.

The radio said the unmanned space vehicle is scheduled to reach the moon in 3½ days.

A statement by the Soviet news agency Tass said the launching was part of the Soviet program for exploration of outer space and planets of the solar system.

FUNCTIONS NORMALLY

"All the apparatus on board the automatic station functioned normally," Tass reported. The radio report said the interplanetary station—called Moon-4—was shot from an orbiting space platform.

The use of such unmanned devices is a preliminary to attempts to land men on the moon, a goal of both Soviet and United States Governments.

The Chief of the U.S. space agency, James E. Webb, has estimated at something under \$20 billion the cost of landing the first Americans on the moon by 1970.

RESEARCH DEVICES

The American National Aeronautics and Space Administration is promoting a surveyor project which would soft-land instrument packages on the moon, to include some shots which would orbit that planet and not land.

The Russian device appeared to have a research mission of this type.

"The observation of the flight of the station, the determination of the parameters of its trajectory, the reception of scientific information are carried out by a special measuring complex on the territory of the Soviet Union," Tass said.

It gave the moon probe's last position as over the Yellow Sea.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to proceed. When I reach the Committee on Science and Astronautics I will yield.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert the article in its entirety in the RECORD. This is insert No. 1.

The Speaker and others on this side of the aisle have been asking for a bill of particulars every day since this statement was made. But all we have gotten have been more unsubstantiated claims that the budget can be cut up to \$15 billion. We have seen a vague letter from former President Eisenhower encouraging the budget cutters, but we have received no bill of particulars.

It would seem that a study group that includes senior Republican members of the Committee on Appropriations could produce such a bill—particularly after all

the ballyhoo that has accompanied its operations.

The truth is that the only way a \$15 billion cut can be made is to cut into the real muscle of indispensable functions of Government.

Using the total 1964 budget as a base, it is obvious that interest costs totaling \$10.1 billion cannot be reduced.

It can also be assumed that a reduction of this size involves elimination of the new programs proposed by the President, which, except for military pay increases, total \$1.8 billion in 1964.

And therefore the remaining \$96 billion budget requests would have to be cut by \$13.2 billion.

Faced with prolonged silence, we have been compelled—in the public interest—to make our own analysis of precisely how the Republicans would propose to cut the \$13.2 billion. We have been forced to do this because there has been not even one statement explaining how a \$15 billion cut would affect our space program, our defense program, our domestic programs.

Incidentally, the man upon whom the Republicans are reportedly relying for advice in their budget cutting, the gentleman who served as a budget director during the Eisenhower administration, Maurice Stans, is certainly well versed in Republican finances. He saw a highly publicized \$500 million anticipated surplus in 1959 become a \$12.5 billion deficit.

We have carefully analyzed the budget.

Working along guidelines discussed with the fiscal experts, we have apportioned the \$15 billion reduction on an equitable basis between the departments, the new and continuing programs, and functions. At this point, I insert into the record material describing exactly how we arrived at our equitable apportionment. This is insert No. 2, insert No. 2 having been discarded.

We have asked for details because the American people want to know just what services the Republicans want to curtail. They want to know just what functions the Republicans intend to wipe out. They want to know just what new programs the Republicans would eliminate.

But no news has been forthcoming.

There have been some concrete indications by Republican leaders as to just where they intend to apply the knife, and we have considered those indications in making our analysis.

For instance, it is clear that they intend to slash deeply, or eliminate entirely, programs that are keyed to the welfare of the American people. Most of us on this side of the aisle favor the youth employment bill and the Youth Conservation Corps, most of our friends across the aisle are opposed.

I have been told that one distinguished Republican leader called the Youth Conservation Corps a—and I quote—a "Youth Waste Corps" unquote.

It is clear from the record the Republicans intend to eliminate or cut down programs vitally needed by millions of Americans—programs which have been supported by Democratic administrations and Democratic Congresses for more than a score of years.

They refuse to face the problems that beset us today.

They refuse to admit the 20th century is here.

They want to turn the clock back. Like an ostrich, they stick their heads in the sands, oblivious to the problems that swirl around their feet.

They would ignore the millions of older people who live in constant dread of disastrous hospital bills. They scream "socialized medicine" when anyone attempts to help these older people.

They ignore the millions of children who grub out inferior educations in overcrowded classrooms. They scream federal control when we attempt to help these children.

They ignore the millions of young people who need guidance, employment, and training. They ridicule efforts to help our youth by saying we want to send them off into the woods to play.

They ignore the fact that millions of Americans need more doctors and dentists in their communities. The village council is working on that problem, they say.

Now let us consider the careful analysis we have made.

Exactly what will it mean to make a \$15 billion cut in the budget?

If our friends across the aisle are really sincere in what they say they intend to do they will have to take this course. Aside from new programs and interest charges, they must cut: \$7,756 billion in the area of national defense; \$620 million in the area of international affairs and finance; \$784 million allocated for space research and technology; \$987 million allocated for our agricultural programs and resources; \$357 million for preservation and development of our natural resources; \$424 million allocated to commerce and transportation functions; \$69 million for housing and community development; \$242 million for education; \$796 million for health, labor, and welfare; \$768 million for veterans benefits and services; \$312 million for General Government; \$28 million allowed for pay adjustment; and \$34 million for contingencies.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Seven hundred million dollars taken out of the space program is going to delay the goal that has been set for that program for many years in the future. It is interesting to note that the gentleman who made this statement, a former President of the United States, speaks about this spongy program, but he had some spongy talk during his own administration.

You will remember after Sputnik was put up that startled the world, Engine Charlie said that he could see no value in putting a basketball into the sky. But basketballs in the sky will represent a new system of communication worldwide, a new system of weather announcement that will bring credit to the whole program. If we want to retard the program, this is the way to do it.

We were shocked when the Russians orbited two astronauts and showed the

capability of bringing these two people within 2 miles of one another, one being orbited some 24 hours after the other. When this capability was shown, we were shocked, just as we were shocked when Sputnik went up.

The future of this country lies in its science and technology. Going to the moon is part of the full scheme. It is the techniques that are developed there which will serve the whole program, and having established a goal, if we are to keep that goal we are going to need the space money that has been allotted.

And I would like to point out the international prestige that goes with that. International prestige at this time is important.

Who was sent to Argentina? The Vostok capsule and the Russian cosmonauts. Now they send them around the world, to China, to build up the prestige that they need in these countries. And, I am sure if any of you followed closely the triumphal trip that Colonel Glenn made into Africa and other places where they lined up to see him and to see his capsule, you would appreciate this value to us.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. The distinguished chairman of the committee is making a most important statement. He talks about prestige. I would like to ask the gentleman what in his opinion would be the effect on, No. 1, our own country and, No. 2, upon world affairs if the Russians succeeded in reaching the moon and, for that matter, if they put a planet in outer space before we do?

Mr. MILLER of California. I do not think there would be any question about it, just as Sputnik was the thing that first revitalized them; that it would revitalize their position and reestablish their position in many parts of the world, particularly among the new emerging nations, and it would be a great setback for this country if that thing happened.

Mr. BOGGS. Does the gentleman think that Mr. Maurice Stans would then congratulate the leadership in this body in reducing the budget so that this would put the Russians on the moon sooner?

Mr. MILLER of California. I do not know what he would do, but I am conscious of the fact that this program has the support of the American people. I am not conscious of anyone who during the last campaign advocated slicing the space budget lost out, but I know of at least one man who voted against it, for reasons that only he knows, that is no longer a Member of this body.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentlemen for his contribution.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes; I must yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Apparently there is quite a discussion going on here about the budget, and we had a little action on the budget today which was, to me, highly satisfactory. As I indicated earlier, we accomplished a real substan-

tial reduction by a couple of amendments that were adopted here with substantial Republican support. The savings that are now involved in this first appropriation bill come right up to the target we had set with respect to this bill.

I understand some references have been made to a letter addressed to me by former President Eisenhower. I do not care how much you undertake to belittle his advice to the American people, but believe me that advice will be listened to. Now, beyond that I shall not undertake to reply in detail to some of the things that have been said. I just hope the gentleman from Oklahoma, my counterpart on the majority side, whom I have the highest respect and admiration for, will agree with me that after we have a chance to look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and see just what has been said here, why, possibly some of us will have something to say a little further.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like first to respond to the distinguished minority leader by saying that I think it is the duty of the Congress to survey every item and to scrutinize every item in the budget and make cuts where practical. We are trying to analyze the results of a cut across the board based on some of the figures that have appeared in newspapers and apparently have been given out by members of the so-called task force.

May I say that no one holds the distinguished minority leader in higher esteem than I. With reference to his last statement, I might say, however, that all we say here will be available in the RECORD for the inspection and scrutiny of all who want to read it, and we would like to see the bill of particulars made equally available to us.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say to the gentleman that the bill of particulars is right in that large envelope. The gentleman would undoubtedly be very happy if the gentleman could have a real good look at that. But I say right now that the gentleman is not about to. I said earlier today in the debate that we have a bill of particulars that has been looked over by conscientious Members of this body and by able people throughout this country who stand for what we know the majority of the people of this country want, which is to do away with deficit spending. If we are going to pursue that—

Mr. ALBERT. If I may respond further, I think a matter as important as the budget of the United States, is important enough that any suggestions relating to it should be made a matter of public record at the earliest possible date so that all those who are interested in making a contribution with respect to it will have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I have no intention of belittling General Eisenhower. The letter to which I referred was given wide distribution by the distinguished minority leader. I first saw it in the discus-

sion that the minority leader, the majority leader, and myself participated in last Friday. But this letter makes serious charges. A portion of the second paragraph of the Eisenhower letter reads as follows:

Moreover, I am particularly concerned in this situation for our children. If we irresponsibly keep on passing them our bills they will inherit not a free country with bright opportunities, but a vast wasteland of debt and financial chaos.

We would be less than responsible if we did not reply to that kind of language. Nobody is belittling the former President. We are simply presenting the point of view of the administration in power which has responsibility for the Government of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the entire letter.

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

The letter follows:

(Text of a letter from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower in response to a letter¹ from Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK. Mr. Eisenhower's letter was made public by Mr. HALLECK following a meeting of the Republican Committee on Budget Reduction headed by Representative FRANK BOW of Ohio.)

PALM DESERT, CALIF.,
March 26, 1963.

DEAR CHARLIE: Replying to your letter, I start by stating my conviction that if the Government is to accept deliberately a massive deficit, and then simultaneously embark upon lavish new spending and a huge tax cut, the Nation is headed for trouble. If we do this we will convict ourselves of fiscal recklessness and a failure to heed the plain lessons of history.

Moreover, I am particularly concerned, in this situation, for our children. If we irresponsibly keep on passing them our bills, they will inherit, not a free country with bright opportunities, but a vast wasteland of debt and financial chaos. Our youngsters have the right to expect more from us than a confession of our unreadiness or inability to pay for the things we demand from our government.

Of course, there is no compulsion upon us to be so foolish. I believe the new spending programs in the pending budget can be drastically reduced without hurting a single essential function and still leave the level of Federal operations billions higher than I thought necessary only 2 years ago.

My last budget—for fiscal 1962—called for authority to spend \$81 billion. The 1964 budget before you asks for \$108 billion. Such a pyramiding of programs will inevitably create higher and higher spending in coming years and more and more difficulty in ever bringing our finances into balance. If this \$27 billion increase were cut in half, we would still have the fastest growing budget we have ever had in peacetime. Cuts of that magnitude would seem to be both reasonable and desirable, if only we will keep

¹ Text of Halleck letter to General Eisenhower, March 25, 1963:

"As you undoubtedly are aware, there is a great deal of concern here in the Congress on the part of both Democrats and Republicans about the spending proposals in the President's budget.

"Having in mind your vast experience both as a military leader and as our Nation's Chief Executive and realizing your continuing interest in the affairs of government, many of us feel that an expression of your views on this matter would be most helpful."

in mind the adverse consequences of failing to make them.

Take defense—up \$10 billion in 2 years. In my view, it is almost incredible to say this program cannot be safely pared. The defense budget I left behind provided amply for our security. Even allowing for costly developments since then, I have no doubt that the enormous defense sums can well stand a judicious and sizable pruning.

The space program, in my opinion, is downright spongy. This is an area where we particularly need to demonstrate some commonsense. Specifically, I have never believed that a spectacular dash to the moon, vastly deepening our debt, is worth the added tax burden it will eventually impose upon our citizens. This result should be achieved as a natural outgrowth of demonstrably valuable space operations. But having made this into a crash program, we are unavoidably wasting enormous sums. I suggest that our enthusiasm here be tempered in the interest of fiscal soundness.

I am sure there are many other areas in the voluminous budget where substantial economies can be made, to the great benefit of the Nation.

May I stress this point: there is not a trace of partisanship in the views here expressed. Responsible government is not a partisan issue. Leading citizens, in both parties in and out of government, have most emphatically stated that they share similar convictions. Among these are my last two Budget Directors, whom I asked to appraise the pending programs, because I am not now in a position to specify the detailed reductions that can be made. They believe that a cut of \$10 or \$12 billion in spending authority would be practicable, without injuring any necessary activity. I agree with them that, at the very least, major surgery on the proposed programs, old and new, is a necessary accompaniment to a cut in taxes.

My hope is that our countrymen will grow indignant enough over these dangers to our country's future to make their views vigorously known to you gentlemen in the Congress. If this does come to pass, then we will face the happy prospect of reducing spending, reducing taxes, and looking after our children's tomorrow all at the same time.

With warm personal regard,
As ever,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I did not mean to say that you were belittling the former President of the United States. I do not think I used that word.

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, you did, I hate to say.

Mr. HALLECK. If I did, I am going to stand on it. But beyond that, as I said, I do not think General Eisenhower—former President Eisenhower—needs too much defense at my hands, although I am willing to take on that defense at any time. I am going to see to it tomorrow that his letter goes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, whether you put it in piecemeal or not. I do not know.

Mr. BOGGS. I have already put it in.

Mr. HALLECK. Have you put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. That is very good, then, because I had planned to do that today in connection with the bill which

we had under consideration. But I thought possibly it might be considered too partisan. So I refrained from putting it in the RECORD. But if you put it in, then all I can say is I commend you for putting it in.

May I say further, and then I shall discontinue my part of this discussion, because after all, as I said earlier, this is not the time to undertake to carry on this debate from our side, and that we will in due time have some further things to say about this matter of excessive spending in the budget; may I say I am absolutely sure that those of us who are trying to cut out excessive wasteful spending are supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I think the overwhelming majority of the American people are for cutting out wasteful spending. But our analysis of this matter indicates that if the kinds of cuts that have been publicized are made we are going to cut out some spending that I am sure the American people think is very desirable.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. This is not a question of personalities insofar as General Eisenhower is concerned. I think General Eisenhower is a fine gentleman, and I like him very much. I supported President Eisenhower when he was President oftentimes more than the members of his own party, both in committee and on the floor of the House. So I am not making any attack on General Eisenhower. I am dealing with this letter which he wrote, which I consider a vague document which says nothing. And also I am surprised that the minority leader would have what he calls a bill of particulars which he will not reveal for the benefit of the American people. If he has a bill of particulars I think it is important that the American people know what it is.

Just one other point, because I think what we are doing here is very important in making this record. Let us talk about this business of what we have left our children and what we are going to leave our children. Aside from the \$180 billion increased expenditures under the Eisenhower administration, and the more than \$20 billion they added to the national debt, in 1958 we had a deficit in our balance of payments of \$3.5 billion. In 1959 it was \$3.7 billion. In 1960 it was \$3.9 billion. In 1961 it was \$2.5 billion and in 1962 it was down to \$1.9 billion.

This affects the flow of gold from the United States of America and it has a vital aspect in our so-called fiscal responsibility and the fiscal stability of our Government. I do not think this is something that the former President can be particularly proud of.

In addition to that he talks about our children, and about a dollar that is worthless. We have had more price stability in the last year than we have had at any time in the recent past. I think it is probably impossible to have total

price stability in a growing country. I know the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is very knowledgeable on this subject; we serve together. But here are the figures. This is the wholesale price index.

Mr. CURTIS. How about taking the Consumer Price Index? That is what the people have to pay.

Mr. BOGGS. U.S. wholesale and consumer prices have remained more stable in the last 2 years than those of any other major industrial country on earth, except Canada.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the figures will show that that is not a true statement. The President used that, I might say, last year in his TV address to the Nation. I took the floor of the House to put the correct figures in. I think that we should have the correct figures from the Consumer Price Index. Then anyone can see that that is not a true statement.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, let us consider some of these figures in more detail.

First, the \$7.7 billion reduction in defense expenditures.

There would be an immediate loss of three Army Reserve divisions. There would be a real reduction in the Army's ability to provide modern equipment for the remaining forces.

The Nation's ability to react to such crises as the Cuban threat would be sharply reduced. The general capability of the United States to project its power quickly into strategic situations around the world would be reduced.

The Navy's ability to wage antisubmarine warfare would be crippled—as would its capability of maintaining the Polaris submarine force at a level needed to accomplish its deterrent purpose.

The shipbuilding and ship conversion program would be reduced by one-fourth.

There would be a steep reduction in aircraft procurement for the Navy.

The readiness of the fleet would be impaired.

Our Strategic Air Force would be cut back.

The Minuteman missile force would face curtailment at a time when the Soviet Union is continuing to build its intercontinental ballistic missile force.

Nine squadrons in our Continental Defense Command would be eliminated, reducing our capability in that area.

Gaps would be created in our perimeter defense.

Tactical Air Force squadrons would be reduced as would our airlift squadrons.

This is a black picture.

This is a gamble with the future of America I am not prepared to take.

We would be handing the Soviet Union a deck stacked against us in any future encounter.

In short, we would be a weakened nation.

The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has discussed the effect of a cut of \$784 million in the space program. Under leave previously obtained I shall merely insert my remarks on that particular point.

The Republican slash would reduce our \$5.7 billion space budget by \$784 million.

Inevitably, a cut this size would have to hit our effort to be the first nation to land on the moon.

The reason is simply that the biggest chunks of our space budget are for projects such as the three-man Apollo spacecraft which would make the landing, and for advanced boosters like Saturn V, which will send Apollo toward the moon.

A total of \$1.2 billion has been budgeted for Apollo, and \$733 million for Saturn, our workhorse in space.

No money could be cut from Project Mercury, which has already put three Americans into orbit, because that effort is nearing completion. And the Gemini project's two-man space efforts are fully planned already, so massive cuts cannot be made there.

The kind of money they are talking about would have to come from Apollo and Saturn V. There is no other possibility.

In all, the Republican cuts would postpone until some time in the 1970's our hopes for landing a man on the moon, and would destroy America's chances of being first in space.

I now insert into the RECORD a more specific description of the harm that the budget cutters would do to the space program. This is insert No. 4.

Now let us examine another area where the Republican ax would cut deeply: natural resources.

The reduction there would be \$357 million.

The Corps of Engineers would sustain a \$149 million slash.

This is an operation dear to the hearts of all Congressmen, as can be seen by the record.

Construction projects totaling \$23.7 million would be eliminated. These include 32 major projects and 38 small projects.

Another 44 major projects—scheduled for construction this year—would be deleted, saving an estimated \$97 million.

And contract awards on some projects already underway would be held up, saving another \$28 million.

I remind the House that these Republican savers would not only kill vital projects, but for every \$30,000 they chop from the Corps of Engineers budget, our calculations show that they will place one more American on the unemployed list—a list that is a costly moral and financial burden for this Nation.

A more detailed summary of this phase is now inserted into the RECORD. This is insert No. 5.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I want to commend the gentleman for pointing out that these cuts are cuts in really the muscle or indispensable functions of government. The gentleman would, of course, support cuts in expenditures that were not necessary, of the type the Secretary of Defense described in his testimony before the Joint Economic Com-

mittee. He described how he had shaved the defense budget by some \$13 billion by improved procedures, how he proposed to save up to \$3.4 billion in the future in changes in procedure, in procurement, in further reliance on competitive bids as composed to cost-plus contracts. As a member on the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, I am personally very interested in the efficiencies proposed by the Secretary.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. He has made a real contribution. Whenever savings can be made that will not cut into the muscle of Government operations of course we are all for them.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I with several other members of that committee have been working long and hard to try to bring some appropriation bills out here that we think will cut to the bone; but this is what we run into.

Item after item after item comes in from these various agencies increasing this year's budget over last year as the result of acts of this Congress. These are new services required of these agencies, and they bring us the bill for them. When I check back on the record I find that most of the items we are forced to add to the appropriation bills this year passed unanimously.

Who is trying to kid the American people? Are these folks who are trying to make these cuts in the budget really sincere? If they are, why were they not around here when some of these bills that force us to raise the budget passed the House without opposition? The way it figures out, because of the acts of the last Congress we are going to have to increase this year's budget by \$2.5 billion, just to break even this year with what we did last year, and that takes no account of the increase in the mail volume and other things over which the Government has no control.

It seems to me that when a charge is made here that this increase is irresponsible it is a reflection on the Committee on Appropriations. Having worked on that committee for several years, I know of no group in or out of Congress more responsible for bringing responsible bills before the Congress than that committee. I think they are the most expert of all. I fail to see how we can pass bill after bill after bill requiring extra costs to the Government, without any opposition, and then expect appropriation bills to come in cut below what they were the year before. I think that is so foolish, such a fake idea, that there is going to be a lot of budget cutting when it is impossible to do it, that I think that idea is not going to take with the American people. When you analyze the budget and the acts of the Congress that require these expenditures, you will find that 75 percent of them are not for the committee to cut. We are all for economy, but the most foolish economy is to be penny wise and pound foolish. I hope this House does not do anything like that.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our distinguished majority leader for having brought this entire subject of the budget into such clear and sharp focus.

Most of us would like nothing better than to be able somehow to reduce the cost of government dramatically if it were possible to do so without causing truly essential Government services to suffer.

Unfortunately, it is not easy. In fact, really spectacular reductions in the operating expenses of our Government could be achieved only at the price of rather severe curtailments in our military strength. This is true because approximately 80 percent of our entire Federal budget goes in one way and another to pay for past wars and to maintain our readiness in the hope that, by being prepared, we can prevent a future war.

Only about 20 cents of the Federal tax dollar remains to perform the entire broad spectrum of wholly nonmilitary Federal activities. This is the first thing we must recognize when we begin to sharpen our budget-cutting scissors.

Certainly it is the responsibility of Congress to eliminate every vestige of waste or extravagance that can be found. Clearly we have the duty to root out as ruthlessly as possible any duplication, overlapping, or inefficiency that can be found.

This we have been doing and will, I am sure, continue to do.

A few years ago, I joined with other Members in the sponsorship of several proposals embodying major recommendations of the Hoover Commission. A number of these bills passed, and we are enjoying today the rather substantial economies they made possible.

The military has made great strides in the consolidation of warehousing space and hundreds of millions have been saved. Disposal of surplus commodities has been toughened up and military procurement practices have been centralized and unified at considerable savings.

Each year since I have been in Congress, the lawmaking branch in its appropriations process has made substantial cuts in certain Presidential budget requests. This has been true in both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Yet the myth persists that a great, uncontrollable orgy of waste is going on. Some people appear to believe that Congress should approach the delicate and difficult and complex business of Federal appropriations with an indiscriminate meat ax rather than with a surgeon's instrument.

Broad and generalized charges are repeated, but the facts do not substantiate them. One such charge has been that our Government is dashing headlong into what its critics call a welfare state. Yet the facts do not bear this out. As a proportion of the Federal budget, welfare type expenditures have declined markedly over the past generation. Just 25

years ago, welfare programs of various types accounted for 44 percent of our total Federal budget. Today, they account for only some 6 or 7 percent.

Another charge has been that the Government is developing what the critics call a vast horde of Federal bureaucrats. Once again, the facts do not support the allegation. In 1946, out of every 1,000 American citizens 19 were civilian employees of the Federal Government. Today, the ratio has been reduced to 13 out of every 1,000. And of this 13, 6 are civilian employees of our armed services.

Unquestionably the basic underlying reason for the size of our Federal budget is the world in which we live. Whether we like it or not, the mantle of world leadership has fallen to our shoulders. For this, we pay a price. It is basically the price of providing the shield and the armor of freedom itself.

Out of each Federal tax dollar, about 61 cents go for our current military effort and for our space effort. We do this because we know that we live in a day when only the strong can stay free.

The next largest single item in the budget is the fixed interest charge on the national debt which claims approximately 11 cents of each Federal tax dollar. Most of this debt, of course, was accumulated during World War II.

A third big item is the veterans program in all its facets, which represents some 6 cents of the tax dollar for those services to widows and orphans, veterans' hospitals, and similar programs by which a grateful Nation has attempted to demonstrate that it appreciates the sacrifices of those who gave of their wholeness in defense of our country.

Add these three together, and the conclusion is unmistakable. War and the continuing competition with world communism account for the lion's share of our Federal outlays. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara is working valiantly to provide a lean, hard-hitting Defense Establishment. He has made remarkable strides in trimming away all the fat that he can find. Yet there is a limit to what can be done in this line while still upholding our military responsibilities. No thinking person wants the Congress to take unnecessary chances with our military strength. We would be derelict in our duty indeed were we to place this land of ours at the mercy of those who have no mercy.

Let us by all means eliminate every item of waste that can be found. But let us not be stampeded into rash actions. Let us proceed in a statesmanlike fashion. Let us keep this matter in its rightful perspective. For it would avail us nothing if we were to save even several billion dollars and let the cause of freedom fail.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his very fine statement. It is in line with the point I am trying to make.

We have heard these statements about the possibility of cutting out \$13 billion. Analyze it any way you wish, we cannot do it without hurting national defense and other programs which serve the American people which we cannot afford to cut out.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our distinguished majority leader. The information he brings us is particularly helpful.

I am sure the membership on the majority side is as interested in economy as is any member of the minority. I noticed with some sadness a statement recently in the Wall Street Journal entitled "Economy, Anyone?" And it went on to say:

"Some budget cutters in Congress seek more funds for pet projects."

I noticed with particular interest this particular comment in the Wall Street Journal. They pointed out a simple fact that should be printed with this story. The opening paragraph of this story reads as follows:

An Indiana Congressman pressures a committee of the House to add \$25 million to the budget to help build a deepwater port in his district.

A Virginia lawmaker introduces legislation for a \$39 million James Madison memorial building here in the Nation's Capital. Some Virginia economist is mentioned as seeking a \$50 million Patent Office in his own district.

The whole text of this seems to support the idea that these economizers rush to the floor and support economy in the other fellow's district, but even the loudest criers for economy still push for more spending for their own districts, States, or special interests.

One of the economizers from Indiana seeks \$25 million of the taxpayers' money for a deepwater port in his district that serves no useful purpose in northern Indiana because Chicago and a number of other ports can adequately take care of the need. This is not economy.

I am deeply saddened that some of my Indiana colleagues on the minority side are not present for I would like to enter into a colloquy with them about this project.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. In connection with these documents that have been mentioned and with special reference to the letter which the minority leader has given such emphasis—the letter from the former President of the United States—some of the distinguished members of the Republican Party, some who have held office in the Republican Party, one of whom was Republican National Committee chairman, have said that these estimates of how much the budget might be cut were way out of line. As a matter of fact, his estimate was about \$3 billion, as a practical matter. So it is quite evident that even within the Republican Party they know that this projected cut of \$13 billion is wholly unrealistic and actually threatens the security of the United States.

I am glad to see that some of the distinguished members of the Republican Party are in disagreement with the former President.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his statement; and now I would like to continue.

Now let us turn to the Department of the Interior, another operation in which many of us are vitally interested. An estimated \$153 million must be cut from that budget if the Republican's \$15 billion goal is to be reached—far more than even the deep cuts sought by the appropriations committee last week.

A total of 26,735 man-years of employment would be lost. The budget of the Bureau of Land Management would be reduced by \$4.4 million; the National Park Service, by \$48.4 million; the Bureau of Reclamation by \$27.5 million; the Bureau of Indian Affairs by \$34.9 million—and the slashes go down into the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife; the Bonneville Power Administration; and the Southwestern Power Administration.

The Bureau of Land Management would be compelled to kill construction programs planned in a number of States—including Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming.

The National Park Service would be forced to take similar steps. Work planned in parks in Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands—and other States—work planned in those States would be halted by the Republican budget busters.

The same is true for the other bureaus in the Department of the Interior.

A more detailed listing is now inserted in the Record. This is insert No. 6.

The Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture would have its effectiveness drastically reduced. A detailed breakdown of the effects of the \$45 million cut there is now placed in the Record. This is insert No. 7.

Now let us look at the rest of Agriculture.

A 15-percent budget cut must come under the Republican plan.

A total of \$5.7 billion of the \$7.2 billion agricultural budget request for 1964 must be used for previous commitments.

This leaves only \$1.5 billion from which to make the proposed Republican cuts.

Thus, an overall 15-percent cut for the Department as a whole would leave only \$511 million for the following programs:

Research, education, soil and water conservation, meat and poultry inspection, plant and animal disease and pest control, marketing services, food distribution, crop insurance, REA loans, and flood protection.

Such a severe cut would mean closing down most research laboratories and disbanding their highly trained staffs.

It would mean cutting Federal support for the Cooperative Extension Services by nearly \$1 million a State and firing an average of 700 extension workers in each State, or one or more in each county in the Nation.

It would mean eliminating 38 million acres of soil surveys, about two man-years of technical assistance of each of the 2,900 soil conservation districts, and substantially slowing down 11 major flood prevention projects.

And it would mean:

Eliminating or drastically reducing the 700 crop and livestock estimate reports essential for the computation of parity prices.

Shutting down several hundred Federal meat and poultry inspection houses.

Eliminating electric service to 76,000 new rural customers and new or improved service to 99,000 rural subscribers.

Eliminating crop insurance programs from 700 counties and depriving more than a quarter of a million farmers of crop insurance protection for which they are willing to pay.

Stopping work in the eradication of plant and animal diseases and pest control, such as brucellosis, tuberculosis, hog cholera, cattle tick, Japanese beetle and sweet potato weevil to name a few.

Reducing by \$90 million the amount of food distributed through the States to needy persons, including 10 million schoolchildren and more than 5 million persons in institutions and homes.

Reducing the food stamp program assistance by \$25 million—enough to assist 200,000 needy persons in 23 economically depressed areas.

Curtailling watershed projects in Michigan and many other States.

At this point, I place insert No. 7 into the Record, giving an itemized description of the harm budget cutters would do to watershed and flood control projects.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I know that the gentleman is going to insert in the Record insertion 5 which details some of the public works projects affected by this cut.

I recall coming here in the 83d Congress. For the first 2 years I sat on the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. The Public Works Committee at that time was chaired by a member of the opposition party. I recall the arguments used in those days about this is no time to have any new starts because we were in the Korean war, and we should not get into these particular projects at that time.

The Congress went along. I joined the Committee on Appropriations 2 years later, and we did start some new projects. I think it is pennywise and pound foolish to have this kind of a program, a program which says we ought to have no new starts because this is not the time to do it. Savage waters and floods are not the respecter of time at all. So we held off building public works projects. I am not talking about deepening harbors, rivers, and the channels of some

rivers around the country. I am talking about strictly flood control projects.

So we held off. We did not build the projects. But the storms came. They came in 1955, they came a couple of years thereafter. We lost lives, we lost property, and I say any bill of particulars which details a \$145 million slash in the Engineers' budget is risking lives and the protection of property.

There are listed in the gentleman's insertion over 125 projects which will be stopped, either during construction or no new plants.

I think the membership of this House ought to go slow in this particular area. There are many other areas, too, with which I am concerned, the area with respect to the accelerated public works program, the Housing Home Agency programs. I sit on the subcommittee that makes money available to the agency, and I sit on the committee that makes available money for the Federal Aviation Agency. I am happy to see the distinguished and great chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce sitting here. The bill of particulars will cut \$111 million from this agency. Detailed for expenditure in fiscal 1964 is \$755 million for the Federal Aviation Agency. Of that figure \$127 million goes toward facilities and equipment. That is, the kind of things that make air traffic safe in the United States. When you start to cut these you get into an area where I think you endanger the lives and property of people who fly on these planes and the people who live underneath them.

I think this dialogue is good, not for the purpose of getting into an argument with the party of opposition but only for the purpose of letting the people of America know that there are areas detailed by the opposition that are dangerous areas in which to cut.

I hope that the membership of the House will read this dialogue and the insertions that the distinguished majority leader will put in here in detail, showing the areas that will be cut if we would follow the advice of the distinguished former President of the United States and also some of those who serve in this body.

I think it is a record that the people of this Nation ought to read, and the membership of this House ought to read.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his very splendid contribution to this discussion.

And now let us consider the \$796 million reduction in the area of health, labor, and welfare.

A total of \$697 million would be chopped out of the budget of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

The Food and Drug Administration would have its capacity to protect consumers reduced sharply. Its ability to implement and enforce the new drug safeguards would be hit a body blow.

The Republican ax would drop on the Nation's schoolchildren.

Literally millions of youngsters would be deprived of school lunch and milk programs.

By whacking \$39 million out of the \$284 million of new authority requested

for these programs, we would be forced to cut them by 14 percent.

The results:

There will be 381 million fewer meals served to schoolchildren.

There will be 417 million fewer half-pints of milk distributed.

The lunch program will drop 2.2 million children, an average of 40,000 per State.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to particularly commend the gentleman for his comments on this point. There are three areas that the gentleman comments on which particularly deserve attention. The first is the item which the gentleman discussed in regard to the proposal of our Republican brothers to reduce the food stamp program which would be required by the projected cuts and eliminate some 200,000 needy persons in 23 economically depressed areas. This would be a cruelty and a hardship on these people of almost unbelievable dimensions and deprive these people in a very real sense of a good, wholesome, and stable diet. More than this, it would impose a terrific additional servitude on the welfare payments of these communities which are forced to bear the load and the hardship which these agencies have to carry. Now, over and above this is another item of particular importance, and that is, from what our Republican brothers have indicated, it becomes plain that there would be a reduction, according to their plans, in the force of the Food and Drug Administration to protect the consumers. This is a particularly sensitive area. During the last session of the Congress we passed legislation which imposed a tremendous responsibility on the Food and Drug Administration which, coupled with previous enactments dealing with food additives and with color additives and now with additional policing responsibility in the field of drugs, requires a tremendous increase in the staff of the Food and Drug Administration to provide the level of protection that is needed.

The Food and Drug Administration requires this money not only to protect the people but to give industry the kind of service it requires, to see to it that the industry has the kind of quick service and the quick clearance of these substances which enables industry to make changes and which would enable the industry to market the products at an accelerated rate, possibly new drugs, which might result in a tremendous saving of life, and to give the Food and Drug Administration the kind of staff, technically competent staff, to accept or to reject new drugs which may have side effects of the most dreadful sort upon those who would receive them. This is one of the things that was particularly obvious in the drug hearings in the Senate and in our own committee in the last session of the Congress, and that is lack of adequate personnel. The Food and Drug Administration is incapable of giving the people of this country the kind of protection they need and giving the

industry the kind of service it needs unless they have adequate personnel. Over and above this, which I think is particularly important, is the direct action that the Republican projected program would have on young people. For example, it can be anticipated from their program, as the gentleman pointed out, that something like \$16.9 million in cash payments to the States, an average of about \$300,000 per State, would be eliminated from the school lunch program. Many of our children in this country today have no opportunity to have a good, warm lunch, sufficiently balanced and good in body except that which they receive through their school lunch program. This is something else that our Republican friends would do to us and do to the people in every part of the country in their pennywise and pound-foolish advocacy of reduction, so I particularly commend my friend for his comments today.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes, briefly.

Mr. CURTIS. It is hard to have those wild statements go by unchallenged. Of course, you can dream up everything that is most attractive to the public such as the school lunch program and say that the Republicans are out to wipe it out. There is no evidence of that. There are no plans along those lines.

Mr. Speaker, I might say, and I will have my 20 minutes to respond, what we are trying to do is to hold the budget and expenditures to the level of fiscal year 1963, which reflects an increase of \$18 billion in a period of 3 years in Federal expenditures, from \$81 billion, as compared to an \$11 billion increase in the previous 6 years. Here is what we are trying to do, and to bring out these very attractive programs you are demonstrating exactly, I might say to the majority leader, why it is necessary to keep within our own confines our itemizations, otherwise you will stir up every pressure group in the United States to try to prevent it.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I want to point out that the cutback of funds for the food stamp program would have dreadful effects in my community. We are about to commence the program on May 1. Some 68,000 recipients of this program in my community are waiting for the benefits which are going to supplement their very low relief allocations.

Mr. Speaker, in my community as a result of the policies of the State government which is not responding to the needs of the local communities, the family allowances for relief have been cut back to 60 percent of the need. This matter of the food stamp supplementation is absolutely imperative. We are one of the new communities involved in this program. We would suffer dreadfully if it were cut back at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in order to reorient this discussion and to bring it back to the issue with which it was begun, I would like again to quote from the Washington

Post, which purportedly on March 5 published the account of a Republican task force press session, and this is the quote:

A House Republican study group announced yesterday that it has found projects costing \$10 billion to \$15 billion which can and should be cut from appropriations requested for next year.

Now, of course, that means that from \$10 billion to \$15 billion has got to give from somewhere in the budget. What I have been trying to do is to apply such cuts to the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, I see the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in the Chamber, and I would like to say that the Federal Aviation Agency would suffer a cut of \$111 million, eliminating over 1,100 operating and planned facilities required for the safety of air traffic control if a total cut of \$15 billion is applied to that Agency.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to also join in complimenting our distinguished majority leader in bringing to the attention of the House this realistic discussion of this highly sensitive and what has been so well described as complicated national budget.

The gentleman mentioned something about proposed reductions in our Federal aviation program. I have not seen the bill of particulars. I do not know just what services are to be reduced. I am concerned about any attempted reduction in the total funds to the extent mentioned by our distinguished majority leader affecting this service, because I think we should remind ourselves, each one of us, that not only are the lives of millions and millions of people who utilize the commercial airlines services of this country, but it has only been 4 years ago or a little more that, in an effort to try to bring about greater safety, authority to control the military aviation program was given to the Federal Aviation Agency and a substantial part of the funds to which the gentleman refers here is made necessary because of the increased responsibility that has been shifted from our military program to the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I think each one of us had better give long and careful and thoughtful consideration before we attempt to do anything that would endanger the lives of our people who are going to use these services. Whether we like it or not, they are going to use them in the future, and I for one will be watching what happens. I am confident that the Committee on Appropriations is going to take that into consideration, as did the gentleman from Massachusetts a moment ago so well expressed in his comments to the Members of the House.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his very fine contribution.

Twelve thousand schools, child-care centers, summer camps, and other non-profit groups will be dropped from the

milk program, an average of over 250 per State.

For the benefit of our Republican colleagues, I will present the financial savings to the Federal Government.

We would save \$16.9 million in cash payments to States—an average of more than \$300,000 a State—on the lunch program; and \$14.2 million—an average of \$284,000—on the milk program. I, for one, will not look upon those savings with pride.

A \$50 million reduction in the Department of Labor budget would reduce appropriations for State employment services by \$25 million, thus destroying 4,800 jobs. Also, it would cut \$25 million from the Manpower Development and Training Act, thus preventing 22,400 workers from getting retraining. I insert a State-by-State breakdown of these disastrous economies into the RECORD. This is insert No. 8.

I turn to the field of commerce and transportation, where the Republican reduction must total \$424 million.

ARA was established to eliminate pockets of depression that affect 35 million people in 1,000 areas. The 15-percent reduction in the Department of Commerce budget would reduce the allocation for the Area Redevelopment Administration by \$28.5 million. This would mean 10,000 fewer jobs would be created in 1964. The regions hardest hit by this job killing are listed in insert No. 9, hereby placed into the RECORD.

A total of \$500 million needed to supplement the existing accelerated public works program would be cut. Looking at this supplemental appropriation, we see that for every million dollars deleted from this program, 1,600 man-months of employment are lost.

The \$500 million would provide approximately 120,000 man-years of employment. If we turn our backs on this appropriation, we turn our backs on communities that have already drawn plans for needed public works projects. We turn our backs on the unemployed because they are concentrated in those areas.

A State-by-State list of past accelerated public works achievements is hereby inserted into the RECORD. This is insert No. 10.

Ship construction would be cut by \$16.5 million.

A total of \$37 million would be cut from the Weather Bureau, from the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and other agencies that provide scientific information essential to transportation—particularly aviation—and our defense and space programs. Details of this \$37 million cut are listed in insert No. 11, now placed in the RECORD.

The budget of the Federal Aviation Agency would be cut by \$111 million, eliminating over 1,100 operating and planned facilities required for the safety of air traffic.

Communities like West Chicago, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Abilene, Tex.; and Utica, N.Y., would be among the 100 American communities where airport traffic control towers would be closed out.

Seventy instrument landing systems and 50 approach light systems also would be destroyed.

Elimination of radar procedures designed to prevent midair collision would be forced.

And hundreds of communities would be deprived of Federal assistance in making airport improvements.

The aviation industry contributes nearly \$12 billion annually to the gross national product. It depends upon public confidence. I now place a list of the GOP targets into the RECORD. This is insert No. 12.

And now let us talk about the Post Office Department and its modest \$78 million prorated reduction.

The effect of that reduction will be felt in Grand Rapids, Mich.; in Canton, Ohio; in Rensselaer, Ind.; in Pekin, Ill.; in Nashville, Tenn.; in Chicago, in Detroit, in San Francisco, in New York City, in Boston, in Denver—in other cities and towns across the nation.

Extension of daily city delivery service to approximately 1 million new homes and small businesses which normally would receive such service would stop.

Rural delivery service would be frozen through fiscal 1964, and all Saturday rural deliveries would be stopped.

The day-to-day handling of mail in every major city in the United States would be seriously crippled due to no further purchases of all mail-handling equipment, such as postage meters, facer cancelers.

The Post Office Department's research and engineering program would be wiped out.

Let us look at another vital governmental function, one that would suffer a \$50 million slash in the Republican bloodletting.

The Coast Guard would be compelled to make its reductions in its replacement budget because of fixed items in other categories.

In other words, replacement of obsolescent ships, buildings, and other facilities would be halted.

The Coast Guard's ability to perform its functions would be threatened, as indicated by insert No. 13, which I now place in the RECORD.

Another small, but vital agency is the Small Business Administration.

Its prorated share of the Republican cut would be \$30 million.

Many field and regional offices would be closed. For example, offices in Maine, Virginia, and Texas would be shut down.

Its loans to small businesses would be reduced, both in size and volume. It could accept no more loan applications for fiscal year 1964. Its relationship with commercial banks would be damaged.

Insert No. 14, a list of areas that could be hit by an SBA cut, is placed into the RECORD.

The Civil Aeronautics Board would be compelled to make its \$10 million slash by eliminating airline subsidies for flight frequencies, so fares would be jacked up.

Let us discuss the effect of a \$55 million reduction in the housing and community development activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

This would mean a one-third reduction in public facility loans, in loans for

housing for the elderly, and in loans to families dislocated by Federal projects.

This would mean that 70 small communities would be deprived of financial assistance in construction of essential water and sewer systems.

It would mean that 15 projects for the elderly—with facilities for 1,650 housing units—would be deleted.

And the cut in the loans for persons displaced by urban renewal and other Federal aid projects would mean that 2,250 families could not obtain financing they need for homes. Again, there is a group that needs help the most, would be hurt the most.

Mr. Speaker, we move to another major category:

Education, which would be reduced by \$242 million.

Vocational education would be cut in half.

National defense fellowships would be reduced from 1,500 to 750.

Cooperative research programs would be cut by 69 percent.

The assistance to libraries would be cut in half.

Training of teachers for the mentally retarded would be curtailed.

The slash of \$81 million in the National Science Foundation would be a blow to our requirements for highly trained technical manpower.

And I want to say parenthetically here—as the President pointed out in his message to Congress on education on last January 29—that Soviet institutions of higher learning are graduating three times as many engineers and four times as many physicians as we are.

Thousands of promising students would be deprived of fellowships they need to continue their education.

Expansion and modernization of science and engineering facilities would be halted.

The training of teachers would be slowed at a time when they will be needed to meet the demands caused by the enrollment in colleges of the 1946 baby boom.

Vital research programs would be stalled.

The college housing program would be curtailed by \$41 million, resulting in cancellation of 30 college housing projects. This would mean that about 8,000 students may be denied a college education because of a shortage of dormitory space.

Construction of schools for our Indian population would be hard hit. In Alaska, for example, construction of eight schools by the Bureau of Indian Affairs would be called off. Others would be blocked in Arizona.

Now for another major area: international affairs and finance. The total reduction here would be \$620 million.

Of that figure, \$476 million would come out of the Agency for International Development—and this is substantially more than any reasonable review of that budget would permit.

The State Department would be cut \$50 million, U.S. Information Agency by \$30 million, the food-for-peace program by \$30 million, and the Peace Corps budget by \$15 million.

Now let us examine the effect on the Veterans' Administration.

A prorated \$740 million reduction in appropriations for the Veterans' Administration—its share of the proposed \$15 billion reduction—would have these effects:

First. Twenty-two thousand, nine hundred and sixty-five jobs would be cut out.

Second. Many regional offices would be abolished. Divisions in others would have to be consolidated.

Third. Services would be reduced because of the reduced personnel. Work could not be processed as it should. Huge backlogs would develop.

Fourth. The loss of physicians, medical administrators, engineers, nurses, statisticians, and other professional or skilled employees would hamper present medical programs, hinder planning.

Fifth. A 50-percent decrease in the medical research program would result in dismissal of 1,500 skilled research people. Their activities include research in medicine, surgery, psychiatry, neurology, problems of the aging, and pulmonary diseases. Research would be eliminated or curtailed in cancer, arteriosclerosis, use of tranquilizers in psychiatry, coronary heart disease surgery, and the automatic processing of heart tracings.

Sixth. Eight hospitals would be closed, eliminating medical care for 30,000 patients.

Seventh. Construction of seven new hospitals with 5,260 beds would be deferred. Modernization of 15 old hospitals with 18,088 beds would be delayed, as would 41 improvement projects in 37 other hospitals. No new research facilities would be built.

Eighth. No commitments would be made to help provide loans on 19,700 homes in areas of short money supply.

Ninth. Payments to 800,000 of the Nation's pensioners with service-connected disabilities would be eliminated. Pensions to 1 million disabled veterans and 800,000 widows and orphans would be cut by \$60 a year.

Tenth. An estimated 200,000 veterans would be denied admission to hospitals during the year. This load would be shifted to already overtaxed State and local hospitals.

The loss of VA employees would include these positions:

Medical administration and miscellaneous: 165 positions, including 57 construction specialists.

Medical and prosthetic research: 1,500 skilled investigators.

Medical care: 18,500 employees, including 2,200 nurses and 900 physicians.

Insert No. 15, now placed in the RECORD, provides a clear idea of the cities and towns hardest hit by curtailment of the Veterans' Administration hospital program.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the excellent speech being made by the majority leader has pointed up in many, many cases the fundamental weakness in this shotgun approach

which has been adopted from the other side of the aisle with regard to the proposed budget reduction.

While each and every one of us has a stake in seeing that sensible reductions are made, I think we have an equally important stake in seeing that we keep faith with the people of America in the obligations which we have undertaken. And certainly this field which has just been mentioned by the distinguished majority leader of the effect upon our Veterans' Administration program is an excellent example of this.

If we go down the line with the proposed reductions to include the Veterans' Administration program in it, if we cut off the needed new hospital facilities that must be built to meet the requirements of our veteran population, if we cut down upon the services which are essential to the veterans, to the pensioners who are dependent upon the assistance from the Government for their very livelihood, if we take these steps in the veterans program certainly we break faith with the veterans of America just as we would be breaking faith with the schools of America and with the small communities of America and with the States of America if we cut back upon programs to which this Government has become firmly committed.

The proposed \$15 billion cut would require inevitably a breach of faith with the American people upon more than a score of different vital fronts in our country.

I certainly join the gentleman in the hope that we will have this so-called bill of particulars at the earliest possible hour.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank my colleague for his fine contribution.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I am sure it is pretty clear from what is being said on this side that the Members here do not object to cutting the budget. What has been done with respect to the bill we had on the floor today indicates that. Here is the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations where the budget was cut by the committee some 9 percent. I am certain the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill that will be here on Thursday will contain not a light cut but a substantial reduction. I am sure this will hold true in a number of areas.

Those of us who sit on the Committee on Appropriations are screening all of the requests of the various agencies. There is not a question about the fact that we will bring bills to this floor here that will have substantial cuts. But when they talk about a \$10- to \$15-billion cut, then they get up to the stratosphere. This is absolutely unreasonable. This is fiscal irresponsibility.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] a moment ago pointed to the cut in the Veterans' Administration budget. The budget for the Veterans' Administration this year amounts to about \$5.3 billion. At least two-thirds

of that budget is composed of fixed charges, compensations and pensions, the money that we pay to educate the G.I.s. All of this is occasioned by legislation passed almost unanimously by this House. When you cut \$740 million out of this budget you are really hurting this agency.

The high employment in the Veterans' Administration occurred in 1946 when the Veterans' Administration reported 226,000 employees. This year, that figure has been reduced substantially. The Veterans' Administration in 1963 reported total employment of 173,000. I think this is good. This is action by both sides of the aisle. I have no quarrel with that. I say it is good. But I do say that those who believe this budget can be cut from \$10 to \$15 billion place a sense of irresponsibility on the Members who serve on the Committee on Appropriations. I think that committee has shown it does a good job when the job has to be done. The bills brought to this floor by the subcommittees and the full Committee on Appropriations will show that there is real responsibility on the part of the Members who serve on that committee, both on this side and the other side.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. The point I want to make, and I think the gentleman has made it clearly, is that if you make this 10-percent cut, which would involve not adding any new obligational authority, then, if you cut 10 percent from a \$108-billion budget you have a cut of from \$10 to \$15 billion. Let the Appropriations Committee continue as it did today and drop it out, and we have our answer.

Mr. BOLAND. The problem is, and I think the gentleman from Missouri recognizes it, is that you cannot go into a meat-ax approach by just cutting 10 percent. The members of the Committee on Appropriations and all Members who sit in this Chamber will cut where the cuts ought to come. But when you say willy-nilly we are going to cut 10 percent, this is a bad approach. I think you have to place some faith in the members of the Committee on Appropriations and you have to trust their judgment. This will happen in connection with all of the bills that will be brought to the floor, but this committee is not going to sit down and say, "We will knock 10 percent off here and 10 percent off there and 10 percent off the total amount." You just cannot do it. That is fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with that. All I am pointing out is that the Committee on Appropriations did cut this 10 percent, and if we project it across the \$108 billion request for new obligational authority you have your \$11 billion.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, on that point, and I think it is highly important, the second appropriation bill, which has just been reported and is being scheduled for consideration Thursday, contains a reduction of only 2 or 3 percent.

That total would be a fraction of 1 percent of the total Federal budget.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. This is the very essence of what we are talking about. With reference to this idea of an across-the-board cut, you have to start off by admitting that you cannot cut the interest on the national debt. You cannot cut it 10 percent. You cannot cut it 5 percent. You cannot cut it 1 percent. You cannot cut it at all.

Now if you apply 10 percent to the Defense Establishment, 10 percent of \$55 billion would be \$5½ billion. That would be sheer folly.

The gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, just talked about using the meatax on agencies like the Federal Aviation Agency which would mean cutting out the aviation control towers and radar equipment and the other things that make it possible for you to fly safely.

So I predict—and I saw the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] with a brown envelope under his arm, and I am sorry he is not here—he talked about a bill of particulars, which was a great secret. We counted on a bill of particulars from the Republicans. But it is going to be just like the gentleman in the other body pointed out this morning, the recommendation of our distinguished former President Eisenhower is drastic and is not responsive to the conditions of the day.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is probably the first time that a woman ever had any difficulty in getting the last word on something.

I would like to associate myself with Congressman Boggs, that the Committee on Appropriations worked very hard to cut items. More than 50 people appeared in public hearings. Fifty members of the public, and not one person appearing offered any cuts nor did they offer any opportunity to make cuts nor did they show any desire for cuts. And when certain items were not included in the appropriation bill, they informed various of us Members that they were going over to the other body to have them put in over there. I may say that these people who want these research facilities and so on added to the bill are not Democrats. We would enjoy having them, but we know that there are certain limitations.

I do want to point out one thing. Mr. BOLAND has discussed the harbors and flood control programs. I want to say that on the west coast, we face the problem of keeping our trade facilities always in order. Many of us last year were able to support a trade bill because a great part of our district is based on trade. Of course, it is necessary to carry

on that trade through the ever-protective work on the harbors and rivers, particularly in the channel deepening programs. In my own district and in Mrs. GREEN's district and in the rest of Oregon, and in the upper river it is necessary to have channel deepening in order to bring in any shipping whatsoever. If you curtail that shipping, you are curtailing the economy of our section of the country, and you will be putting more people out of work than are out of work at the present time. So I am very happy, may I say to the distinguished majority leader, that you are calling these facts to our attention today. I do not think the people in the West would for a moment want to go along on any program that would prevent the deepening of the Columbia River or the improvement of the harbors which mean more trade.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman very much for the very fine statement she has made.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I am sorry to interfere with the majority leader's exercise, but I would like to ask one question. I would like to be clear on this: Have you or any members of your party seen this so-called bill of particulars?

Mr. ALBERT. I have not. We have asked for it. The Speaker of the House has asked the Republican task force to produce it, but up to now it has not been produced.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I have not seen it either, but the reason I asked the question of the distinguished majority leader is simply this. As I have listened to the exercise put on by the majority leader and his people, I have been under the impression that they had seen it and that they were specifically rebutting the Republican position. In other words, if they do not know what the Republican position is, how can they rebut the Republican position? I am really confused about that.

Mr. ALBERT. The answer to that is simply this. A task force purportedly issued a press release in which it stated up to \$15 billion could be cut. We have applied that cut across the agencies and these are the results—that is all there is to it. That is all there is to it.

Mr. CLEVELAND. You people have done the prorating. You have not seen the bill of particulars.

Mr. ALBERT. We have no other way to approach the problem. We have done this in a pro rata way in those places where fixed budgetary items are not included.

Mr. CLEVELAND. It is your pro rata, it is not the Republican pro rata. You have not seen the bill of particulars.

Mr. ALBERT. No, it is prorating a very big Republican estimate.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. The point is that every Republican statement we have had except the statement made by the two gentlemen from the other body to whom I

referred a moment ago talked about a cut of from \$10 to \$15 billion. They were ridiculous. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], if my recollection serves me correctly, said the budget could be cut between \$10 and \$15 billion, while former President Eisenhower in the letter which the minority leader put into such great circulation and which I have put in the Record, said it was between \$10 and \$12 billion. We asked the minority leader for a bill of particulars.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the majority leader for his very excellent presentation of a very important matter. I do not know of any matter that so deeply affects this great Nation of ours than does this legislative budget.

To make a meat-ax cut of \$15 billion is not only going to severely hurt the defense of this Nation of ours, but will affect the lives of all our people, every segment of our economy, and this indirectly will be harmful throughout the free world.

I listened very attentively to the chairman of the Space Subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. He talked about what the setback to the space program would be. I think we learned a terrible and a devastating lesson when we got behind with our missile program by waiting and cutting back the budget and letting the Russians get ahead of us with sputnik.

This particular so-called Republican \$15 billion cut, this meat-ax approach would cut almost a billion dollars out of agriculture. But getting back to our space program, in 15 States they would cut something like 65,000 jobs, where 65,000 people would be taken from jobs where people are now employed.

They are working on this vast scientific program right now. They will be told: "Well, we have spent a lot of money getting ready in this program, but you cannot work any longer, you are cut back, you are curtailed"; "the Republican budget meat ax got your job." In my own home State of Louisiana some 6,000 employees would be dismissed from the Saturn project at the vast Michoud plant in New Orleans and Slidell, which is one of the most important, and so regarded by all the scientists in America and throughout the entire world, as one of the most important space projects at this period in the entire world. This project will send men to the moon unless the budget is cut.

There are some 15 or 16 States that are directly affected, and many more indirectly affected in this space program where present employees would be discharged with this Republican budget cut.

This idea of people coming up here and saying that they are for economy in Government and for cutting useless expenditures is not a monopoly. I think there are just as many Democrats on this side who are for economy in Government as there are Republicans on that side. But on the other hand you have to realize that this is a great Nation and that we are fighting for our own survival to continue as a great free Nation. If

we are going to do that we are going to have to take care of our national defense. Why, when you talk about a \$15 billion cut, why do you not say \$25 billion? Why do you not make it \$50 billion? It is just as easy to say "cut \$50 billion" as it is to say "cut \$15 billion." You Republicans can go back home and tell your folks the situation as it has been outlined here and tell them that you were for cutting it back \$50 billion but were not successful; it will be just as easy to use the figure \$50 billion as it is to use the figure \$15 billion. You have got to face reality and you have to face it when you say \$15 billion. And to make that much of a cutback you are going to hurt and severely damage the defense of these United States, you are going to hurt the farmers of this Nation, you are going to cut back practically every farm program, every flood control program and every forestry program and on and on cutting out so many vastly needed programs.

With this \$15 billion meat-ax approach you Republicans would cut almost a billion dollars from our farm program.

In other words, if you do that, under the name of economy, you are going to take it right off the skin of the farmers' backs. That is where it is coming from. At the same time you are taking funds that should go into the development of our natural resources and reforestation, taking care of our forests and improving our Nation.

You Republicans say we should not have this unemployment in one breath and then you say in the next breath you want a meat-ax curtailment of \$15 billion so you will have thousands more unemployed. If you have any consistency at all in your soul you have got to admit you are advocating more and more unemployment, doing a far greater disservice to the unemployment problem than you are in trying to solve it.

I represent the city of Baton Rouge, La., that just got a \$5 million post office and Federal Court Building. We have been waiting for 10 years for that. Those postal employees have been working in the back yard and when it rained they had to get a tarpaulin and put it over the back of the place. They asked me for years why the delay? I told them that we can get only a few new buildings each year in the United States. They say we have to cut the budget, cut down the appropriations. So we just have a few new buildings each year. This Federal building that went to Baton Rouge, capital of the State, was 10 years overdue.

I think there are only 20 such buildings authorized by the Congress this past session, yet over 200 cities in America have qualified for the same type of building, depending upon the proportion and size of each city. Yet of the 200 cities that were eligible only 20 cities got a public building, the other 180 had to wait.

You say wait. Wait for what? How long are we going to have to wait? You get only 20 out of 200. A lot of us will not be around when that last city on the list finally gets its building, a Federal building or post office, that it desperately

needs now. And if you cut this budget we will not get the 20 that were recently authorized.

I just want to read off a few that will be canceled. There are Republicans as well as Democrats who live in these States and cities where you are going to get disastrous results if you cut \$15 billion. You are going to cut construction of so many buildings. This cut would force the GSA to drop the following construction projects:

Arizona—Tucson—\$344,000. You just will not let them have a \$344,000 building that is already programmed.

Arkansas—Pine Bluff—Post office and courthouse, \$2,391,000. Gone with the budget cut.

California—Fresno—Courthouse and Federal office building, \$5,400,000. Same.

Idaho—Boise—Courthouse and Federal office building, \$7,500,000. Same.

That's just a few—there are many more in other States that will be eliminated also.

And there are others in every part of the country, including those that need it the most.

Cleveland, Ohio, needs a much larger building, and they certainly need it badly, but with this \$15 billion cut theirs is eliminated also.

The idea is if you are going to take the meat-ax approach, and you chop so many people up, it does not make any difference what city is affected or what part of the country it is, how bad it is needed or what it is needed for; your building just vanishes into the thin air with the budget cut.

I want to say something when it comes to the defense of the country. I do not think anybody on either side of the aisle has a monopoly on patriotism or a monopoly on economy. I think I am just as much for economy or as patriotic as any Member of Congress.

I can remember when economy was practiced a little bit too much; it was before I came to Congress. Some Members took the meat-ax approach by saying, "Why should we fortify Guam?" Those that voted against fortifying Guam, some did not get reelected when Pearl Harbor came along. It was a terrible lesson and those who want to use the meat-ax \$15-billion-budget-cut approach can profit by the failure to fortify Guam in the early 1940's because some thought then it was more important to both balance and cut the budget than to fortify Guam.

And who does not want to help the farmer? I think many of us sincerely want to help the farmer, but how can some help the farmer by wanting to curtail his program and at the same time try to make the farmer believe that you are helping him? So, the farmer has his product going out the gate and everybody makes a profit out of it as it goes to the market to the final consumer. But, what about the farmer who has produced it? Who is protecting him? It is not the people that want to cut \$15 billion in a meat-ax approach on this appropriation bill and on the agricultural appropriation bill, where flood control, reforestation, watershed, and many agri-

cultural projects will be cut almost a billion dollars.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MORRISON. I say in conclusion, and I beg your pardon for using so much of your time, here you can see just exactly the people that say they want to help the farmer. Well, here is a chance to keep their word and see that the program is not curtailed and see that this almost \$1 billion is not meat-axed out of it, which would set the farmer, the farm program, and the people of this country back years and years with such a disastrous result that we could probably never overcome our devastation.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I have been very interested in the valiant attempt of our great majority leader to elicit from our friends across the aisle on the minority side the most closely guarded top secret in Washington which apparently is, What is the content of this \$15 billion budget cut?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, that is the only secret that has not leaked out in Washington in recent weeks.

Mr. REUSS. That seems to be true, and I have been trying for the life of me to see how this secret can be so well kept. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this \$15 billion cut is apparently the brainchild of the six-man Republican task force, and I also call the gentleman's attention to a story which appeared just a day or two ago in the Wall Street Journal, certainly not a Democratic paper, in which it says that of the six-man House Republican task force masterminding force, to cut the President's money request, four Members have been urging additional unbudgeted funds to the appropriation bills that we are now considering. I ask the gentleman, could it be that the reluctance of the minority leadership to disclose the \$15 billion figure is because 66 2/3 percent, 4 out of 6, of the Republican task force, are apparently budget busters themselves?

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman answers his own question.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I wanted only to add to the colloquy that has been going on between the distinguished majority leader and others my own personal experience that is analogous to what the gentleman from Wisconsin has just said, because last week I went back home to the second largest city in my congressional district to announce the site of a new post office in that district which the people of that community, especially the members of the business community, had long been trying to get and had not been able to, although having a Republican President and a Republican Congress-

man had still not been able to bring to fruition.

But I was happy to be able to announce that they were going to get this new post office. One of the reasons I had pointed out was that I had had such great support in my own efforts from members of the business community and especially members of the chamber of commerce of this particular community.

I pointed out at a chamber of commerce-sponsored luncheon last Friday in the city of Elkhart, Ind., the fact that I had had a lot of letters from some members of that organization urging that we cut the President's budget, but I had not had one single letter from any citizen of that community and specifically from any member of the Elkhart, Ind., Chamber of Commerce, urging that the item for the construction of a new post office in Elkhart, Ind., should be deleted.

Mr. Speaker, I could cite other instances which have to do with other Members of this body in other districts, but I shall restrain myself and give only this personal instance of the example to which my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] has already made reference.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman for a brief statement.

Mr. HALL. I would like to say to the majority leader that I am not nearly as enthusiastic about the exercise of the gentleman and his cohorts as some of the Members on the other side of the aisle have been, nor would I predict, with a 3-to-2 majority on the other side of the aisle, the outcome of the various task forces. But I would certainly say that this is one of the best organized fishing expeditions that I have ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the majority leader that the armed services procurement bill has already passed. That record will stand on its own and for itself.

Mr. Speaker, I regret the invective and the inferences that have been used about an across-the-board, meat-ax type of cut. Although realizing that this is the wrong bait in the fishing expedition, I will say that the task force will in due time, as the distinguished minority leader has said, bring out these various items to prove to the satisfaction of the people of our Nation the differential between the President of our Nation's speech on a Monday in January in his state of the Union message, and its utter inconsistencies the following Thursday in the budget message.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if an effort to cut \$10 to \$15 billion is successful, it will be a real threat to our economic stability.

It would mean more people out of work at a time when unemployment still is a critical problem.

It would be an economic shock and depressant at a time when the economy needs a stimulant.

It would mean that a policy of America last would prevail.

An America last in economic growth.

An America last in education.

An America last in defense.

An America last in assistance to its young people.

In the world today, in the competition with the Soviet Union, an America second is an America last.

We cannot afford to be anything but first.

Our freedom, our safety, our security, and the security of the free world depend upon our being first in defense, first in space, first in education, first in medical care, first in all things vital to the fabric of a great nation.

They would hamstring our space effort. "Why rush to the moon?" they ask.

They are like the skeptics who scoffed at Christopher Columbus. They are like the short-range seers of that day who informed Columbus with a knowing smile that the earth was flat and that he would surely come tumbling off the edge if he persisted in sailing on.

They are the ones who looked at the tiny light that traced the path of Russia's first satellite and said, "Why worry about basketballs in the sky?"

I turn to the prorated \$312 million reduction in general government.

A total of \$114 million would be lopped off the Treasury budget.

The first effect would be the loss of something like \$600 million in taxes, brought about by the reduced effectiveness of the Internal Revenue Service which would sustain a \$110 million reduction.

The level of the operation of Internal Revenue Service would be cut back to 1960.

In terms of manpower, the cut would eliminate 12,000 man-years.

The division which investigates crime and tax fraud would be reduced.

The collection organization would be damaged.

The data processing master file system would be virtually halted.

The Narcotics Bureau's budget cut of \$1 million would reduce its ability to control the illicit drug traffic.

A reduction of \$86 million in the budget of General Services Administration would mean cancellation of construction projects totaling that amount in 10 cities. Also, it should be remembered that for every \$15,000 taken out of General Services Administration's budget, one civilian job dies.

I place insert No. 16 into the RECORD, a list of the projects and the 10 cities.

The Justice Department would be hit by a \$48 million cut. This will mean a substantial reduction in positions and a corresponding loss in effectiveness.

Now this does not include the many new programs which the Republicans have made doubly clear are in line for emasculation. That would come also.

The proposed Education Improvement Act would be paralyzed by a \$1.215 billion slash.

The youth employment opportunities bill would be knocked flat on its back with a \$100 million cut.

The \$195 million needed for civil defense shelters would be knocked out.

Another \$100 million needed to shore up our mass transportation systems in

metropolitan areas would be deleted with gusto.

The rural housing guarantee program, medical education, maternal and child health, the campaign against mental illness and mental retardation—all these will die if the budget cutters have their way.

If they were successful, they must assume an awesome responsibility because their budget knife would have plunged deep into the heart of America's most urgent needs. This budget bloodletting would only mean destruction of these vital programs.

They rattle their political sabers and then they call for broad reductions in defense expenditures. They are like Janus, the old Roman god. Janus had two faces. One looked ahead. One looked behind. You never knew which way Janus was heading or which face to listen to.

Now is not the time to stop.

Now is the time to go, to move ahead.

Now is the time to believe in America, to believe in its resilience, to believe in its people.

We believe that we must meet our Nation's problems, that we must move ahead at a faster pace.

We believe that, at the same time, we must act to stimulate our economy, step up purchasing power, encourage business investment, broaden our industrial base, create more jobs—and bring the day nearer when a balanced economy will mean a balanced budget.

To accept the Republican position would be to shift the country into reverse gear at a time when it needs to shift into high gear.

I have presented a broad picture of what the false economists ask us to do to America.

And I have given some details regarding the specific effects this irresponsible budget slashing would have on the farms, towns and cities of this Nation.

We must repel this attempt to turn the clock back, an attempt that would make America last.

We must recognize our obligations, our responsibilities.

INSERT No. 1

GOP IN HOUSE SEES \$15 BILLION CUTS FEASIBLE

(By Richard L. Lyons)

A House Republican study group announced yesterday that it has found projects costing \$10 billion to \$15 billion which can and should be cut from appropriations requested for next year.

The group of senior GOP members of the Appropriations Committee told a news conference that their study of the budget assisted by Maurice H. Stans, Budget Director during the Eisenhower administration, showed such cuts both feasible and urgent.

Without cuts of this dimension, said Republican FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, chances that Congress will approve a tax cut this year "will be almost nil."

The Republican did not specify where the cuts should be made. They said they had compiled a list but did not want to appear to be prejudging testimony still to be given to the Appropriations Committee.

House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK suggested that Republicans "submit a bill of particulars" before asking Democrats to join their drive on spending.

House GOP leader CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, had suggested previously that \$3 billion might be cut from the defense budget, \$1 billion from each service branch. Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, Republican, of Wisconsin, member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, said sizable amounts could be saved if the Pentagon would require competitive bids for all purchases.

Bow suggested that cuts could be made in the space program and foreign aid. He also listed guidelines for making across-the-board savings. They include holding down new jobs, requiring departments to absorb pay raises effective next January, postponing nonemergency construction and new programs, and cutting down low-priority current programs.

The cuts proposed would be in the \$108 billion new spending authority requested, not in the \$98.8 billion spending budget where \$11.9 billion deficit is expected by the administration. Part of the spending budget will be financed by money appropriated in previous years, but Bow estimated the GOP's proposed cuts would reduce the deficit by \$4 to \$6 billion.

Major budget-cutting crusades have a habit of bogging down because of the complexity of the budget process, and the stake that all parts of the economy have acquired in Federal spending.

Asked if Members of Congress would give up public works projects for their districts to save money, Representative BEN F. JENSEN, of Iowa, senior Republican on the Appropriations Committee, said he was sure they would.

The cry to cut the budget has picked up steam this year from the combination of a planned deficit, a proposed tax cut and the need to raise the debt ceiling.

The administration has asked that the debt ceiling, which is scheduled to drop April 1, be kept at \$308 billion for the rest of the year ending June 30. It will come back later with a request to increase the ceiling to about \$320 billion. The House Ways and Means Committee has delayed action on the temporary \$308 billion request. Republicans apparently are using the threat of a bruising floor fight to try to hold down spending during the rest of this fiscal year.

At the House Ways and Means Committee's tax hearings yesterday, Roswell Magill, Under Secretary of the Treasury 25 years ago, urged Congress to discard the administration's tax reforms and make more modest cuts in taxes. Proposed reforms would wash out much of the tax relief, Magill said. He also urged tighter control over spending.

INSERT No. 2

APPORTIONMENT OF THE REPUBLICAN \$15 BILLION PROPOSAL—NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL 1964. WHERE CAN \$15 BILLION BE CUT?

The Republicans have claimed that \$15 billion can be cut from the President's request for fiscal year 1964 new obligational authority, but refuse to specify where cuts totaling this amount could be made.

Using the total 1964 budget request of \$107.9 billion as a base, it is obvious that interest costs totaling \$10.1 billion cannot be reduced. It can also be assumed that a reduction of the size contemplated involves the elimination of major new programs proposed by the President, which except for military pay increases, total \$1.8 billion in 1964. The remaining \$96 billion of budget requests would thus have to be cut by \$13.2 billion. Since no indication is given of how this would be accomplished, it is reasonable to assume that it would be done on a pro rata basis, across the board, with programs and agencies being reduced according to the proportions which they represent of the total.

The figures:

	[In millions]
Total estimated requests.....	\$107,927
Assume interest payments cannot (or will not) be cut.....	10,103
Remainder	97,824
Assume major new programs pro- posed by the President will be cut (or be in list of cuts), ex- cept for military pay:	
New education program.....	1,215
Youth employment opportuni- ties.....	100
Civil defense shelters.....	195
Urban mass transportation.....	100
Medical education (34) and Hill- Burton hospital modification to permit renovation and mod- ernization of older general hos- pitals, etc. (35).....	69

[In millions]

Assume major new programs, etc.— Continued	
Maternal and child health, in- cluding mental retardation, etc.....	\$19
Land and water conservation fund.....	25
Rural housing guarantee program (to eventually shift direct loans to private banks).....	100
Total, above new programs.....	1,823
Remainder.....	96,000

This remainder allocates by function as shown in column 3, below. If the remain-
ing cut needed to reach \$15 billion were al-
located the same way, the reductions would
be as shown in column 4. Amounts in mil-
lions:

Function	New obligational authority			
	Total in budget	New pro- grams listed above	Remainder	Added cuts needed for \$15,000,000,000 total
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
National defense.....	\$56,702	\$195	\$56,507	\$7,755
International affairs and finance.....	4,514		4,514	620
Space research and technology.....	5,712		5,712	784
Agriculture and agricultural resources.....	7,289	100	7,189	987
Natural resources.....	2,628	25	2,603	357
Commerce and transportation.....	3,091		3,091	424
Housing and community development.....	599	100	499	69
Health, labor, and welfare.....	5,984	188	5,796	796
Education.....	2,983	1,215	1,768	242
Veterans' benefits and services.....	5,594		5,594	768
General government.....	2,277		2,277	312
Allowances:				
For pay adjustment.....	200		200	28
For contingencies.....	250		250	34
Total (excluding interest).....	97,824	1,823	96,000	13,177

Breakdown by agency of reductions in NOA
needed for \$15 billion total,¹ selected
functions

	[In millions]	Reduction needed
International affairs and finance:		
Agency for International Develop- ment.....		\$476
State Department.....		50
U.S. Information Agency.....		30
Department of Agriculture (title II, Public Law 480).....		30
Peace Corps.....		15
Other.....		19
Total.....		620

Breakdown by agency of reductions in NOA
needed for \$15 billion total,¹ selected
functions—Continued

	[In millions]	Reduction needed
Health, labor, and welfare:		
Health, Education, and Welfare.....		\$697
Labor Department.....		50
Department of Agriculture (school lunch and special milk programs).....		39
Other.....		10
Total.....		796

Natural resources:	
Corps of Engineers.....	149
Department of Interior.....	153
Department of Agriculture (Forest Service).....	45
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	6
Other.....	4
Total.....	357
Commerce and transportation:	
Department of Commerce.....	132
Federal Aviation Agency.....	111
Post Office.....	78
Coast Guard (Treasury).....	50
Small Business Administration.....	30
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	13
Other regulatory agencies.....	10
Total.....	424

Breakdown by agency of reductions in NOA
needed for \$15 billion total,¹ selected
functions—Continued

	[In millions]	Reduction needed
Education:		
Health, Education, and Welfare.....		\$101
National Science Foundation.....		81
Housing and Home Finance Agency (college housing loans).....		41
Department of Interior (Indian edu- cation).....		13
Other.....		6
Total.....		242
General Government:		
Treasury (Internal Revenue Service, etc.).....		114
General Services Administration.....		86
Department of Justice.....		48
Legislative branch.....		17
Judiciary.....		9
Other.....		38
Total.....		312

¹ Excluding interest and major new programs
proposed by the President.

INSERT No. 3

A \$784 million slash in NASA budget—the
consequences:

Summary of employment reductions by location	Jobs
Alabama.....	1,600
California.....	9,220
Colorado.....	1,000
Connecticut.....	290
Kansas.....	250
Florida.....	3,200
Louisiana.....	6,340
Mississippi.....	800
Massachusetts.....	1,220
Minnesota.....	770
New York.....	1,890
Alaska.....	50
Missouri.....	1,800
Texas.....	800
Wisconsin.....	800
Iowa.....	600

Subtotal (identifiable contrac- tor locations).....	30,730
Various (unidentified by locations) ¹	35,000
Total.....	65,730

¹ Identification by State is available only
for large prime and first tier subcontractors.
The effects of the proposed reduction on the
employment plans of lower tier subcon-
tractors, vendors and suppliers is approxi-
mately 35,000.

NASA—The budget-cutters' job toll on major contractors

Project	Major prime or subcontractor	Location	Employment reduction
Gemini.....	McDonnell.....	St. Louis, Mo.....	1,800
	Rocketdyne.....	Canoga Park, Calif.....	100
	AI Research.....	Los Angeles, Calif.....	50
	IBM.....	Owego, N.Y.....	50
	Lockheed.....	Sunnyvale, Calif.....	600
	Convair.....	San Diego, Calif.....	800
	Martin.....	Denver, Colo.....	1,000
Apollo.....	NAA.....	Downey, Calif.....	3,600
	NAA subcontractors:		
	Minneapolis-Honey- well.....	Minneapolis, Minn.....	720
	Collins.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa.....	600
	Pratt & Whitney.....	East Hartford, Conn.....	290
	Aerojet-General.....	Sacramento, Calif.....	140
	Avco Corp.....	Massachusetts.....	120
	Northrop.....	Newbury, Calif.....	160
	AI Research.....	Van Nuys, Calif.....	300
	Marquardt.....	do.....	140
	Grumman.....	Bethpage, N.Y.....	1,600
	MIT.....	Cambridge, Mass.....	400
	AC Spark Plug.....	Milwaukee, Wis.....	800
	Raytheon.....	Bedford, Mass.....	400
	Kollsman.....	Elmhurst, N.Y.....	240
	Chrysler.....	New Orleans, La.....	1,120
	Douglas.....	Santa Monica, Calif.....	960

NASA—The budget-cutters' job toll on major contractors—Continued

INSERT No. 5

Project	Major prime or subcontractor	Location	Employment reduction
Saturn I development	Chrysler	New Orleans, La.	1,400
	Douglas	Santa Monica, Calif.	600
Saturn IB development	Chrysler	New Orleans, La.	1,000
	Douglas		300
Saturn V development	Boeing	New Orleans, La.	1,500
	do	Wichita, Kans.	500
	NAA	Downey, Calif.	550
	do	Tulsa, Okla.	50
	Douglas	Santa Monica, Calif.	1,000
	Rocketdyne (NAA) F-1	Canoga Park, Calif.	200
GSE and other		Various	1,600
C. of F.:			
Laurel operations center		Florida	300
Marshall Space Flight Center		Alabama	200
Mississippi test facility		Mississippi	800
Various			720
Center support costs:			
Laurel operations center		Florida	200
Marshall Space Flight Center		Alabama	1,400
Manned spacecraft center		Texas	800
Other			300

INSERT No. 4

CORPS OF ENGINEERS PROJECTS

(Pending and incomplete projects that would be killed or held up by \$149 million reduction)

Alabama: Paint Rock River; Mobile Harbor; Eufaula National Wildlife Refuge lands.

Arizona: Alamo Reservoir; Tucson diversion channel.

Arkansas: Arkansas River and tributaries; Navigation locks and dams; Gillham Reservoir; Ouachita and Black Rivers; Bull Shoals Reservoir Units 7, 8; Greers Ferry Reservoir; Narrows Dam (Third power unit); Helena Harbor, Ark.

California: New Hogan Reservoir; Russian River Reservoir; Sacramento River flood control; Bear Creek; Camanche Reservation; Oroville Reservoir; Sacramento River bank protection; Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff; Ventura-Pierpoint area (reimbursement); Walnut Creek; Duck Creek.

Connecticut: East Branch Reservoir; Hancock Brook Reservoir; Northfield Brook Reservoir; West Thompson Reservoir; Cedar to Silver Beach (reimbursement); Stamford; Westport; Milford Harbor.

Florida: International Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami; Apalachicola River; Bakers Haulover Inlet; Miami Harbor, 1960 act; Canaveral Harbor; Garrison Bight, Key West; Cat Point Channel, Boca Ciega.

Georgia: Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin; Walter F. George Lock and Dam, Eufaula National Wildlife Refuge lands.

Hawaii: Wailoa Stream; Manele Bay, Lanai.

Idaho: Brucis Eddy Reservoir; Boise Valley (Columbia River local protection); Mission-Lapwai.

Illinois: Clear Creek drainage and levee; Sid Simpson (Beardstown); Shelbyville Reservoir; Calumet River and Harbor; Mt. Carmel; Mouth of Sangamon River; Warsaw Harbor.

Indiana: Huntington Reservoir; Levee Unit 5, Wabash River; English; Calumet River and Harbor.

Iowa: Little Sioux River; Van Meter.

Kansas: Pomona Reservoir; Perry Reservoir; Marion Reservoir; Florence.

Kentucky: Barren River Reservoir; Corbin; Green River Reservoir; Grayson Reservoir; Little Sinking Creek.

Louisiana: New Orleans to Venice, Hurricane protection; Big Choctaw Bayou; Bayou Nicholas.

Maine: Portland Harbor, deepen to 45 feet; Searsport Harbor; Kennebec River.

Maryland: St. Michaels Harbor; Nan Cove.

Massachusetts: Chicopee Falls, Mass.; Three Rivers; Conant Brook Reservoir; Plymouth Town Beach.

Michigan: Detroit River, Trenton Channel; Saginaw River.

Minnesota: Duluth Superior Harbor, outer harbor; Marshall; Winona; Harriett Island Harbor, St. Paul.

Mississippi: Jackson and East Jackson. Missouri: Canton; Cape Girardeau; South River Drainage District; Stockton Reservoir; Mississippi River at Clarksville; Sandy Slough; Gregory Drainage District.

New Jersey: Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea; anchorages at Reedy Point, Deepwater Point, and enlarging Marcus Hook and Mantus Creek anchorages, New Jersey; Raritan Bay, Sandy Hook Bay.

New Mexico: Socorro.

New York: Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point; Buffalo Harbor (1960 act) and Flushing Bay and Creek (1962 act); Herkimer; Rochester Harbor; Buttermilk Channel; Fire Island Inlet; Lackawanna.

North Carolina: Wrightsville Beach; Pamlico Sound to Rodanthe; Cedar Island Bay; Core Creek.

Ohio: Astabula Harbor (1960 act); Sandusky Harbor; Toledo Harbor (1950, 1958, and 1960 acts); Racine Locks and Dam.

Oklahoma: Short Mountain Lock and Dam; Cherry and Red Fork Creeks, Tulsa; Arkansas River and Tributaries, navigation locks and dams.

Oregon: Blue River reservoirs; Yaquina Bay and Harbor; Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, 35 and 40 feet; Fern Ridge Reservoir modification; Columbia River alternate barge channel, Interstate Bridge-Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash.

Pennsylvania: Dam 4, Monongahela River, Bethlehem; Elkland; Robinson Run, Oakdale; Trout Run, Portage.

Puerto Rico: San Juan Harbor.

Rhode Island: Lower Woonsocket; Pawtuxet Cove.

Tennessee: Cordell Hull Dam; J. Percy Priest; Woodland Street Bridge.

Texas: Bardwell Reservoir; Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway; Deepening to 40 and 42 feet; Proctor Reservoir; Sabine-Neches Waterway; Big Fossil Creek; Fort Worth Floodway (West Fork Extension).

Virginia: Norfolk.

Washington: Little Goose Lock and Dam; Sammamish River; Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, 35- and 40-foot projects; Port Townsend; Zintel Canyon, Kenewick; Connell; Vancouver-Columbia River alternate barge channel, Interstate bridge Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash.

West Virginia: Racine Locks and Dam.

Wisconsin: Bay City Harbor; Pepin Harbor; Manitowoc County Shore, Revetment; Eau Galle River.

Wyoming: Jackson Hole.

Mississippi River and tributaries: Wolf River and tributaries; Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries; Cache River.

These are Interior projects that would be blocked by the proposed budget reduction of \$153 million.

Alabama (National Park Service) construction: Horeshoe Bend National Military Park; Natchez Trace Parkway (see also Mississippi and Tennessee) maintenance and rehabilitation.

Alaska (National Park Service) construction: Glacier Bay National Monument; Mount McKinley National Park; Sitka National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management construction: Galena, fire control station. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries construction projects: Design exploratory fishing vessel; design research vessel. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction, buildings and utilities: Koliganek Day School, Elim Day School, Goodnews Bay Day School, Kasigluk Day School, Circle Day School, Grayling Day School, Barrow High School, Kotzebue High School; road construction.

Arizona (National Park Service) construction: Casa Grande National Monument; Chiricahua National Monument; Grand Canyon National Park; Lake Mead National Recreation Area (see also Nevada); Navajo National Monument; Petrified Forest National Park; Saguaro National Monument; Southwest Archeological Center; Tonto National Monument; Tuzigoot National Monument; Wupatki and Sunset Crater National Monuments; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management construction program: Hualapai Mountain Recreation Area; roads (Chloride-Tipton, Black Rock Mountain); operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Reclamation: Gila: South Gila collection drains; additions, Welton-Mohawk pumping plant; Glen Canyon (Arizona-Utah), general property; Flagstaff-Pinnacle Peak No. 2 transmission line; Glen Canyon-Flagstaff No. 2 transmission line. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction, buildings and utilities: Sells gas system, Phoenix shop building, Kaibeto Boarding School, Shonto Boarding School; irrigation systems: Colorado River, Fort Apache, San Carlos, surveys and planning; road construction.

Arkansas (National Park Service) construction: Arkansas Post National Memorial; Hot Springs National Park; Pea Ridge National Military Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Southwestern Power Administration construction projects: Jonesboro-Idalia 154 transmission line; Jonesboro substation addition.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife construction projects: Kelso Fish Farming Station.

California (National Park Service) construction: Cabrillo National Monument; Death Valley National Monument; Lassen Volcanic National Park; Muir Woods National Monument; Point Reyes National Seashore; Sequoia-Kings Canyons National Park; Yosemite National Park; Whiskeytown Recreation Area; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management construction program, recreational facilities: Owens Valley Recreation Area, 3 sites; roads; Barrel Springs, grading 7 miles; Red Mountain, grading 4 miles; Brock Gulch, grading 4 miles; Sheldon Creek, grading, 2 miles; Big Jackass Creek, grading, 4 miles; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife construction projects: Kern-Pixley National Wildlife Refuge. Geological Survey construction projects: Rock Laboratory, Menlo Park; special facilities, Menlo Park (planning). Bureau of Indian Affairs construction, irrigation systems: Big Pine; Morongo; X-L Ranch; surveys and planning; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation project and major features, Central Valley: irrigation development; channels, levees, and

floodworks (Federal part); Corning water distribution system; Pacific coast intertie; forebay pump plant intake channel; forebay pump plant.

Colorado (National Park Service) construction: Bents Old Fort National Historic Site; Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument; Colorado National Monument; Dinosaur National Monument (see also Utah); Great Sand Dunes National Monument; Hovenweep National Monument (see also Utah); Mesa Verde National Park; Rocky Mountain National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management construction program, buildings, Craig district office; recreation, Five Points Places and Drowsy Waters Recreation Sites; roads, Trident Mesa, grading 10 miles; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Geological survey construction projects: Nuclear research, Denver; special facilities, Denver (planning). Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife construction projects: Denver National Wildlife Research Center; Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction: Irrigation systems, Pine River; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, Florida participating project: Permanent operating facilities; O. & M. housing; Frypan-Arkansas (new project start).

Florida (National Park Service) construction: Castillo de San Marcos National Monument; Everglades National Park; Fort Caroline National Memorial; Fort Jefferson National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries construction project: Design research laboratory; road construction.

Georgia (National Park Service) construction: Fort Frederica National Monument, Fort Pulaski National Monument, Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Hawaii (National Park Service) construction: City of Refuge National Historic Park, National Battlefield Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Idaho (National Park Service) construction: Craters of the Moon National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management construction program; buildings: Bennett Mountain Lookout, Squaw Butte Lookout, Burley warehouse and fire office, Salmon office expansion and warehouse; recreation: Salmon River Recreation Area, three sites; roads: Deep Creek, grading 13 miles; Big-Knox-Bull, grading 6 miles; Herd Creek, grading 3 miles; Bell Mountain, grading 3 miles; bridges, five; Big Butte-Arco Road, surfacing 9 miles. Bureau of Land Management construction program, buildings (see above); operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries construction project, Columbia River fisheries development. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction, irrigation systems, Fort Hall; road construction, Bonneville Power Administration construction projects: Transformer additions; replacements and minor capital additions.

Indiana (National Park Service) construction: Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial.

Kentucky (National Park Service) construction: Mammoth Cave National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Louisiana (National Park Service) construction: Chalmette National Historic Site; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Maine (National Park Service) construction: Acadia National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Maryland (National Park Service) construction: Antietam National Battlefield Site and Cemetery, Baltimore-Washington Parkway, Catoctin Mountain Park, C. & O. Canal National Monument, Fort McHenry National Monument, George Washington Memorial Parkway (see also Virginia); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fish-

eries and Wildlife; construction: Patuxent Research Center.

Massachusetts (National Park Service) construction: Cape Code National Seashore, Adams National Historic Site, Minute Man National Historic Site, Salem Maritime National Historic Site; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Michigan (National Park Service) construction: Isle Royale National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries construction project: Equipment for research laboratory. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife construction: Jordan River Fish Hatchery.

Minnesota (National Park Service) construction: Grand Portage National Monument; Pipestone National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife construction: Agassiz National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction.

Mississippi (National Park Service) construction: Natchez Trace Parkway (see also Alabama and Tennessee); Vicksburg National Military Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction project: Design research vessel. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction: Buildings and utilities, Central High School; road construction.

Missouri (National Park Service) construction: Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Southwestern Power Administration, construction projects: Carthage substation addition; Idalia substation addition.

Montana (National Park Service) construction: Custer Battlefield National Monument; Glacier National Park; Yellowstone National Park (see also Wyoming); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, construction program; recreational facilities; Madison River Recreation Area; roads; operating programs; soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge; Medicine Lake National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction; irrigation systems; annual contract payments: Blackfeet, Crow, Fort Belknap, Fort Peck; surveys and planning. Bureau of Reclamation, projects and major features: East Bench Unit, Missouri River Basin; O. & M. housing; Lovell-Yellowtail transmission line (Wyoming-Montana); Yellowtail Unit, Missouri River Basin; Yellowtail Afterbay Dam. Bonneville Power Administration, construction projects: General structures and improvements, preliminary engineering, transformer additions, replacements and minor capital additions.

Nebraska (National Park Service) maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, construction: Desoto National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction: Road. Bureau of Reclamation, projects and major features, Frenchman-Cambridge Division, Missouri River Basin; Frenchman Creek channelization; Dunlap substation.

Nevada (National Park Service) construction: Lake Mead National Recreation Area (see also Arizona); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, recreation: Red Rock Canyon Recreation Area; roads: Mount Wilson, grading 9 miles; operating program: soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, irrigation systems: Duck Valley, Fort McDermott, Moapa, Pyramid Lake; road construction.

New Jersey (National Park Service) construction: Edison Laboratory National Monument; Morristown National Historic Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries, construction: Sandy Hook Fishery Research.

New Mexico (National Park Service) construction: Bandelier National Monument; Carlsbad Caverns National Park; Chaco Canyon National Monument; Gila Cliff

Dwellings National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, roads: Rio Puerco road system; operating program: soil aid moisture conservation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, buildings and utilities, Chasgal Boarding School; irrigation systems: Mescalero, Highback, Navajo project, Middle Rio Grande Pueblos, miscellaneous pueblos, surveys and planning; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major features, Rio Grande recreational facilities (new start); San Juan-Chama participating project (Colorado-New Mexico; new start).

New York (National Park Service) construction: Federal Hall National Memorial; Hamilton Grange National Memorial; Sagamore Hills National Historic Site; Saratoga National Historic Park; Statue of Liberty National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, construction: Montezuma National Wildlife Range.

North Carolina (National Park Service) construction: Blue Ridge Parkway (see also Virginia); Cape Hatteras National Seashore; Fort Raleigh National Historic Site; Great Smoky Mountains National Park (see Tennessee); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction.

North Dakota (National Park Service) construction: International Peace Garden; Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major features: Fargo substation additions; Hillsboro substation; Jamestown-Watertown transmission line (North Dakota-South Dakota); Northwood substation.

Ohio (National Park Service) construction: Perry's Victory National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction project: Design research vessel.

Oklahoma (National Park Service) maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, irrigation systems, surveys and planning; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature: Arbuckle (new project start).

Oregon (National Park Service) construction: Crater Park National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, construction, buildings, Riddle Mountain Lookout; recreation, Steens Mountain Recreation Area, seven sites; roads, Steens Mountain, surfacing, 9 miles; Grizzly, grading, 4 miles; Hampton Buttes, grading, 18 miles; Beatty's Butte, grading, 7 miles; Rudlo Mountain, grading, 4 miles; Vale project road system; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction project, Columbia River fisheries development. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, irrigation systems, survey and planning; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature, Rogue River basin, Agate Dam (new project start); Vale, Bully Creek extension; minimum health and safety facilities. Bonneville Power Administration, construction projects, John Day-Keeler; Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest interconnection; Fairview Brandon No. 2; Dorena service; McMinnville service.

Pennsylvania (National Park Service) construction: Gloria Dei (Old Swedes) Church National Historic Site; Hopewell Village National Historic Site; Independence National Historic Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Mines, construction projects: Brucetown research facilities.

South Carolina (National Park Service) maintenance and rehabilitation.

South Dakota (National Park Service) construction: Badlands National Monument; Mount Rushmore National Monument; Wind Cave National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, construction, Waubay Na-

tional Wildlife Refuge; Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge; Lake Andes National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction.

Tennessee (National Park Service) construction: Andrew Johnson National Monument; Great Smoky Mountains National Park (see also North Carolina); Natchez Trace Parkway (see also Alabama and Mississippi); Shiloh National Military Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Texas (National Park Service) construction: Big Bend National Park; Fort Davis National Historic Site; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction project; research vessel. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature, Canadian River: Main aqueduct pumping plants; main aqueduct, Pipelines Canyon to Lamesa.

Utah (National Park Service) construction: Arches National Monument; Bryce Canyon National Park; Capitol Reef National Monument; Dinosaur National Monument (see also Colorado); Hovenweep National Monument (see also Colorado); Natural Bridges National Monument; Timpanogos Cave National Monument; Zion National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, construction program, buildings, Vernal warehouse; Escalante warehouse; roads, 50-Mile Mountain, grading 2 miles; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, construction projects, Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, irrigation systems. Uintah and Ouray; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major features; Emery participating project, Swasey diversion dam; Weber Basin, East Canyon Dam, Warren Canal and laterals.

Virginia (National Park Service) construction: Appomattox Court House National Historic Park; Blue Ridge Parkway (see also North Carolina); Custis Lee Mansion National Memorial; George Washington Memorial Parkway (see also Maryland); Jones Point Park; Manassas National Battlefield Park; Petersburg National Military Park; Prince William Forest Park; Shenandoah National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Washington (National Park Service) construction: Mount Rainier National Park; Olympic National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction projects: Columbia River fisheries development; research vessel; design of research vessel. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature: Spokane Valley (new project start). Bonneville Power Administration, construction projects: Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest interconnection; system reactive facilities; Puget Sound area service; Bangor-Fairmount; Grand Coulee-Okanogan; Sappho area service; transformer additions.

West Virginia (National Park Service) construction: Harpers Ferry, National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Wyoming (National Park Service) construction: Fort Laramie National Historic Site; Grand Teton National Park; Yellowstone National Park (see also Montana); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, construction program, roads: Green Mountain, grading 2 miles; Shirley Mountain, grading 5 miles; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, irrigation systems: Wind River; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature: Glenrock-Glendo transmission line; Lyman substation and taplines; Lyman participating project (new project start); Seedskadee participating project—upper west side pumping plant, east side

canals and laterals, west side canal and laterals.

District of Columbia (National Park Service) construction: National Capital Parks; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Puerto Rico (N.P.D.), construction: San Juan National Historic Site; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Virgin Islands (National Park Service) construction: Virgin Islands National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Various States (National Park Service) construction: Planning, general rehabilitation, and interpretive exhibits. Bureau of Land Management, construction programs, roads. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction projects, unmanned buoys, advance planning.

INSERT NO. 6

ESTIMATED PROGRAM REDUCTION DUE TO \$45 MILLION CUT IN FOREST SERVICE BUDGET

Alabama: 9 million board feet timber cut; 760 acres reforestation (Fed. st. pr.) \$25,000 road construction; \$60,000 research; 70 employment loss (Fed. st. pr.).

Alaska: 54 million board feet timber cut; 20 acres reforestation, \$250,000 road construction; \$60,000 research; 150 employment loss.

Arizona: 44 million board feet timber cut; 180 acres reforestation; \$410,000 road construction; \$105,000 research; 470 employment loss.

Arkansas: 25 million board feet timber cut; 3,100 acres reforestation; \$75,000 road construction; \$60,000 research; 150 employment loss.

California: 270 million board feet timber cut; 3,700 acre reforestation; \$1,960,000 road construction; \$275,000 research; 2,000 employment loss.

Colorado: 23 million board feet timber cut; 630 acres reforestation; \$720,000 road construction; \$75,000 research; 670 employment loss.

Connecticut: — million board feet timber cut; 160 acres reforestation; \$— road construction; \$35,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Delaware: — million board feet timber cut; 50 acres reforestation; \$— road construction; \$— research; — employment loss.

District of Columbia: — million board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; \$— road construction; \$260,000 research; 170 employment loss.

Florida: 12 million board feet timber cut; 6,700 acres reforestation; \$45,000 road construction; \$70,000 research; 60 employment loss.

Georgia: 8 million board feet timber cut; 6,400 acres reforestation; \$80,000 road construction; \$100,000 research; 170 employment loss.

Hawaii: — million board feet timber cut; 200 acres reforestation; \$— road construction; \$5,000 research; — employment loss.

Idaho: 117 million board feet timber cut; 1,440 acres reforestation; \$1,110,000 road construction; \$50,000 research; 1,240 employment loss.

Illinois: — million board feet timber cut; 220 acres reforestation; \$15,000 road construction; \$65,000 research; 30 employment loss.

Indiana: — million board feet; 460 acres reforestation; \$15,000 road construction; \$10,000 research; 20 employment loss.

Iowa: — million board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; \$— road construction; \$10,000 research; — employment loss.

Kansas: — million board feet timber cut; 60 acres reforestation; \$— road construction; \$— research; — employment loss.

Kentucky: 4 million board feet timber cut; 2,400 acres reforestation; \$40,000 road construction; \$35,000 research; 80 employment loss.

Louisiana: 12 million board feet timber cut; 3,700 acres reforestation; \$45,000 road construction; \$80,000 research; 130 employment loss.

Maine: — million board feet timber cut; 800 acres reforestation; \$5,000 road construction; \$20,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Maryland: — million board feet timber cut; 550 acres reforestation; \$— road construction; \$55,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Massachusetts: — million board feet timber cut; 160 acres reforestation; \$— road construction; \$5,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Michigan: 21 million board feet timber cut; 5,700 acres reforestation; \$190,000 road construction; \$50,000 research; 200 employment loss.

Minnesota: 21 million board feet timber cut; 5,300 acres reforestation; \$210,000 road construction; \$95,000 research; 180 employment loss.

Mississippi: 22 million board feet timber cut; 11,900 acres reforestation; \$65,000 road construction; \$140,000 research; 190 employment loss.

Missouri: 5 million board feet timber cut; 1,000 acres reforestation; \$50,000 road construction; \$35,000 research; 80 employment loss.

Montana: 90 million board feet timber cut; 550 acres reforestation; \$690,000 road construction; \$115,000 research; 910 employment loss.

Nebraska: — million board feet timber cut; 20 acres reforestation; \$20,000 road construction; \$10,000 research; 30 employment loss.

Nevada: — million board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; \$125,000 road construction; \$5,000 research; 80 employment loss.

New Hampshire: 3 million board feet timber cut; 170 acres reforestation; \$30,000 road construction; \$30,000 research; 60 employment loss.

New Jersey: — million board feet timber cut; 70 acres reforestation; \$— road construction; \$15,000 research; — employment loss.

New Mexico: 24 million board feet timber cut; 100 acres reforestation; \$280,000 road construction; \$35,000 research; 440 employment loss.

New York: — million board feet timber cut; 2,900 acres reforestation; \$— road construction; \$10,000 research; — employment loss.

North Carolina: 9 million board feet timber cut; 3,600 acres reforestation; \$80,000 road construction; \$155,000 research; 130 employment loss.

North Dakota: — million board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; \$— road construction; \$10,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Ohio: — million board feet timber cut; 1,000 acres reforestation; \$10,000 road construction; \$70,000 research; 30 employment loss.

Oklahoma: — million board feet timber cut; 280 acres reforestation; \$10,000 road construction; \$— research; 20 employment loss.

Oregon: 440 million board feet timber cut; 10,500 acres reforestation; \$1,960,000 road construction; \$195,000 research; 1,500 employment loss.

Pennsylvania: 4 million board feet timber cut; 2,700 acres reforestation; \$40,000 road construction; \$55,000 research; 140 employment loss.

Puerto Rico: — million board feet timber cut; 230 acres reforestation; \$30,000 road construction; \$30,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Rhode Island: — million board feet timber cut; 40 acres reforestation; \$— road construction; \$— research; — employment loss.

South Carolina: 14 million board feet timber cut; 8,400 acres reforestation; \$30,000 road construction; \$30,000 research; 80 employment loss.

South Dakota: 7 million board feet timber cut; 170 acres reforestation; \$80,000 road construction; \$20,000 research; 140 employment loss.

Tennessee: 6 million board feet timber cut; 2,700 acres reforestation; \$60,000 road construction; \$10,000 research; 50 employment loss.

Texas: 16 million board feet timber cut; 1,750 acres reforestation; \$30,000 road construction; \$25,000 research; 80 employment loss.

Utah: 11 million board feet timber cut; 230 acres reforestation; \$300,000 road construction; \$75,000 research; 390 employment loss.

Vermont: — millions of board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; \$30,000 road construction; \$15,000 research; 40 employment loss.

Virginia: 6 million board feet timber cut; 450 acres reforestation; \$65,000 road construction; \$10,000 research; 140 employment loss.

Washington: 232 million board feet timber cut; 5,300 acres reforestation; \$1,180,000 road construction; \$60,000 research; 780 employment loss.

West Virginia: 5 million board feet timber cut; 1,900 acres reforestation; \$50,000 road construction; \$40,000 research; 100 employment loss.

Wisconsin: 11 million board feet timber cut; 1,350 acres reforestation; \$120,000 road construction; \$545,000 research; 300 employment loss.

Wyoming: 15 million board feet timber cut; 4,500 acres reforestation; \$250,000 road construction; \$15,000 research; 440 employment loss.

Total: 1,540 million board feet timber cut; 104,500 acres reforestation; \$10,179,000 road construction; \$3,335,000 research; 12,000 employment loss.

INSERT No. 7

Flood control and watershed projects, pending or in progress, the bulk of which would be stopped by a 1987 million budget reduction in the Agriculture Department.

Alabama: Watershed projects: Big Prairie, Bristow's Creek, High Pine Creek, Hurricane Creek, Lost Creek, Powell Creek, Terrapin Creek, Town Creek, Crowabout Creek, Bib Nance Creek.

Arizona: Watershed: Apache Junction-Gilbert, Florence area, Frye Creek-Stockton Wash, Magma.

Arkansas: Watershed: Arkansas City, Big Creek, Caney Creek, Chicot, Desha and Drew, Crooked Bayou, East Fork, Point Remove, Flat Creek, Fourche Bayou, Grady Gould, Kelso-Rohwer, Muddy Fork of Illinois River, Randolph-Walnut Lake, Upper Culotches Bay, West Fork Point Remove, Tupelo Bayou, Poteau River.

California: Flood Control: Los Angeles, Santa Ynez. Watershed: Adobe Creek, Buena Vista Creek, Central Sonoma, Escondido Creek, Marsh-Kellogg, Napa River, Ulatits Creek.

Colorado: Watershed: Coalbank, Arroyos, Franktown Parker Tributaries of Cherry Creek, Indian Wash, Limon, Roatcap Wash, Vineland Area Tributary to Arkansas River.

Connecticut: Watershed: Blackberry River, Furnace Branch-Middle River, North Branch Park River, South Branch Park River.

Delaware: Watershed: Upper Nanticoke River.

Florida: Watershed: Fisheating Creek Marsh, North St. Lucie River Drainage District, Pine Barren Creek, Sarasota West Coast, Sebastian River Drainage District, South Sumter, Taylor Creek, Upper Josephine-Jackson Creek, Upper Tampa Bay, Istokpoga Marsh, Jumper Creek.

Georgia: Flood Control: Coosa. Watershed: Bishop Creek, Bull Creek, Fort Creek, Hazel Creek, head of Little Tennessee River, Little Satilla, Little Tallapoosa, Marbury Creek, Middle Fork Broad River, Mill Creek, North Broad River, Potato Creek, Rocky Comfort Creek, Sandy Creek, South River, Tobesofkee Creek.

Hawaii: Watershed: Puukapo, Waianae Iki, Waianae Nui, Naalebo.

Idaho: Watershed: Cedar Creek.

Illinois: Watershed: Big Blue, Hog River-Pig Creek, Scattering Fork, Seven Mile Creek, Shoal Creek.

Indiana: Watershed: Boggs Creek, Busseron, French Lick Creek, Lattas Creek, Little Wea, Middle Fork Anderson River, Prairie Creek, West Creek, Dewitt Creek.

Iowa: Flood control: Little Sioux.

Watershed: Badger Creek, Bee-Jay, Big Park, Big Wyacondah, Crooked Creek, David's Creek, Davis-Battle Creek, Held, Hound Dog Creek, Indian Creek, Mill Picayune, Moulton, Pierce Creek, Pony Creek, Rocky Branch Creek, Ryan-Henchal, Stennett-Red Oak Creek.

Kansas: Watershed: Andale, Beek Creek, Fall River, Frog Creek, Middle Caney, Nebo Creek, Silver Creek, Spring Creek, Twin Caney, Upper Verdigris, Walnut Creek, Whiskey Creeks.

Kentucky: Watershed: Beaver Creek, Big Muddy, Big Reedy Creek, Buck Creek, Caney Creek, Canoe Creek, Crab Orchard, Cypress Creek, Donaldson Creek, East Fork Clarks River, East Fork Pond River, Humphrey-Clanton Creek, Little Kentucky River, Meadow Creek, Mud River, North Fork Little River, Obion Creek, W. Fork Clarks River, W. Ford Pond River.

Louisiana: Watershed: Bayou Blue, Bayou Dupont, Bayou Folse, Bayou Rapides, North Tensas, Pleasant Valley, Big Ditch and Scarbroughs Creek, Upper Bayou Nezipque.

Maine: Watershed: Libby Brook.

Maryland: Flood control: Potomac River. Watershed: Ninepin Branch, Aydelotte, Gilbert Run, Little Creek, Little Youghiogheny, Long Marsh, Upper Rock Creek.

Massachusetts: Watershed: Baiting Brook, Powdermill Brook, SuAsCo, Upper Quaboag.

Michigan: Watershed: Little Black River, Little River, Mistiguay Creek, Muskrat Creek, North Branch Mill Creek, South Branch Cass River.

Minnesota: Flood control: Little Sioux. Watershed: Bear Valley, Coon Creek, Middle Fork of Two River, North Branch of Two River, Zippel Creek.

Mississippi: Flood control: Little Tallahatchie, Yazoo. Watershed: Beasha Creek, Bentonla, Buck Island Bayou, Central Bogue Phalia, Chiwapa Creek, Gray's Creek, Muddy Creek, Mulberry Creek, Persimmon-Burnt Corn Creek, Second, Shammack Creek, Tacket Creek, Tallahatchie Creek, Upper Bogue Phalia, West Hatchie, Upper Quiver River.

Missouri: Watershed: East Fork of Big Creek, Hoover-Frankum, 102 river tributaries, Panther Creek, Platte river tributaries, South Fork of Blackwater, Tabo Creek Calahan.

Montana: Watershed: Box Elder Creek, Whitehall.

Nebraska: Watershed: Antelope Creek, Big Indian, Bowman-Spring, Buckley Creek, Gering Bailey, Mud Creek, Oak-Middle Creek, Plattsmouth, Plum Creek, Wildhorse, Wilson Creek, Bellwood, Bear-Pierce-Cedar.

Nevada: Watershed: Upper Meadow Valley Wash, Virgin Valley.

New Hampshire: Watershed: Olivarian Brook, Souhegan River (Mass.).

New Jersey: Watershed: Paulins Kill, Pine Mount Creek, Repaupo Creek, Stony Brook, Town Bank, River Cove.

New Mexico: Watershed: Apache-Brazito Mesquite, Fillmore Arroyos, Hackberry Draw, Saltpeter Creek, Santa Cruz River, Tortugas Arroyo, Case Draw.

New York: Flood control: Buffalo Creek. Watershed: Conewango Creek, Cowaselon Creek, Genegantslet Creek, Ischua Creek, Naticoke Creek, Upper Five Mile Creek.

North Carolina: Watershed: Broad Creek, Gum Neck, Abbotts Creek, Ahsokie Creek, Bear Creek, Conetoe Creek, Cutawhiskie Creek, Deep Creek (Yadkin), Grindle Creek, Horse Swamp-Flat Swamp, Moccasin Creek, Muddy Creek, Pollock Swamp, Town Fork Creek, Turner Creek, Mosley Creek-Tracey Swamp.

North Dakota: Watershed: Elm River, Lower Forest River, Middle-South Branch Forest River, North Branch Forest River, Swan-Butte Creek, Tewaukon (S.D.), Wild Rice Creek (S. Dak.).

Ohio: Watershed: Chippewa Creek, Dick's Creek-Little Muddy, East Fork Buck Creek, Marsh Run, Upper Wabash.

Oklahoma: Flood control: Washita. Watershed: Bear, Fall, and Coon Creeks, Bib Wewoka, Cache Creek, Caney-Coon Creek, Cottonwood Creek, Delaware Creek, Fourche Maline Creek, Halkey Creek, Boggy Creek, Little Deep Fork Creek, Little Wewoka-Graves Creek, Long Branch, Sandy Creek, Sallisaw Creek, Salt Creek, Squaw Creek, Stillwater Creek, upper Black Bear Creek, upper Blue River, upper Clear Boggy Creek, upper Red Rock Creek, Wagon Creek, Whitegrass-Waterhole Creek.

Oregon: Watershed: Beaver Creek, Little Pudding River, Lynx Hollow, Middle Fork Hood River, Skipanon River, Willakenzie.

Pennsylvania: Flood control: Potomac. Watershed: Brandywine Creek, Del., Brodhead Creek, Dunlap Creek, Greene-Dreher, Kaercher Creek, Lackawaxen tributaries, Little Schuylkill River, Mill Creek, Mill Run, North Fork Cowanesque River, Sandy Creek, Saul-Mathay, Briar Creek, Martin Creek.

South Carolina: Watershed: Broadmouth Creek, Brushy Creek, Coneross Creek, Duncan Creek, Fishing Creek, Hills Creek, Huff Creek, Thicketty Creek, Wateree Creek, Backswamp, Lynches Lake Camp Branch.

South Dakota: Watershed: Brule Creek, Green Creek, Marne Creek, Pattee Creek, Silver Creek, Turkey Ridge Creek.

Tennessee: Flood control: Coosa. Watershed: Bear Creek, Cane Creek, Cub Creek, Cypress Creek, Hardin Creek, Houser Creek, Jennings Creek, Johnson Creek, Lick Creek, Line Creek (Ky.), Meridian Creek, Pine Creek, Porters Creek (Miss.), Reelfoot Indian Creek (Ky.), Thompson Creek, Proctor Creek, Indian Creek (Miss.).

Texas: Flood control: Colorado (middle), Trinity, Washita. Watershed: Agua Dulce, Auds Creek, Caney Creek, Chiltipin-San Fernando Creek, Cummins Creek, East Bay Bayou, East Keechie, Kent Creek, Kickapoo Creek, Knob Creek, Langford Creek, lower Brushy Creek, lower Plum Creek, Madden Arroyo, Martinez Creek, northeast tributaries of Leon River, Olmitos-Garcias Creek, Plum Creek, Ramirez Creek, Salado Creek, San Diego-Rosita Creeks, Sulphur Creek, Tehuacana Creek, Town Branch, upper Brushy Creek, upper Lake Fork, upper Las Moras Creek, Valley Creek, York Creek.

Vermont: Watershed: Neshobe.

Utah: Watershed: American Fork-Dry Creek, Blue Creek-Howell, Miller Biglow, North Fork of Ogden River, North Sanpete.

Virginia: Flood control—Potomac. Watershed: Beautiful Run, Beaver Creek, Buffalo Creek, Leatherwood Creek, Little River, Marrowbone, Muddy Creek, Roanoke Creek, White Oak Run, Johns Creek, Horsepasture.

Washington: Watershed—French Creek, Lacamas Creek Tributaries, Marshland.

West Virginia: Flood control—Potomac. Watershed: Bonds Creek, Crush Creek, Harmon Creek (Pa.), Polk Creek, Saltlick Creek, Upper Decker.

Wisconsin: Watershed—Bad Axe, Bay City, Bogus Creek, Coon Creek, Garden Valley (Rose Valley), Lost Creek, Mill Creek, South

Nelson, Trout Run Creek, Twin Parks, West Fork Kickapoo.

Wyoming: Watershed: Arnold Drain, Boulder Lake, London Flats-Bovee, North Fork Powder River.

Puerto Rico: Watershed—Anasco River, Guayanes.

INSERT No. 8

A reduction of \$25 million in Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration would require a reduction in State staffs of about 4,800 positions and the closing of many small services. Clearly this would mean a deterioration in service to unemployment insurance claimants.

The figures:

Effect of \$25,000,000 reduction on employment security operations

State	Estimated loss in positions	Number of offices to be closed
Alabama	69	8
Alaska	15	3
Arizona	54	8
Arkansas	51	7
California	484	10
Colorado	58	10
Connecticut	65	1
Delaware	14	1
District of Columbia	30	0
Florida	100	2
Georgia	72	4
Hawaii	16	1
Idaho	30	8
Illinois	225	2
Indiana	85	2
Iowa	64	12
Kansas	53	10
Kentucky	54	3
Louisiana	63	4
Maine	28	5
Maryland	77	3
Massachusetts	166	3
Michigan	185	20
Minnesota	83	12
Mississippi	50	8
Missouri	110	8
Montana	32	7
Nebraska	34	6
Nevada	17	3
New Hampshire	17	2
New Jersey	200	1
New Mexico	32	6
New York	575	10
North Carolina	92	10
North Dakota	21	4
Ohio	177	8
Oklahoma	60	6
Oregon	61	6
Pennsylvania	360	7
Puerto Rico	41	0
Rhode Island	41	1
South Carolina	53	8
South Dakota	24	6
Tennessee	61	6
Texas	240	14
Utah	33	3
Vermont	21	6
Virginia	66	8
Virgin Islands	1	0
Washington	32	5
West Virginia	50	5
Wisconsin	70	5
Wyoming	20	6

Manpower development and training activities: Effects on the allocation to States in dollars and numbers of trainees by a \$25,000,000 reduction in the President's budget request

State	Dollars	Number trainees
Alabama	420,160	380
Alaska	49,440	45
Arizona	123,520	112
Arkansas	271,840	246
California	2,496,800	2,262
Colorado	172,960	157
Connecticut	346,080	314
Delaware	49,440	45
District of Columbia	123,520	112
Florida	568,640	515
Georgia	494,400	448
Guam	5,710	5
Hawaii	74,240	67
Idaho	74,240	67

Manpower development and training activities: Effects on the allocation to States in dollars and numbers of trainees by a \$25,000,000 reduction in the President's budget request—Continued

	Dollars	Number trainees
Illinois	1,211,360	1,098
Indiana	543,840	493
Iowa	271,840	246
Kansas	222,400	202
Kentucky	494,400	448
Louisiana	420,160	380
Maine	148,320	134
Maryland	346,080	314
Massachusetts	716,960	650
Michigan	1,285,440	1,165
Minnesota	420,160	380
Mississippi	296,640	269
Missouri	568,640	515
Montana	98,880	90
Nebraska	148,320	134
Nevada	49,440	45
New Hampshire	74,240	67
New Jersey	889,920	806
New Mexico	98,880	90
New York	2,595,680	2,352
North Carolina	593,280	538
North Dakota	74,240	67
Ohio	1,409,120	1,277
Oklahoma	271,840	246
Oregon	247,200	224
Pennsylvania	2,076,480	1,882
Puerto Rico	222,400	202
Rhode Island	148,320	134
South Carolina	271,840	246
South Dakota	74,240	67
Tennessee	494,400	448
Texas	939,360	851
Utah	98,880	90
Vermont	49,440	45
Virginia	346,080	314
Virgin Islands	5,220	5
Washington	420,160	380
West Virginia	321,440	291
Wisconsin	444,960	403
Wyoming	49,440	45
U.S. total	25,000,000	22,400

INSERT No. 9

A 15-percent cut reduction in the Area Redevelopment Administration would mean a loss of an estimated 10,000 jobs that could have been created in 1964. These jobs break down this way:

Northeast region (Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virgin Islands)	2,500
Lake States (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin)	2,000
Appalachian (Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia)	1,000
Southeast (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina)	2,500
Northwest (Alaska, Idaho, Iowa, Colorado, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, Wyoming)	500
Southwest (Arizona, California, Hawaii, Missouri, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah)	1,500

INSERT No. 10

Examples of pending projects scheduled for elimination if the President's \$500 million supplemental request for accelerated public works is cut out.

ALABAMA

1. Graysville's \$399,000 application for a new sewer system with 399 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Grant's \$665,000 request for a new water system generating 665 man-months of labor.

3. Bullock County's \$225,000 application for a new 30-bed nursing home creating 225 man-months of labor.

ALASKA

1. Dillingham's \$269,000 application for a new water system generating 269 man-months of on-site labor.

2. North Pole's \$220,000 request for a new sewer system creating 220 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Central Kenai Peninsula's \$750,000 application for a new 20-bed general hospital generating 750 man-months of on-site labor.

ARIZONA

1. Parker's \$139,000 application for a new water system generating 139 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Hopi Indian Reservation request for \$180,000 community sewer and water system, 180 man-months of on-site labor.

3. U.S. Forest Service \$119,000 construction of recreational facilities, 180 man-months of on-site labor, Sitegreaves National Forest.

ARKANSAS

1. McGehee's \$300,000, new city hospital, 300 man-months on-site labor.

2. Leola's \$70,000, APW funds, new water system, 70 man-months on-site labor.

3. Hazen's \$112,000, new sewer system, 112 man-months on-site labor.

CALIFORNIA

1. San Diego Mercy Hospital, \$1,997,000 to replace hospital, possible 2,000 man-months on-site labor.

2. Manteca's \$348,000, new sewer system, 348 man-months on-site labor.

3. Orange Cove's \$10,000 new water system, 10 man-months of on-site labor.

COLORADO

1. Alamosa Community Hospital's \$713,000, 28-bed addition, 713 man-months on-site labor.

2. Trinidad's \$295,000 new electric system, 295 man-months on-site labor.

3. San Luis' \$19,000 new harbor facilities, 19 man-months on-site labor.

CONNECTICUT

1. Bristol's \$160,000 new sewer system, 160 man-months on-site labor.

2. Watertown's \$141,000 water system, 141 man-months on-site labor.

3. Ansonia's \$650,000, sewage treatment plant, 650 man-months on-site labor.

DELAWARE

1. Dover's \$227,000 sewer system, 227 man-months on-site labor.

2. Greenwood's \$87,500 sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewer, 87.5 man-months on-site labor.

FLORIDA

1. Margate's \$25,000 new bridges, 25 man-months on-site labor.

2. Florida City's \$330,000 new waste treatment plant, 330 man-months on-site labor.

3. Jackson Memorial Hospital (Miami), \$1,500,000, 252-bed addition 1,500 man-months on-site labor.

GEORGIA

1. Shellman's \$5,000 new sewer system, 5 man-months on-site labor.

2. Martin's \$45,000 water system, 45 man-months on-site labor.

3. Wrightsville's \$90,000 sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewer, 90 man-months on-site labor.

HAWAII

1. Hilo's \$10,000 water system, 10 man-months on-site labor.

2. Hawaii County's \$2,800,000 sewage treatment works, 2,800 man-months on-site labor.

IDAHO

1. Grangeville's \$13,000 water system, 13 man-months on-site labor.

2. Plummer's \$34,000 sewage system, 34 man-months on-site labor.

3. Bonner's Ferry, \$75,000 for stabilization pond and outfall sewer, 75 man-months on-site labor.

ILLINOIS

1. Panama's \$9,000, water system, 9 man-months on-site labor.

2. Bartleson's \$108,000 water system, 108 man-months on-site labor.
3. Farmersville's \$92,000 waste treatment plant, 92 man-months on-site labor.
4. Pocahontas' \$91,500, sewage treatment works, 91.5 man-months on-site labor.
5. Richland Memorial Hospital, (Olney), \$175,000 an addition and remodeling, 150 man-months on-site labor.

INDIANA

1. Charlestown's \$35,000, sewer system, 35 man-months on-site labor.
2. Spurgeon's \$83,000 water system, 83 man-months on-site labor.
3. Harrison County Hospital (Corydon) \$150,000, an addition and remodeling, 150 man-months on-site labor.

IOWA

1. Centerville's \$379,000 sewer system, 379 man-months on-site labor.
2. Moravia's \$30,000, sewage treatment plant, 30 man-months on-site labor.

KANSAS

1. Arama's \$154,000 sewer system, 154 man-months on-site labor.
2. Pittsburgh's \$452,000, water system, 452 man-months on-site labor.
3. Walnut's \$36,200, stabilization pond and out fall sewer, 36.2 man-months on-site labor.

KENTUCKY

1. Jackson's \$85,000, water system, 85 man-months on-site labor.
2. Martin's \$80,000 new sewer system, 80 man-months on-site labor.
3. Butler's \$47,500, sewage treatment plant, 47.5 man-months on-site labor.
4. Pendleton County Hospital (Falmouth), \$250,000 new hospital, 250 man-months on-site labor.

LOUISIANA

1. Estherwood's \$85,000 new water system, 85 man-months on-site labor.
2. Dubach's \$183,000 sewer system, 183 man-months on-site labor.
3. Opelousas' \$448,600 sewage treatment plant, 448.6 man-months on-site labor.
4. West Carroll Parish Hospital (Oak Grove) \$200,000 25-bed hospital, 200 man-months on-site labor.

MAINE

1. Madawaska's \$39,000 new water system, 39 man-months on-site labor.
2. Saco City's \$300,000 sewer system, 300 man-months on-site labor.
3. Webber Hospital (Biddeford) \$200,000, an addition, 200 man-months on-site labor.

MARYLAND

1. Cumberland's \$75,000 sewer system, 75 man-months on-site labor.
2. Cresaptown's \$61,000 sewage treatment plant, 61 man-months on-site labor.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. Gloucester's \$304,000 sewer system, 304 man-months on-site labor.
2. East Longmeadow's \$173,000 new water system, 173 man-months on-site labor.
3. Amesbury Hospital (Amesbury) \$400,000, 18-bed addition, 400 man-months on-site labor.

MICHIGAN

1. Tecumseh's application for \$80,000 for a new sewer system generating 80 man-months of on-site labor.
2. Manistique's request for \$86,000 for a new water system creating 86 man-months of on-site labor.
3. Bottsford Hospital in Farmington application for \$225,000 for a new 45-bed general hospital generating 225 man-months of on-site labor.
4. Sagula's application for \$12,500 for a sewage treatment plant creating 12.5 man-months of on-site labor.

MINNESOTA

1. Cook's application for \$55,000 for a new waste treatment plant generating 55 man-months of on-site labor.
2. Bemidji's request for \$33,000 for a new water system creating 33 man-months of on-site labor.
3. Evansville's application for \$64,000 for a new sewer system generating 64 man-months of on-site labor.
4. St. Luke's Hospital in Duluth application for \$1,939,500 for the replacement of 168 hospital beds creating 1,939.5 man-months of on-site labor.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Okolona's application for \$183,000 for water system additions generating 183 man-months of on-site labor.
2. Prentiss' request for \$6,000 for a new sewer system creating 6 man-months of on-site labor.
3. Humphrey's County Hospital in Belzoni application for \$2,250 to replace flammable ceilings in corridors generating 2 man-months of on-site labor.

MISSOURI

1. Grandin's application for \$50,000 for a new water system creating 50 man-months of on-site labor.
2. Mayview's request for \$71,000 for a new sewer system generating 71 man-months of on-site labor.
3. Gainesville's application for \$9,700 for a stabilization pond creating 9.7 man-months of on-site labor.

MONTANA

1. Polson City's application for \$49,000 for a new sewer system generating 49 man-months of on-site labor.
2. Culbertson's request for \$84,000 for a new water system creating 84 man-months of on-site labor.
3. Eureka Community Hospital application for \$240,000 for a new hospital generating 240 man-months of on-site labor.

NEBRASKA

1. Sargent's application for \$164,000 for the improvement of city streets creating 164 man-months of on-site labor.
2. Litchfield Village's request for \$20,000 for a new sewer system generating 20 man-months of on-site labor.
3. Good Samaritan Hospital in Kearney application for \$728,250 for a new hospital creating 728.3 man-months of on-site labor.

NEVADA

1. U.S. Forest Service application for \$50,000 for construct recreational facilities on roads in the Inyo National Forest generating 74 man-months of on-site labor.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Littleton's application for \$202,000 for a sewage treatment plant creating 202 man-months of on-site labor.
2. Mary Hitchcock Memorial Hospital in Hanover request for \$350,000 for an addition generating 350 man-months of on-site labor.

NEW JERSEY

1. Driebelle Borough's application for \$39,000 for a new water system creating 39 man-months of on-site labor.
2. Bordentown's application for \$9,000 for a new sewer system generating 9 man-months of on-site labor.
3. Cinnamans Township request for \$14,000 for the repair and improvement of community buildings creating 14 man-months of on-site labor.
4. Community Memorial Hospital in Toms River request for \$75,000 for alterations generating 75 man-months of on-site labor.

NEW MEXICO

1. Raton's application for \$325,000 for a new water system generating 325 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Wagon Mound's request for \$254,000 for a new sewer system creating 254 man-months of on-site labor.
3. Espanola Hospital's application for \$33,000 for expansion of X-ray and laboratory facilities generating 33 man-months of on-site labor.

NEW YORK

1. Waddington's application for \$45,000 for a new sewer system creating 45 man-months of on-site labor.
2. Tonawanda's application for \$225,000 for a new water system generating 225 man-months of on-site labor.
3. Lake Placid-Saranac Lake Hospital in Ray Brook's application for \$900,000 for a new hospital to replace two existing hospitals creating 900 man-months of on-site labor.
4. Sharon Springs' request for \$70,500 for additions to the sewage treatment plant generating 70.5 man-months of on-site labor.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Henderson's application for \$13,000 for a new sewer system creating 13 man-months of on-site labor.
2. Highlands' request for \$122,000 for a new water system generating 122 man-months of on-site labor.
3. Wautauga's application for \$825,000 for a new 100-bed general hospital creating 825 man-months of on-site labor.

NORTH DAKOTA

1. Fort Totten Indian Reservation's application for \$28,000 for individual water and waste systems generating 28 man-months of on-site labor.

OHIO

1. Brookside's application for \$5,000 for a new sewer system creating 5 man-months of on-site labor.
2. Jackson's request for \$50,000 for a new waste treatment plant generating 50 man-months of on-site labor.
3. Union Township's application for \$81,000 for a new water system creating 81 man-months of on-site labor.
4. Holzer Hospital in Gallipolis' application for \$600,000 for the installation of a cobalt unit creating 600 man-months of on-site labor.
5. Clarksburg's request for \$30,000 for a sewage treatment plant generating 30 man-months of on-site labor.

OKLAHOMA

1. Dewar's application for \$48,000 for a new sewer creating 48 man-months of on-site labor.
2. Crowder's request for \$17,000 for a new water system generating 17 man-months of on-site labor.
3. Sequoyah County Memorial Hospital in Sallisaw request for \$198,000 for a new 28-bed general hospital creating 198 man-months of on-site labor.

OREGON

1. Gearhart City's application for \$30,000 for a new water system generating 30 man-months of on-site labor.
2. Maupin's request for \$63,000 for a new sewer system creating 63 man-months of on-site labor.
3. Presbyterian Intercommunity Hospital in Klamath Falls application for \$1,333,000 for a new 131-bed general hospital generating 1,333 man-months of on-site labor.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. Brownsville Hospital's request for \$1,800,000 for a new hospital creating 1,800 man-months of on-site labor.
2. Applewood's application for \$21,000 for a new sewage treatment plant generating 21 man-months of on-site labor.
3. Borough of Aspinwall request for \$13,000 for new water storage creating 13 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Center Township's application for \$10,000 for a new sewer system generating 10 man-months of on-site labor.

5. Wilkes-Barre's application for \$10,000 for new bridges creating 10 man-months of on-site labor.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Warwick's application for \$75,000 for a new water system generating 75 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Narragansett's request for \$142,000 for a new sewer system creating 142 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Mercy Hospital in Woonsocket application for \$816,573 for a new hospital generating 816.6 man-months of on-site labor.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. Williston's application for \$51,000 for a new sewer system creating 51 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Lodge's request for \$47,000 for a new water system generating 47 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Cherokee County Memorial Hospital in Gaffney application for \$141,894 for new and expanded service facilities creating 141.9 man-months of on-site labor.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Wapala application for \$5,000 for a stabilization pond generating 5 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Fort Pierre's request for \$28,500 for a sewage treatment plant creating 28.5 man-months of on-site labor.

TENNESSEE

1. Rutledge's application for \$85,000 for a new sewer system generating 85 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Bethel Springs' request for \$32,000 for a new water system creating 32 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Bradley County Hospital in Cleveland request for \$8,320 to expand service areas generating 8.3 man-months of on-site labor.

TEXAS

1. Douglassville's application for \$61,000 for a new water system creating 61 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Wells' request for \$50,000 for new gas storage generating 50 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Alba's application for \$52,000 for a new sewer system creating 52 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Mother Frances in Tyler application for \$757,050 for an addition of 134 general beds and 19 mental beds, generating 757.1 man-months of on-site labor.

UTAH

1. Wellington's application for \$36,000 for a new water system creating 36 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Payson City's request for \$42,000 for a new sewer system generating 42 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Utah Valley Hospital in Provo request for \$90,000 for remodeling the 240-bed general hospital creating 90 man-months of on-site labor.

VERMONT

1. Island Pond's request for \$180,000 for a sewage treatment plant generating 180 man-months of on-site labor.

VIRGINIA

1. Big Stone Gap's application for \$561,000 for a new water system creating 561 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Wise's request for \$57,000 for a new sewer system generating 57 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Gate City's request for \$65,400 for a sewage treatment plant creating 65.4 man-months of on-site labor.

WASHINGTON

1. Centralia's application for \$138,000 for a new water system generating 138 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Lynden's request for \$125,000 for a new sewer system creating 125 man-months of on-site labor.

3. St. Anthony Hospital in Wenatchee request for \$113,318 for a new hospital of 46 beds to replace an unsuitable structure, generating 113.3 man-months of on-site labor.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Glasgow's application for \$15,000 for a new water system creating 15 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Summers County Hospital in Hinton application for \$1,486,708 for a new 50-bed hospital generating 1,486.7 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Milton's request for \$29,000 for a stabilization pond creating 29 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Belmont's application for \$30,000 for a sewage treatment plant generating 30 man-months of on-site labor.

WISCONSIN

1. West Salem's application for \$47,000 for a new water system creating 47 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Stevens Point's request for \$48,000 for a new sewer system generating 48 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Marinette General Hospital application for \$200,000 for an addition of 40 beds creating 200 man-months of on-site labor.

WYOMING

1. Deaver's application for \$32,000 for a new water system generating 32 man-months of on-site labor.

2. U.S. Forest Service request for \$60,000 to construct recreational facilities and buildings in the Targhee National Forest generating 90 man-months of on-site labor.

INSERT NO. 11

Itemized list of crippling budget cut in Weather Bureau and other related activities.

ALABAMA

Weather Bureau: Decommission short-range radar at Montgomery, Huntsville, Birmingham, and Mobile. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Montgomery.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Elimination of one class II ship and one class IV ship will effect the probable bids of Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co. of Mobile; and the Mobile Ship Repair, Inc., of Mobile.

Maritime Transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at Alabama Drydock & Shipbuilding Co. of Mobile.

ALASKA

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at Cordova. Reduce five man field office from full 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12-hour coverage at St. Paul Island. Reduce six-man field office from 24 to 12 hours at Yakutat, Barter Island, Bethel, Cold Bay, Juneau, Kotzebuc, and McGrath.

ARKANSAS

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Texarkana. Decommission short-range radar at Fort Smith.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

ARIZONA

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Prescott. Close four-man station at Yuma. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Flagstaff.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

CALIFORNIA

Weather Bureau: Close two-man stations at Mt. Shasta, Sandburg, and Blue Canyon. Close three-man stations at Bishop, Eureka, and Alamosa. Reduce five-man field offices from full 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12-hour-a-day coverage at San Francisco (down-

town office), Bakersfield, and Point Arguello. Reduce six-man field offices from 24 to 12 hours at Long Beach, Red Bluff, and Santa Maria. Close the weather office at Stockton. Decommission short-range weather radars at Eureka. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Santa Monica.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Sea Space, Inc., of Palo Alto, and National Engineering Science Co. of Pasadena. Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship that would affect the following probable bidders: Bethlehem Steel Co. of San Francisco; Harbor Boat Building Co. of Terminal Island; National Steel and Shipbuilding Co. of San Diego.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships, at one or more of the following yards: Bethlehem Steel Co. of San Francisco; National Steel and Shipbuilding Co. of San Diego; Todd Shipyards of San Pedro.

COLORADO

Weather Bureau: Decommission short-range radar at Pueblo. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Denver. Eliminate procurement of communications recording equipment for relaying meteorological satellite data at Denver.

CONNECTICUT

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station at New Haven. Reduce five-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Bridgeport. Decommission short-range radar at Hartford.

DELAWARE

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Weather Bureau: Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at Dulles Airport.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Georgetown University; Computer Usage Co. and IBM.

FLORIDA

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Pensacola. Close three-man station at Fort Myers. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day service to 12 hours a day at West Palm Beach and Orlando. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at Miami.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Florida State University.

GEORGIA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station in Valdosta. Close two-man station at Rome and Thomasville. Close three-man station at Columbus. Decommission short-range radar in Macon, Atlanta, and Savannah.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

HAWAII

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for the University of Hawaii.

IDAHO

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at Lewiston. Reduce six-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Pocatello.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

ILLINOIS

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Cairo. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Rockford. Reduce upper air soundings from

four a day to two a day at Peoria. Eliminate procurement of communications recording equipment for relaying meteorological satellite data at Chicago. Cancel new wind measuring equipment at Quincy.

INDIANA

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at South Bend. Decommission short-range radar at Fort Wayne and Indianapolis.

IOWA

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station at Dubuque. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Waterloo. Reduce six-man field office same amount at Burlington. Decommission short-range radar at Burlington.

KANSAS

Weather Bureau: Close the weather office at Concordia. Decommission short-range radar at Concordia, Goodland, Topeka, and Dodge City. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Topeka.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

KENTUCKY

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Lexington. Decommission short-range radar at Louisville.

LOUISIANA

Weather Bureau: Reduce five-man field office from 24-hours-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Alexandria. Decommission short-range radar at Baton Rouge and Shreveport. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Shreveport. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at New Orleans.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Louisiana State University.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, by the Avondale Shipyards, Inc., of New Orleans.

MAINE

Weather Bureau: Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Portland.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, by the Bath Iron Works of Bath.

MARYLAND

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Frederick.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State.

National Bureau of Standards: Deferral of special purpose laboratories at Gaithersburg.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at Bethlehem Steel Co. Shipbuilding Division at Sparrows Point, and Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., of Baltimore. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for the Johns Hopkins University, of Baltimore.

MASSACHUSETTS

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Pittsfield. Reduce five-man location from 24 hours a day to 12 hours a day at Boston (downtown office). Decommission short-range radar at Boston and Worcester. Eliminate procurement of communications recording equipment for relaying meteorological satellite data at Boston. Reduce five-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Boston. Reduce six-man station same amount at Worcester.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at the Bethlehem Steel Co., shipbuilding division, at Quincy.

MICHIGAN

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Escanaba. Close three-man station at Alpena. Close four-man station at Marquette. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Detroit City Airport. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Detroit (Willow Run Airport). Eliminate forecasting station at Detroit. Decommission short-range radar at Flint and Muskegon. Cancel new wind measuring equipment at Kalamazoo.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships, at Defoe Shipbuilding Corp. of Bay City.

MINNESOTA

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Rochester. Decommission short-range radar at Rochester. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at International Falls.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

MISSISSIPPI

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station at Vicksburg. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Meridian. Decommission short-range radar at Meridian and Jackson.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, by the Ingalls Shipping Corp., of Pascagoula.

MISSOURI

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24 hours a day coverage to 12 hours a day at Kansas City. Decommission short-range radar at Columbia. Close three-man station at St. Joseph. Decommission short-range radar at Springfield.

MONTANA

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Kalistell and Havre. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Great Falls.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

NEBRASKA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Valentine. Close four-man stations at Lincoln and Norfolk. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Scottsbluff. Decommission short-range radar at North Platte, Scottsbluff and Norfolk.

NEVADA

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station in Elko.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at Concord.

NEW JERSEY

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Trenton.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3

of 17 planned replacement ships, at New York Shipbuilding Co. of Camden.

NEW MEXICO

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station in Ratan. Close two-man station in Clayton. Close three-man station at Silver City and Roswell.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State.

National Bureau of Standards: Eliminate procurement of scientific equipment worth \$740,000.

NEW YORK

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at La Guardia Airport. Decommission short-range radar at Rochester, Binghamton, and Albany. Reduce upper-air soundings from four a day to two a day at New York City.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Columbia University in New York City.

NORTH CAROLINA

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Asheville (downtown office) and Winston-Salem. Close the weather office in Greensboro. Decommission short-range radar at Raleigh.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship will effect the probable bid of the Barbour Boat Works, Inc., of New Bern.

NORTH DAKOTA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station in Devils Lake. Close three-man station in Williston.

OHIO

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Sandusky. Close three-man station at Mansfield. Eliminate forecasting station operation at Cincinnati. Decommission short-range weather radars at Akron, Cleveland, Columbus. Reduce upper-air soundings from four a day to two a day at Dayton.

Maritime Transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships at one or more of the following yards: American Shipbuilding Co. of Lorain; American Ship Building Co. of Toledo.

OKLAHOMA

Weather Bureau: Decommission short-range radar at Tulsa.

OREGON

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Meacham and Sexton Summit. Close three-man station at Roseburg. Close four-man stations in Burns and Eugene. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Astoria. Decommission short-range weather radar and cancel new wind-measuring equipment at Astoria.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State. Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship that could affect the following probable bidder: Willamette Iron and Steel Co., of Portland, and Gunderson Bros. Engineering Corp., of Portland.

PENNSYLVANIA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Lancaster. Close two-man station at Reading. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Erie. Reduce six-man station same amount at Pittsburgh (downtown office), Scranton, and Williamsport. Decommission short-range weather radar at Pittsburgh. Cancel new wind-measuring equipment at Bradford.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships, at Sun Shipbuilding and Drydock Co. of Chester.

RHODE ISLAND

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Block Island.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Weather Bureau: Close the weather station at Florence. Decommission short-range radar at Columbia. Cancel new wind-measuring equipment at Anderson.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Sioux Falls. Decommission short-range radar at Sioux Falls.

TENNESSEE

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station in Memphis (downtown office). Reduce five-man field office from 24 hours a day to 12 hours a day in Bristol. Decommission short-range radar at Nashville and Memphis.

TEXAS

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station at Victoria, and Galveston airport. Reduce six-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Lubbock and San Angelo. Eliminate forecasting station at El Paso. Close weather offices at Dallas and Laredo. Decommission short-range radar at Abilene, Austin, Corpus Christi, Houston, Lubbock, Midland, Port Arthur, San Antonio, San Angelo, Waco, and Wichita Falls. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at San Antonio, Amarillo, and Fort Worth. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at Fort Worth and Houston.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Texas Instruments, Inc., of Dallas. Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship that would affect the probable bid of Levittown Shipbuilding Co., of Orange.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at Bethlehem Steel Co., shipbuilding division, at Beaumont.

UTAH

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station in Milford. Close three-man station in Wendover. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day in Salt Lake City.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State.

VERMONT

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

VIRGINIA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Cape Henry. Close three-man station at Lynchburg. Decommission short-range weather radar at Richmond. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Norfolk.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State. Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship could affect the bid of the Norfolk Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp. of Norfolk. Eliminate research and development grants slated for the American Scientific Corp. of Alexandria.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships, at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., of Newport News.

WASHINGTON

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Walla Walla. Close three-man station at Stampede Pass. Reduce 6-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Seattle (Boeing Field) and Yakima. Close the weather office at Olympia. Decommission short-range radar at Tatoosh Island. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Olympia. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at Seattle. Eliminate procurement of communications recording equipment for relaying meteorological satellite data at Seattle.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

WEST INDIES

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24 hours a day to 12 hours a day and decommission short-range radar at Swan Island.

WEST VIRGINIA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Parkersburg. Reduce five-man field office from 24 hours a day to 12 hours a day at Elkins. Close the weather office at Beckley. Coast and Geodetic Survey: Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship that would affect the probable bid of the Marietta Manufacturing Co. of Point Pleasant.

WISCONSIN

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at La Crosse. Decommission short-range radar at Madison.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at the Chisler Corp. of Sturgeon Bay; the Fraser-Nelson Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. of Superior; and Manitowoc Shipbuilding, Inc., of Manitowoc.

WYOMING

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at Sheridan.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

INSERT NO. 12

A \$110 million reduction in Federal Aviation Agency budget would mean that these facilities and services currently provided would be discontinued: 100 airport traffic control towers; 70 instrument landing systems; 50 approach light systems.

These could not be built: 583 facilities to assure greater degree of safety; i.e., airport traffic control towers, airport surveillance radars, omnidirectional radio ranges and distance measuring equipments, instrument landing systems, and airport approach light systems.

A large percentage of the 400 airports requiring improvements for which sponsors have available funds to match the U.S. share would be affected.

Listed facilities are existing or planned. Existing would be discontinued and planned would be blocked by the \$110 million budget cut.

ALABAMA

Annonis: Distance measuring equipment. Eufaula: Distance measuring equipment. Evergreen: Distance measuring equipment. Huntsville: Distance measuring equipment.

Mobile: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Montgomery: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Birmingham: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Dothan: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Mobile: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Muscle Shoals: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Tuscaloosa: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Butler: VHF omnidirectional radio range. Birmingham: Visual approach slope indicator.

ALASKA

Anchorage, Lake Hood: Airport traffic control tower.

Fairbanks: Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

King Salmon: Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Annette: Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Juneau: Airport traffic control tower.

Anchorage: Air route traffic control center.

Fairbanks: Air route traffic control center.

Cordova: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Homer: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Gustavus: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Anchorage: Radar bright display equipment.

Fairbanks: Radar bright display equipment.

Annette: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Bettles: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Big Lake: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Dillingham: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Hinchinbrook: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Nome: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Tanana: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Unalakleet: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

ARIZONA

Phoenix: Air route traffic control center.

Airport surveillance radar.

Douglas: Distance measuring equipment.

Drake: Distance measuring equipment.

Flagstaff: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Gila Bend: Remote communications outlet.

San Simon: Air navigation equipment.

Tuba City: Air navigation equipment.

Yuma: Air navigation equipment.

ARKANSAS

Fort Smith: Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Hot Springs: Airport traffic control tower.

Fayetteville: Long-range radar.

Fort Smith: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Little Rock: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

El Dorado: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Fort Smith: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Harrison: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Pine Bluff: Doppler direction finding equipment.

CALIFORNIA

Oxnard: Airport traffic control tower.

Stockton: Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Palmdale: Airport traffic control tower.

Los Angeles: Air route traffic control center.

Oakland (Fremont): Air route traffic control center operating aircraft movement information service sector.

San Jose (Reid's Hillview): Control tower.
Avenal: Distance measuring equipment.
Goffs: Distance measuring equipment.
Fort Jones: Distance measuring equipment.

Lake Tahoe: Distance measuring equipment.

Los Banos: Distance measuring equipment.
Chico: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Marysville: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Santa Rosa: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Arcata: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Bakersfield: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Los Angeles: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Monterey: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

San Diego: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Santa Barbara: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Stockton: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Los Angeles: Radar bright display equipment.

Oakland: Radar bright display equipment (two units).

Burbank: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Long Beach: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Oakland: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Sacramento: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

San Francisco: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Bakersfield: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Fresno: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Imperial: Doppler direction findings equipment.

Needles: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Palmdale: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Sacramento: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Burbank: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Palm Springs: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Porterville: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Santa Monica: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Visalia: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Avenal: Air navigation equipment.

Palmdale: Air navigation equipment.

San Diego: Air navigation equipment.

Oxnard: Instrument landing system.

San Jose: Instrument landing system.

San Francisco: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (second facility).

COLORADO

Grand Junction: Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Pueblo: Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Denver: Air route traffic control center.

Hugo: Distance measuring equipment.

Thurman: Distance measuring equipment.

Cortez: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Grand Junction: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Pueblo: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Hugo: Air-ground communications.

Denver: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Akron: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Grand Junction: Doppler direction finding equipment.

CONNECTICUT

New London (Groton): VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Windsor Locks: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Instrument landing system (second facility).

New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (second facility).

DELAWARE

New Castle: Airport traffic control tower.

Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

FLORIDA

Pensacola: Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Sarasota, Bradenton: Airport traffic control tower.

Daytona Beach: Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

St. Petersburg: Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Jacksonville (Hilliard): Air route traffic control center.

Miami: Air route traffic control center.

Melbourne: Control tower.

Miami (Opa-Locka): Control tower.

Biscayne Bay: Distance measuring equipment.

Daytona Beach: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Orlando: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Pensacola: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Tallahassee: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Miami: Radar equipment.

Miami (Opa-Locka): New tower service.

Jacksonville: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

West Palm Beach: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Gainesville: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Key West: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Tallahassee: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Vero Beach: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Crestview: Air navigation equipment.

Gainesville: Air navigation equipment.

Key West: Air navigation equipment.

Lakeview: Air navigation equipment.

Vero Beach: Air navigation equipment.

Miami: VHF omnidirectional test facility.

Orlando: VHF omnidirectional test facility.

Jacksonville: Conversion to standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

GEORGIA

Atlanta (Hampton): Air route traffic control center.

Brunswick: Distance measuring equipment.

Columbus: Distance measuring equipment.

La Grange: Distance measuring equipment.

Royston: Distance measuring equipment.

Atlanta No. 2: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Augusta: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Columbus: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Macon: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Savannah: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Doppler direction finding equipment.

Baxley: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Jessup: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Waycross: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Augusta: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Columbus: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

Atlanta: Visual approach slope indicator.

Short approach light system.

HAWAII

Kahului: Airport traffic control tower.

Hilo: Airport traffic control tower.

Honolulu: Air route traffic control center.

Kamuela: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Honolulu: Airport traffic control.

Hilo: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Kahului: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Honolulu: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Kona: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Hilo: Instrument landing system.

Honolulu: Runway end identification lights.

Hilo: Standard approach light system.

IDAHO

Idaho Falls: Airport traffic control tower.

Pocatello: Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Twin Falls: Distance measuring equipment.

Boise: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Pocatello: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Gooding: Air-ground communications.

Burley: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Idaho Falls: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Mullan: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Dubois: Air navigation equipment.

Mullen Pass: Air navigation equipment.

Boise: Conversion to standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

Pocatello: Short approach light system.

ILLINOIS

West Chicago: Airport traffic control tower.

Champaign: Airport traffic control tower.

Chicago: Air route traffic control center.

Bible Grove: Distance measuring equipment.

Bradford: Distance measuring equipment.

Samsville: Distance measuring equipment.

Galesburg: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Marion: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Chicago (Midway 13): Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Moline: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Peoria: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Quincy: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Springfield: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Bloomington: Air-ground communications.
 Chicago: Radar bright display equipment.
 Chicago (O'Hare): Precision approach radar (second facility).
 Chicago (Midway): Traffic control radar beacon.
 Quincy: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Bradford: Air navigation equipment.
 Champaign: Instrument landing system.
 Chicago (Meigs): Instrument landing system.
 Chicago (Midway): New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (2d facility).
 Chicago (Meigs): Visual approach slope indicator.
 Chicago (O'Hare): Short approach light system.
 Champaign: Standard approach light system.
 Chicago (O'Hare): Standard approach light system.

INDIANA

Evansville:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Terre Haute:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Indianapolis: Air route traffic control center.
 Nabb: Distance measuring equipment.
 Richmond: Distance measuring equipment.
 Wolf Lake: Distance measuring equipment.
 Fort Wayne: Airport traffic control radar beacon.
 Indianapolis: Airport traffic control radar beacon.
 Muncie: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
 Indianapolis: Instrument landing system (2d facility).
 West Lafayette: Instrument landing system.
 Evansville: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.
 Terre Haute: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.
 Indianapolis: Standard approach light system.

IOWA

Cedar Rapids:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Waterloo:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Approach light system.
 Sioux City:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Approach light system.
 Dubuque: Distance measuring equipment.
 Sioux City: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Waterloo: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Des Moines: Airport traffic control radar beacon.
 Cedar Rapids: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Des Moines: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Mason City: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Des Moines: Runway end identification lights.
 Sioux City: Runway end identification lights.

KANSAS

Hutchinson:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Approach light system.
 Russell: Distance measuring equipment.
 Wichita: Distance measuring equipment.
 Topeka: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Garden City:
 Long range radar.
 Air traffic control radar beacon.
 Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Hill City: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Salina: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Centropolis: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
 Medicine Lodge: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
 Wilsey: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
 Hill City: Tactical air navigation equipment.
 Wichita: Tactical air navigation equipment.
 Topeka: Conversion to standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

KENTUCKY

York: Distance measuring equipment.
 Covington:
 Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Airport traffic control radar beacon.
 Bowling Green: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 London: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Paducah: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Highway: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
 Whitesburg: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
 Covington:
 Instrument landing system (second facility).
 Visual approach slope indicator.

LOUISIANA

Shreveport, downtown: Airport traffic control tower.
 Shreveport, greater:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Approach light system.
 Monroe:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Lake Charles:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Approach light system.
 New Orleans: Air route traffic control center.
 Alexandria: Long-range radar.
 Baton Rouge: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Monroe: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Shreveport: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 New Orleans: Airport traffic control radar beacon.
 Lafayette: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Monroe: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Alexandria:
 VHF omnidirectional radio range.
 Air navigation equipment.
 Lake Charles: Air navigation equipment.
 New Orleans: Standard approach light system.

MAINE

Portland:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Approach light system.
 Bucks Harbor: Long-range radar.
 Auburn-Lewiston: Terminal VHF radio directional range.
 Portland: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 South Bangor: Center air-ground peripheral communications outlet.
 Millinocket: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Presque Isle: Tactical air navigation equipment.

MARYLAND

Nottingham: Distance measuring equipment.
 Baltimore: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Andrews: Air-ground communications.
 Salisbury: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Ridgely: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
 Salisbury: Air navigation equipment.
 Snow Hill: Air navigation equipment.
 Baltimore: Instrument landing system (second facility).
 New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (second facility).
 Runway end identification lights (two facilities).

MASSACHUSETTS

Worcester:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 New Bedford:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Approach light system.
 Westfield: Airport traffic control tower.
 Hyannis:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Approach light system.
 Nantucket:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Boston (Nashua): Air route traffic control center.
 Chester: Distance measuring equipment.
 Hyannis: Distance measuring equipment.
 Westfield: Distance measuring equipment.
 Bedford: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Boston: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 New Bedford: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Worcester: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Bedford: Visual approach slope indicator.
 Boston:
 Visual approach slope indicator.
 Short approach light system.

MICHIGAN

Flint:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Approach light system.
 Muskegon:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Approach light system.
 Kalamazoo:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Approach light system.
 Battle Creek:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Jackson: Airport traffic control tower.
 Detroit:
 Air route traffic control center.
 Airport surveillance radar.
 Saginaw: Distance measuring equipment.
 Traverse City: Distance measuring equipment.
 Detroit (Willow Run): Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Lansing: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Muskegon: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Sault Ste. Marie: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Alpena: Air-ground communications.
 Battle Creek: Separate control tower.
 Grand Rapids: Separate control tower.
 Detroit (Willow Run): Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Grand Rapids: Separate flight service station.
 Battle Creek: Remote communications outlet.
 Marquette: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Saginaw: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Sault Ste. Marie: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Traverse City: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Alpena: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
 Grand Rapids: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
 Detroit: Instrument landing system.
 Battle Creek: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.
 Detroit, Metropolitan: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (second facility).
 Grand Rapids: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

MINNESOTA

Duluth:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Approach light system.
 Rochester:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Approach light system.
 Minneapolis: Air route traffic control center operating aircraft movement information service sector.
 Farmington: Distance measuring equipment.
 Minneapolis: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Bemidji: Air-ground communications.
 St. Paul (Holman): New tower service.
 Duluth: Separate control tower.
 Redwood Falls: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 St. Paul (Holman): VHF omnidirectional radio range.
 Minneapolis: Visual approach slope indicator.

MISSISSIPPI

Gulfport:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Distance measuring equipment.
 Hattiesburg: Distance measuring equipment.
 Holly Springs: Distance measuring equipment.
 Greenville: Terminal VHF radio directional range.
 Meridian: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Jackson: Airport surveillance radar.
 Greenwood: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Laurel: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
 Greenwood: Air navigation equipment.
 McComb: Air navigation equipment.
 Jackson: VHF omnidirectional test facility.

MISSOURI

Springfield:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Approach light system.
 St. Joseph:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Kansas City: Air route traffic control center operating aircraft movement information service sector.
 St. Louis: Air route traffic control center operating Aircraft Movement Information Service sector.
 Macon: Distance measuring equipment.
 Readsville: Distance measuring equipment.
 Cape Girardeau: Terminal VHF radio directional range.
 Jefferson City: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Joplin: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Springfield: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 St. Joseph: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 St. Louis: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Marysville: Air-ground communications.
 Kansas City:
 Radar bright display equipment (2 units).
 Airport traffic control radar beacon.
 Vichy: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Butler: Air navigation equipment.
 St. Louis: Instrument landing system (2d facility).
 Joplin: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.
 St. Louis:
 New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (2d facility).
 Visual approach slope indicator.
 Short approach light system.

MONTANA

Helena: Airport traffic control tower.
 Great Falls: Air route traffic control center.
 Miles City: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Great Falls: Air navigation equipment.
 Lewiston: Tactical air navigation equipment.
 Whitehall: Tactical air navigation equipment.

NEBRASKA

Chadron: Distance measuring equipment.
 Sidney: Distance measuring equipment.
 Lincoln: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Scottsbluff: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Omaha: Runway end identification lights.

NEVADA

Tonopah: Long range radar.
 Reno: Airport surveillance radar.
 Sod House: Distance measuring equipment.
 Wells: Distance measuring equipment.
 Wilson Creek: Distance measuring equipment.
 Reno: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Las Vegas: Air-ground communications.
 Reno:
 Separate control tower.
 Separate flight service station.
 Battle Mountain: Remote communications outlet.
 Elko: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Ely: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Las Vegas: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Lovelock: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Tonopah: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Beatty: Tactical air navigation equipment.
 Reno: Tactical air navigation equipment.
 Tonopah: Tactical air navigation equipment.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Keene: Distance measuring equipment.
 Lebanon: Distance measuring equipment.
 Laconia: Terminal VHF radio direction range.
 Concord: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Manchester: Air navigation equipment.

NEW JERSEY

Atlantic City:
 Airport traffic control tower.
 Instrument landing system.
 Approach light system.
 Trenton: Airport traffic control tower.
 Newark: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
 Teterboro: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Ship Bottom: Air-ground communications.
 Teterboro: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Trenton: Instrument landing system.

NEW MEXICO

Roswell: Airport traffic control tower.
 Santa Fe: Airport traffic control tower.
 Hobbs: Airport traffic control tower.
 Albuquerque: Air route traffic control center.
 Carlsbad: Distance measuring equipment.
 Corona: Distance measuring equipment.
 Crownpoint: Distance measuring equipment.
 Deming: Distance measuring equipment.
 Hobbs: Distance measuring equipment.
 Otto: Distance measuring equipment.
 Pinon: Distance measuring equipment.
 Texico: Distance measuring equipment.
 Gallup: Terminal VHF radio directional range.
 Silver City/Hurley: Terminal VHF radio directional range.
 Albuquerque: Radar bright display equipment.
 Deming: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Farmington: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Las Vegas: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Roswell: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Tucumcari: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Zuni: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Grants: Air navigation equipment.
 Roswell: Air navigation equipment.
 Texico: Air navigation equipment.
 Truth or Consequences: Air navigation equipment.

NEW YORK

Elmira, Binghamton, Utica: Airport traffic control tower instrument landing system.
 Niagara Falls: Approach light system.
 Islip: Airport traffic control tower instrument landing system.
 New York (Jamaica): Airport traffic control center operation, aircraft movement information service.
 White Plains: Airport surveillance radars.
 De Lancey, Dunkirk, New York (LaGuardia), Utica, Watertown: Distance measuring equipment.
 Ogdensburg, Saranac Lake: Terminal VHF radio directional ranges.
 Binghamton, Buffalo, Islip, New York (Idlewild), Niagara Falls, Peconic, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, White Plains: Equipment to improve the reliability of instrument landing systems.
 Buffalo: Air traffic control radar beacon.
 Albany, Buffalo, Elmira, Watertown: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Plattsburg: Tactical air navigation equipment.
 New York (Idlewild): Instrument landing system (3d facility): New standards approach light system, runway end identification lights, and visual approach slope indicators.

NORTH CAROLINA

Asheville: Airport traffic control tower; instrument landing system.
 Wilmington: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.
 Fayetteville: Airport traffic control tower.
 Pinehurst: Distance measuring equipment.
 Wilmington and Winston-Salem: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.
 Hickory, New Bern, and Rocky Mount: Doppler direction finding equipment.
 Fayetteville: Instrument landing system.
 Winston-Salem: Short approach light system.

NORTH DAKOTA

Fargo and Bismarck: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Jamestown and Williston: Distance measuring equipment.

Grand Forks and Minot: SAGE sector ARTC centers.

Dickinson and Minot: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Pembina: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

OHIO

Mansfield: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Cleveland (Oberlin): Aircraft traffic control center operating aircraft movement information service.

Newcomerstown: Establish long distance measuring equipment.

Cleveland, Columbus, Mansfield, Toledo, Youngstown: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Cleveland: Radar bright display equipment and Air Traffic control radar beacon.

Findlay, Zanesville: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Akron-Canton, Columbus, Toledo: Runway end identification lights.

Cleveland: Short approach light system.

OKLAHOMA

Tulsa (Riverside): Control tower.

Hobart and Sayre: Distance measuring equipment.

Guyman and Stillwater: Establish terminal VHF radio directional ranges.

Ardmore, Hobart, Ponca City, McAlester: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Tulsa: Instrument landing system (second facility).

OREGON

Pendleton: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach lights.

Hillsboro: Establish control tower.

North Bend: Distance measuring equipment.

Eugene, Klamath Falls, Pendleton: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

The Dalles: Doppler direction finding equipment.

PENNSYLVANIA

Erie: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Allentown: Same.

Wilkes-Barre: Same.

Williamsport: Airport traffic control tower and instrument landing system.

Lancaster and Slate Run: Distance measuring equipment.

Erie, Reading and Wilkes-Barre: Improved reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

North Mountain: Air-ground communications (second facility).

Lancaster: New tower service.

Philadelphia and Pittsburgh: Air traffic control radar beacon.

Pittsburgh-Allegheny: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Bradford, Harrisburg, Phillipsburg, Wilkes-Barre: Doppler equipment.

Pittsburgh: Instrument landing system (second facility).

Erie, Pittsburgh, (Allegheny): Runway end identification lights.

RHODE ISLAND

Providence: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Greenville: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system.

Spartanburg: Airport traffic control tower.

Columbia: Establish airport surveillance radars.

Myrtle Beach: Distance measuring equipment.

Charleston, Columbia Greenville, Spartanburg: Equipment to improve existing instrument landing systems.

Anderson, Myrtle Beach: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Allendale, Columbia, Florence: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Charleston: New standard approach light system.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Brookings: High frequency radio directional range.

Huron, Sioux Falls: Equipment to improve reliability of instrument landing systems.

Aberdeen, Pierre: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Bruce: Air navigation facilities.

Aberdeen, Rapid City: Tactical air navigation equipment.

TENNESSEE

Bristol: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Memphis: Aircraft traffic control center operating and aircraft movement information service.

Chattanooga: Airport surveillance radar.

Graham: Establish distance measuring equipment.

Clarksville (Outlaw): Very high frequency radio directional range.

Knoxville: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Tri-Cities: Tower resulting from separation of combined station-tower.

Knoxville, Memphis, Nashville: Air traffic control radar beacon.

Crossville, Jackson: Doppler direction finding equipment.

TEXAS

Amarillo: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Corpus Christi: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Ablene: Same.

San Angelo: Airport traffic control tower, and instrument landing system.

Plainview: Airport traffic control tower.

Longview: Airport traffic control tower, and instrument landing system.

San Antonio, Stinson: Airport traffic control tower.

College Station: Airport traffic control tower.

Brownsville: Airport traffic control tower, and instrument landing system.

El Paso, Fort Worth, San Antonio: Airport traffic control center operating, and aircraft movement information service.

Amarillo: Long-range radar.

Beaumont, Britton, Childress, College Station, Eagle Lake, Guthrie, Hudspeth, Llano, Newman, Quitman: Establish distance measuring equipment.

Ablene, Amarillo, Austin, Brownsville, El Paso, Houston, Lubbock, Midland, San Antonio, Tyler, Wichita Falls: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Fort Worth (Amon Carter Field) and Houston: Air Traffic Control radar beacon.

Lubbock, San Angelo: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Alice, Austin, Childress, College Station, Cotulla, Dahart, Galveston, Lufkin, McAllen, Wink: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Ablene, Galveston, Lufkin, Palacios, San Angelo, Wink: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Houston: (Second) instrument landing system.

UTAH

Salt Lake City: Airport Traffic Control Center operating and aircraft movement information service.

Myton: Establish distance measuring equipment.

Vernal: Establish terminal VHF Radio directional range.

Salt Lake City: Air traffic control radar beacon.

Cedar City and Delta: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Cedar City: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Bonneville, Bryce Canyon, Myton, Provo: Tactical air navigation equipment.

VERMONT

Burlington: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, approach light system, long-range radar, distance measuring equipment, and equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Montpelier: Doppler direction finding equipment, runway end identification lines.

VIRGINIA

Newport News: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Roanoke: Airport traffic control tower.

Lynchburg: Airport traffic control tower.

Lawrenceville and Richmond: Distance measuring equipment.

Staunton: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Newport News: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Dunn Loring: Air ground communications (second).

Blackstone: Remote communications outlet.

Charlottesville and Newport News: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Front Royal and Pulaski: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Charlottesville and Lynchburg: Instrument landing systems.

Roanoke: Runway end identification lines (second and third facilities).

WASHINGTON

Yakima: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing systems, approach light system, and equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Seattle: Airport traffic control center operating Aircraft Movement Information Service and radar bright display equipment.

Ephrata and Hoquiam: Distance measuring equipment.

Pullman and Moscow: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Bellingham: Air-ground communications and Doppler direction finding equipment.

Seattle-Takoma: Air traffic control radar beacon and instrument landing systems.

Hoquiam and Walla Walla: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Walla Walla: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Seattle-Boeing: New approach light system.

WEST VIRGINIA

Huntington and Wheeling: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing systems, and approach light system.

Beckley and Bluefield: Distance measuring equipment.

Elkins: Remote communications.

Bluefield and Huntington: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Charleston and Wheeling: Runway end identification lights.

WISCONSIN

Appleton and Manitowac: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Rhineland: Air-ground communications.

Eau Claire, Green Bay, and Milwaukee: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Milwaukee-Racine: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Milwaukee: Instrument landing system.

WYOMING

Cody: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Rock River: Air-ground communications. Rawlins, Rock Springs, Sheridan, Worland, and Casper: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Crazy Woman: Tactical air navigation equipment.

INSERT No. 13
COAST GUARD

The following items would be eliminated if the proposed Coast Guard budget¹ were cut by \$50 million:

1. Replacement of 1 large high endurance cutter (to be constructed by bid)-----	\$14,000,000
2. Replacement of 2 medium reserve cutters (to be constructed by bid)-----	7,500,000
3. Replacement of 6 tenders (to be constructed by bid)-----	5,600,000
4. Replacement of 2 tenders and moorings to service Missouri River (to be constructed by bid)-----	1,174,000
5. Replacement of Tacan navigational equipment to service communications on cutters-----	2,200,000
6. Elimination of proposal to establish Astoria, Oreg., air detachment-----	1,249,000
7. Construction of air station, Boston-----	2,243,000
8. Construction of 24 family quarters for air detachment, Annette Island, Alaska-----	1,124,000
9. Relocation of air station, Miami to Opa-Locka, Fla.-----	1,115,000
10. Construction of microwave tower and laboratory, Wildwood, N.J.-----	84,000
11. Construction and improvement of lifeboat station, Fort Macon, N.C.-----	459,000
12. Eliminate proposal for establishment of search and rescue facility, Brookings, Oreg.-----	560,000
13. Eliminate construction of moorings at Mayport, Fla., and Juneau, Alaska-----	650,000
14. Rebuilding of primary radio station, Miami, Fla.-----	900,000
15. Eliminate improvements at Coast Guard bases and yard: Terminal Island, Calif., Ketchikan, Alaska, Sand Island, Honolulu, Coast Guard Yard, Curtis Bay, Md.-----	1,783,000
16. Eliminate 1964 phase of Academy improvement program, New London, Conn., and improvements on Reserve Training Center, Yorktown, Va., and receiving station, Cape May, N.J.-----	2,317,000
17. Curtailment of procurement of helicopters, aids to navigation projects, construction, and improvement of shore stations.-----	7,006,000
Total-----	50,000,000

INSERT No. 14

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A \$30 million budget cut in the Small Business Administration would mean that

¹ It is assumed that the entire Coast Guard budget cut would come from its modernization program since other portions of its budget do not contain items susceptible to any sizable reductions.

field and regional offices would be closed.

Typical of this type are the following:

Alaska: Anchorage.
Georgia: Atlanta.
Illinois: Chicago.
Kentucky: Louisville.
Missouri: St. Louis.
Montana: Helena.
Nebraska: Omaha.
Oregon: Portland.
Pennsylvania: Philadelphia.
Rhode Island: Providence.
South Dakota: Sioux Falls.
Texas: Marshall and Houston.
Washington: Spokane.
Puerto Rico: San Juan.

INSERT No. 15

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A 15 percent reduction in the Veterans' Administration budget would mean closing from 7 to 10 hospitals; deferring planning and construction on seven others and curtailing the hospital modernization program.

This would adversely affect the quality of hospital care and the economies, including the construction industry, in these States and communities.

Alabama: Tuskegee.
California: Long Beach, Los Angeles, Palo Alto, and San Francisco.
Florida: Gainesville.
Illinois: Danville and Hines.
Indiana: Fort Wayne and Indianapolis.
Kansas: Wichita.
Kentucky: Fort Thomas and Louisville.
Maryland: Perry Point.
Massachusetts: Bedford.
Michigan: Saginaw.
Missouri: Excelsior Springs.
Nebraska: Grand Island.
New York: Castle Point and Northport.
North Carolina: Oteen.
Ohio: Cincinnati.
Oregon: Portland.
Pennsylvania: Aspinwall, Coatesville, and Erie.
Puerto Rico: San Juan.
South Dakota: Fort Meade.
Texas: Temple.
Vermont: White River Junction.
Virginia: Roanoke.
Washington: Seattle.
West Virginia: Martinsburg.

INSERT No. 16

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

An \$86 million cut would force GSA to drop the following construction projects:

Arizona: Tucson—border patrol station headquarters-----	\$344,000
Arkansas: Pine Bluff—post office, courthouse-----	2,391,000
California: Fresno—courthouse, Federal office building-----	5,400,000
Idaho: Boise—courthouse, Federal office building-----	7,505,000
Maryland: Baltimore—Federal office building (increase)-----	13,706,000
Nevada: Las Vegas—courthouse, Federal office building-----	4,772,000
New Hampshire: Portsmouth—post office, Federal office building-----	2,396,000
Ohio: Cleveland—Federal office building-----	41,223,000
South Carolina: Charleston-----	2,903,000
Texas: Fort Worth-----	15,664,000

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD an article from the Christian Science Monitor describing the testimony of the Secretary of Defense before the Joint Economic Committee, together with that testimony itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

REFORMS OUTLINED: McNAMARA LISTS

SAVINGS

(By Juan Cameron)

WASHINGTON.—Dull are terms such as "logistics management improvement" and "CPFF" contracts.

Yet Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara told Congress this past week such bureaucracy is the key to whittling down the \$50-billion defense budget by \$3.5 billion in the next 3 years.

In an appearance before the House-Senate Economic Committee that had strong political overtones, the embattled Defense Department chief bared the record of past spending mistakes that cost the taxpayer billions.

And, to the pointed bipartisan applause of Chairman Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, and WILLIAM PROXMIER, Democrats and Representative THOMAS CURTIS, Republican, the former Ford Motor Co. president outlined his program of management reform.

THIRTEEN BILLION DOLLARS SAVED

In a crisp, youthful voice, the sleek-haired Defense Secretary told how he had shaved \$13 billion off the 1963-64 new spending requests of the military services.

And he rattled off how through increased emphasis on competitive bidding, centralized purchasing, combined operations, and elimination of "wasteful and inefficient" cost plus fixed fee (CPFF) contracts he hopes to pare defense costs by \$1.9 billion in fiscal 1963 and \$3.4 billion by fiscal 1965.

In pointed reference to the current TFX hearings before another Senate committee led by Arkansas Senator JOHN McCLELLAN, Senator DOUGLAS said: "I consider you to be a great Secretary of Defense, a man who understands the intricate problems in these areas and has had the courage—and some of your actions have taken great courage—to act upon them."

ECONOMIES LISTED

Better procurement policies can affect substantially a major portion of the \$50 billion defense budget. Roughly \$20 billion of the Department's budget today goes toward payrolls, the remainder to logistics, which includes everything from the controversial \$6 billion TFX design, to butcher smocks, belt buckles, and exercise bloomers.

Mr. McNamara ticked off the chief areas of savings thus:

Shifting from noncompetitive to competitive bids can save 25 cents on each dollar. By fiscal 1965 competitive bids will cover \$1.9 billion of defense purchases against \$760 million today with savings estimated at \$500 million annually.

Reduction in cost plus fixed fee contracts from 23.3 percent today to 12 percent by fiscal 1965, with eventual savings of \$700 million.

Arbitrary cuts in Department of Defense civilian 1 million-man employment on the basis of estimated gains in Department productivity. Reductions of 10,000 planned by fiscal 1964.

Closing of some 258 military installations in the United States and 58 overseas and release of 45,000 employees. "Good progress" made to date on program schedules to save \$440 million annually by fiscal 1965.

Consolidation of military communications, headquarters intelligence operations, real estate management and equipment maintenance. The latter alone to produce savings of \$300 million annually by 1965.

Joint supply and service purchasing—including eliminating buying of 18 different types of butcher smocks—which will reduce inventories by \$232 million this year, an additional \$112 million in fiscal 1964.

Joint equipment, such as the TFX aircraft, that over the life cycle of the aircraft will save \$1 billion in development, production, and operating costs.

BUILDING BLOCKS

He confirmed that the huge and expanding defense expenditures on research and development and sophisticated weapon systems did not lend themselves to competitive bidding.

But his philosophy in these expensive fields is to make sure the "technical building blocks"—acquired in research, exploratory, and advance development—are available before large-scale weapon systems are undertaken.

The failure to develop these building blocks before "metal is bent" has been one of the major causes of waste and inefficiency in defense spending, Mr. McNamara told the Douglas group.

Some examples:

Some \$1 billion and 15 years spent on a nuclear-powered aircraft before it was terminated in 1961. No efficient reactor was available.

Four hundred and fifty million dollars on the P-6-M jet-powered flying boat put into production before basic design problems were solved. Terminated August 1959.

Eighty million dollars on automatic decoy missile Goose that was found incompatible with concept of "fall safe" under which manned bombers automatically return to base unless specifically ordered to continue on target.

Eighty million dollars on radio telescope at Sugar Grove, W. Va., before technical problems were solved. Terminated July 1962.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. MCNAMARA BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PROCUREMENT OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, MARCH 28, 1963

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is indeed a pleasure for me to come before this committee for the first time to discuss the progress made by the Department of Defense in improving the economy and efficiency of its procurement and logistics operations. The Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee is among the pioneers in this effort. To the continuing interest and prodding of this and other committees of the Congress, we owe much of the progress achieved in this area over the last 10 years. The personal interest and warm support of the chairman and Mr. CURTIS and the other members of the committee have been a source of strength to me in my efforts to bring about improvements in our logistics management, many of which stem directly from the committee's recommendations.

As the members of this committee well know, it is extremely difficult to change the traditional way of doing things in the Defense Establishment. Many of the actions we have taken during the last 2 years to improve the management of our procurement and logistics operations were recommended by this and other committees of the Congress and by various nongovernmental committees and commissions, 10 and even 15 years ago. For example, the reorganization of the Army technical services, which we put into effect last year, had been recommended to the President by Secretary of Defense Lovett in 1952 with the comment that "A reorganization of the technical services would be no more painful than backing into a buzz saw, but I believe that it is long overdue."

Resistance to change is not unique to the Defense Department. This same problem is also found in almost any large business organization. Change means that people have to relearn the way they are doing things and this is always a painful and time-

consuming process, whether in defense logistics or private business.

The term "logistics," in its broadest application, encompasses the entire spectrum of activity beginning with research and development and extending through procurement, production, construction of facilities, deployment, supply, maintenance, transportation, etc., and ending with the disposal of surplus materiel and facilities. In this sense, our logistics operations account for about three-quarters of the total Defense budget. Looked at in another way—our total payroll for active duty, reserve and retired military personnel and all civilian personnel accounts for roughly two-fifths of our total budget, with the balance (about \$30 billion out of a total of \$50 billion) accounted for by the purchase of goods and services of all kinds, that is, research and development; the procurement of weapons, equipment, spares and other consumables; military construction; maintenance; utilities; etc.

Truly important savings in defense expenditures can be achieved only by attacking this entire spectrum of logistics activities, and that is precisely what we are trying to do. Decisions in the development phase of a weapons system will affect not only the cost of development but also the cost of production and operation of the system throughout its life. As this subcommittee noted in one of its recent reports, "It is apparent that two identical items can be procured, stored, inventoried, issued and maintained in a common way much more economically and efficiently than can two different items." Yet, each new weapon or piece of equipment that enters the inventory brings with it thousands of new and different items of spares and supporting equipment. That is why any serious attempt to reduce the number of different items in our logistics system and thereby reduce costs, must begin in the research and development phase.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The research and development phase itself can be broken down into a number of significant sequential steps:

1. Research (basic and applied): The effort directed toward the expansion of knowledge in such fields as the physical and environmental sciences, i.e., mathematics, physics, psychology, biology and the medical sciences.
2. Exploratory developments: Work directed toward the solution of specific military problems, but stopping short of the actual development of experimental hardware for technical or operational testing.
3. Advanced developments: Projects which have advanced to a point where the development of experimental hardware for technical or operational testing is required, prior to the determination of whether the item should be designed or engineered for eventual service use.
4. Engineering developments: Developments which are being engineered for service use, but which have not as yet been approved for production and deployment.
5. Operational systems development: Continued development, test, evaluation, and design improvement of projects which have already entered the production-deployment stage.

It is from the first three categories—research, exploratory, and advanced developments—that we acquire the technical building blocks, i.e., the new technologies, and critical components, that we need for major systems development. We cannot do a proper job of engineering development, least of all operational systems development, unless these building blocks are available. Lack of attention to this principle in the past has been one of the major causes of waste and inefficiency in the research and development program. All too often large-scale weapon

system developments, and even production programs, have been undertaken before we had clearly defined what was wanted and before we had clearly determined that there existed a suitable technological base on which to draw in developing a system. And, all too often insufficient attention has been paid to how a proposed weapon system would be used; what it would cost; and, finally, whether the contribution the weapon could make to our military capability would be worth the cost. Let me give you a few examples to illustrate this point.

Nuclear-powered aircraft

Here is a case where a major development program was undertaken before a suitable technological base had been created. Nearly 15 years and about \$1 billion had been devoted to the nuclear-powered aircraft project before it was terminated in 1961. Throughout its history the program was characterized by attempts to find shortcuts to early flight. Only a relatively small fraction of the money expended was applied to the really critical pacing item, namely the development of an efficient reactor with a potentially high performance. Most of the funds were consumed in aircraft and weapon system design, in trying to develop turbine machinery, aircraft components, radiation resistant tires and oils, and for the construction of various facilities, many of which would be needed only in support of a flight test program. The powerplant development was oriented primarily to the goal of early flight, an approach which yielded little, if any, potential for further growth into a militarily useful system. Neither of the two powerplants under development at the time the project was canceled held any great promise as practical propulsion units. Both would have required very large aircraft with limited speed and altitude characteristics, and involving severe operational and ground handling problems and hazards. Thus, due to the lack of the pacing item, it is highly unlikely that we would ever have obtained anything useful from a military point of view, had we continued the project.

The P-6-M jet-powered flying boat

Here is a case where a project was advanced into the production phase long before even the basic design problems were solved. The project was started in 1951 to meet an anticipated requirement for a fast, mine-laying, jet-powered seaplane, capable of flying at transonic speeds at sea level and at high altitudes, with an ability to take off and land in 6- to 8-foot waves and carry a payload of 30,000 pounds over a range of 900 miles. Even though various model tests conducted in 1953 and 1954 disclosed a number of serious design deficiencies, the development was continued. Further technical deficiencies were disclosed during flight tests in 1955 and 1956. Nevertheless, the first production contract for operational aircraft was placed in late 1956. By the time this project was terminated in August 1959, the Government had expended almost \$450 million, of which more than \$200 million was spent on the production contract. Even then, most of the technical problems had still not been solved.

SM-73—Goose aerodynamic decoy missile

Here is a case where the operational use of a weapon was not clearly foreseen prior to the commencement of full system development. The project was started in June 1955 and terminated in December 1958 at the cost to the Government of about \$80 million. The Goose was essentially a pilotless aircraft which was designed to fly at about the speed of a B-52 and appear on enemy radar as a manned bomber. The operational concept called for launching Goose at the same time the manned bombers took off. However, the manned bombers could be recalled and returned to their bases, but the Goose could

not be recovered once it was launched. Thus the Goose was incompatible with the new concept of positive control (under which the bombers automatically return to base unless specifically directed to continue to target) and had to be abandoned.

Construction of a radio telescope at Sugar Grove, W. Va.

Here is a case where the construction of an extremely complex research facility was started before all of the technical problems had been thoroughly studied. Construction of this radio telescope, known as the Big Dish, was decided upon in the fiscal year 1959 budget at which time its total cost was estimated at \$80 million. Two years later the cost estimate had risen to \$135 million and to preclude a further increase, the House Appropriations Committee established this amount as a ceiling on the project. By the spring of 1962 it was clear that the cost would amount to \$190 to \$200 million, without any assurance the facility would meet the originally stated requirements. In the light of this, and other factors, the project was terminated last July at a cost to the Government of about \$70 million.

PROGRAM DEFINITION

In order to minimize such problems in the future we are now following the practice of inaugurating large system development projects only after completion of what we call a program definition phase. This is the phase in which we, together with our contractors, do our thinking and planning—before we start bending metal."

Very briefly, the program definition phase begins with the solicitation of proposals from industry and involves a number of early study contracts whose purpose is simply to define the program, prior to authorizing full-scale development. In the early stages of the program definition phase we do not attempt to establish rigorous specifications, preferring to encourage initiative and innovation on the part of our contractors or contractor teams. Indeed, where competing approaches present an unusually difficult choice, we may support more than one approach throughout the whole program definition period.

Working together, a contractor team can explore in depth the many unknowns which are present in any new effort. They can accomplish the overall system design, define the subsystems and major components, and begin the early stages of laboratory experimentation and design. Most important, they can identify the critical problems and make good estimates of how long and how much money it will take to solve them.

With this information at hand, we are in a much better position to decide whether or not to proceed with full-scale development. And if we decide on full-scale development, the basic scientific and management team will have already been established, with a visible history of successful collaboration during the program definition phase. Finally, it will be possible to make the decision for full-scale effort with far greater assurance that the cost estimates are sound, that the performance of the system will meet the promise, and that the military requirement will be filled at the time needed.

Prior planning, and even feasibility testing of pacing components, are a lot cheaper than having to reorient, stretch out, or terminate expensive projects after they have been started. There are, of course, exceptions to this general rule. Where a development can add a new and unique dimension to our military capability like the A- and H-bombs and the ICBM, great costs and risks are justified. But such cases are rare. The typical development promises, if successful, to achieve a capability that can also be achieved in other ways or represents an improvement of but modest proportions in our total military capability. In these cases the urgency

is not as great and the employment of a more measured and orderly approach to development and production is fully justified. In fact, I have observed that in most cases careful and comprehensive prior planning actually saves time as well as money and results in more effective and more dependable weapons.

Another major source of waste, as I noted earlier, is the parallel development of projects and systems designed for the same general mission. The cost of developing new aircraft today is reckoned in the hundreds of millions of dollars. In the case of the B-70, the development of three prototype aircraft will probably cost us about \$1.5 billion and they will still not be designed as operational vehicles. The cost of developing a new major missile system is even higher. We have invested well over \$1 billion in the Nike-Zeus already and the Atlas and Titan developments ran well over \$2 billion each. Even the cost of developing a new aircraft engine to the point of production is about \$150 million.

But this is only the beginning of the increased cost. If two models are produced where one could do the job, the cost of production is also increased. Two production lines instead of one must be set up and tooling and the economies of large-scale, repetitive production are lost, thus significantly increasing the cost per unit. Two separate pipelines of spares and unique support equipment instead of one must be established in the logistics system, with all the additional costs involved. And, finally, two sets of obsolete spares and support equipment instead of one will eventually have to be disposed of when the end item is finally phased out of the inventory. We have on hand, at this very moment, more than \$12 billion of "Excess and long supply" items in our inventories, excluding the billions of dollars of surplus and obsolete major end items which have to be disposed of each year. Thus there are very great economic incentives for reducing the number of different weapon systems and major items of equipment in our inventories.

NIKE-TALOS CONTROVERSY

Yet the record is replete with instances of duplicate developments. One of the most memorable cases of parallel weapon projects conducted under the auspices of different services was the Nike-Talos controversy. The land-based Talos, an Air Force-sponsored adaptation of the Navy shipborne Talos, was directly competitive with the Army's Nike-B (later the Nike-Hercules) development, the follow-on effort to the Nike-Ajax. The history of this controversy was complicated by the roles and missions issue which need not concern us in this context. What is of interest here, however, is the fact that these parallel developments proceeded right up to the point where both were about to be produced and deployed.

At this point, however, Congress balked at the prospect of such an obvious duplication and refused to authorize the use of construction funds for Talos until the Department of Defense completed an evaluation of the two systems and came forth with specific recommendations. As the report of the Senate Armed Services Committee stated: "The committee concluded that both the Army and Air Force are assigned overlapping roles and missions in the anti-aircraft and continental air defense fields. The committee believes that unless concise responsibilities are assigned, duplication of weapon systems costing in the multibillion-dollar ranges might result and that such duplication would obviously be too costly as well as inexcusable from a military standpoint." Faced with this mandate, responsibility for land-based Talos was transferred to the Army in the fall of 1957. Following an evaluation study, the Army canceled the

project in July of 1958 at a cost to the Government of \$118 million.

I know that I need not burden this committee with a recitation of the Thor-Jupiter controversy which involved essentially the same kind of issue.

MULTIPLE AIRCRAFT ENGINE DEVELOPMENT

Another area in which unnecessary duplication has long existed is in jet aircraft engine development. While there may have been a justification in the early stages for a large number of different projects, jet engine technology has now reached a point where parallel development is no longer justified. Indeed, the time has come where we should make use, whenever possible, of engines already developed. This we have done in the case of the new C-141 cargo transport aircraft. Here we had a choice of developing an entirely new engine, which would probably have given this aircraft perhaps a 2- to 3-percent improvement in overall performance, or of using an already developed engine, the TF-33, at a saving in development costs alone of well over \$100 million. Considering the additional saving which will accrue in production costs and later in supply and maintenance costs, it was clear that we should use the TF-33 engine.

MULTIPLE FIGHTER AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENTS

One of the most costly areas of duplication has been that of fighter aircraft. For example, in the 1955-58 period there were no less than four aircraft under development to perform the fighter mission—two in the Navy and two in the Air Force. The Navy aircraft were the F4H-1 and the F8U-3. The Air Force aircraft were the F-105 and the F-107. One might argue that there were special requirements associated with Air Force and Navy missions which necessitated basically different aircraft. Even so both the F4H-1 and the F8U-3 were, as the House Appropriations Committee noted in its report on the 1958 defense appropriation bill, "all-weather fighters with approximately the same mission and operational characteristics." Accordingly, the committee directed the Navy to "take prompt action to decide which of these aircraft it will place in production. This should be accomplished at an earlier date and with fewer test and evaluation aircraft than is presently scheduled." The Navy eventually chose the F4H-1 for production, but by the time the F8U-3 development was terminated, it had cost the Government over \$136 million.

In the case of the Air Force, the F-107 was terminated at a cost of about \$85 million. Even so, two of the four aircraft, the F4H and the F-105, were actually placed in production. A comprehensive analysis of these two production programs in 1961 convinced me that one aircraft, the F4H, could meet the need of the Air Force as well as the Navy, and do it better than the F-105. Accordingly, further procurement of the F-105 has been terminated and the F4H, now designated the F-4, will be bought for both the Air Force and the Navy. In addition, I have assigned supply management responsibilities for all spare parts and components peculiar to the F-4 aircraft to the Department of the Air Force and I have asked the Air Force and the Navy to develop and submit to me, for my approval, joint plans for the maintenance of this aircraft.

TFX

Perhaps the most important single action we have taken thus far to reduce the number of different weapon systems in our inventory is the TFX, which has been so prominent in the news of late. This aircraft development is designed to provide a replacement for the F-4. Instead of developing and producing two separate aircraft, one for the Navy and another for the Air Force, as was done in the case of the F-105 and the F4H, we decided to develop and produce one air-

craft which would meet the requirements of both services. Admittedly, this is not a simple undertaking. The development of a major weapon system to meet the requirements of more than one service is something of a precedent in the Department of Defense. It took more than a year and a half and tens of thousands of manhours of intensive study by both the Defense Department and industry to perfect this plan.

Yet it should be clear to all who are interested in economy and efficiency in the Defense Establishment that we can no longer afford to undertake major development projects to meet unilateral service requirements where a single project can meet the requirements of more than one service. The additional costs involved are much too great. From here on out, we must seek to develop weapon systems to perform a military task, and if it so happens that more than one service has the same task then they will be required, as a general rule, to use the same weapon system wherever this can be accomplished without compromising essential military requirements. Where operational conditions vary, as for example, in attack carrier operations, the minimum number of changes in the common system will be made to accommodate these differences.

This is the principle involved and I think everyone will agree it is an entirely sound one. While one might argue as to precisely how much one system would save as compared with two, I believe everyone would agree that the saving in logistics costs, as I am using the term here today, cannot help but be very substantial. In the case of the TFX we believe these savings will amount to at least a billion dollars in development, production, and operating costs over the life cycle of this aircraft.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COST REDUCTION PROGRAM

Because of the great uncertainties inherent in research and development, we have not attempted to establish precise monetary savings targets for that part of the "logistics spectrum," as we have for procurement, production, construction, supply, maintenance, transportation, etc. For the latter, we have established specific time-phased Defense Department goals for some 24 areas of logistics management. Selected goals in turn have been established for the military departments and defense agencies (i.e., DSA and DCA) so that our key logistics managers know exactly what is expected of them. These goals are admittedly ambitious and will be achieved only if all management levels in the Defense Department give them continuing, high priority attention. Accordingly, the service Secretaries and agency heads have been directed to make a monthly or quarterly review of progress achieved and to report the results to my office. These reports are audited by the Comptroller, both with regard to the goals and the progress against them.

The current cost reduction goals are summarized in the attached table. The last two columns show the goals reported to the President last July. Management improvement actions instituted in 1962 and planned for fiscal year 1963 should ultimately produce annual savings of about \$1.9 billion. Our goal for end fiscal year 1965 is to initiate actions which will increase the rate of savings to about \$3.5 billion a year. These are higher goals than those reported to the President, but I believe they can be achieved with a real effort on the part of all concerned.

Mr. Morris will discuss these goals in detail later and give you an up-to-date progress report on their attainment. What I would like to do at this time is to discuss some of the basic concepts and principles upon which these objectives have been developed.

BUYING ONLY WHAT WE NEED

Before we can intelligently decide what to buy, we must first determine precisely what

is needed, and what is needed must be directly related to realistic and soundly conceived military plans and policies. All too often in the past, materiel requirements were determined on the basis of unrealistic military plans which themselves reflected the wide divergence of views among the services as to the probable nature of a future war. For example, the Air Force, planning essentially for a short nuclear war, was not buying enough combat consumables to support the Army in a conventional limited war. And the Army, envisioning a long, large-scale general war, was generating requirements so large as to be useless in planning its actual procurement programs. As a result, serious imbalances developed in the stocks of weapons, equipment, and combat consumables held by different services and even within the inventories of a single service.

Therefore, one of my first actions in the logistics management area was to insure that the requirements calculations for our major combat items were soundly based on unified contingency planning and realistic, attainable logistics objectives. By redefining our logistics objectives to accord with approved Defense Department-wide contingency plans we were able to reduce our total stated materiel requirements by some \$24 billion. By setting out realistic goals that could be achieved within a reasonable period of time, we have been able to assure that the readiness levels of all related elements of the military forces are raised together and maintained in balance, one with another.

The first step was taken in 1961, in connection with the development of the fiscal year 1963 budget, with the establishment of a specific procurement objective for a large number of important items needed to insure that all of our forces could engage in sustained nonnuclear combat operations for a reasonable period of time. In the 1964 budget, now before the Congress, we propose to take another step to a still higher level of readiness, but again with an eye to the balance among all the related elements of the forces.

In moving toward this goal, we are giving priority to those items in which we are most seriously short, and to those new items which offer large improvements in combat effectiveness in relation to their cost. Modernization simply for its own sake is a luxury we cannot afford. Only by carefully husbanding our resources can we insure that all of our essential materiel requirements are met and that all of our forces are supplied and equipped, on a balanced basis, and are able to carry out the plans we have set for them.

We are also taking steps to get away from the use of often arbitrary and wasteful rule-of-thumb measures for determining pipeline requirements. Instead of simply adopting a standard factor for pipeline computations, we must, at least in the case of high cost, major end items and components, determine quantitative requirements on an item-by-item basis. We must explore every opportunity to shorten leadtimes by using our transportation resources more effectively, by taking steps to increase the post D-day production potential, etc. It is obvious that very great savings are possible if we are able to reduce the pipeline requirements without adversely affecting combat readiness. Let me give you a specific example: in the case of the M-88 tank recovery vehicle, we found that the substitution of a fully adequate transit pipeline factor of 55 days for the previously used arbitrary factor of 120 days enabled us to realize savings of \$12.5 million on just this one item. These actions not only reduce procurement requirements, they also reduce storage and maintenance costs for the entire operational life of the item and, eventually, the amount of surplus which has to be disposed of.

The problem of setting sound requirement standards for major items of equipment is admittedly difficult; however, in the area of supply inventories the logistics management problem becomes far more complicated. This complexity is caused primarily by the great number and diversity of the items involved—nearly 4 million different items, having a value of \$40.6 billion, currently being carried in our supply system. Because these items are so numerous and diverse, we simply must decentralize their management. However, when we do so, we then encounter the tendency of each echelon in the supply system to introduce unilateral safety factors into its requirement calculations. The final result, of course, is that the computed requirement often grossly overstates true needs. To improve the soundness of our supply item requirement calculations, we are undertaking a series of management improvement actions such as wider application of automatic data processing equipment, the increased use of fast logistics communication links, and the continuous review and redefinition of safety factors in our requirements computations.

It is not enough to determine simply the quantitative requirements for equipment and supplies. We must also determine the qualitative requirements as well. There is no point in paying for performance or quality features that are not needed to accomplish the essential military task. In any meaningful sense, procurement of excessive quality, which we call gold plating, is just as wasteful as procurement of excessive quantities. While it is understandable that an item costing \$1,000 may perform more effectively than another costing half as much, we must always make a judgment as to whether the additional performance is worth the doubled cost. This will always be a most difficult area, since informed judgment is required in all such determinations. It is an area, however, in which we have only just scratched the surface of potential management improvement and in which we feel that substantial additional savings can be made in the future.

CONSOLIDATION OF COMMON SUPPLY AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES

In order to be sure that we are buying only what we need we must know exactly what we already have on hand and on order; and this, in an organization as huge, diverse, and far flung as the Defense Department is far from a simple problem. This is particularly true with regard to long supply and excess items, one of the most galling and troublesome areas of logistics management. Instances of one service buying items that are being disposed of by another are, to the taxpayer, the most unexplainable and inexcusable kind of waste. Yet this problem can never be entirely avoided as long as you have different parts of the organization buying and managing the same items. One solution, of course, is to have only one element of the organization purchase and manage all commonly used supplies and services, wherever centralized procurement is indicated. And this has been the solution long favored by many Members of the Congress.

The trend toward the consolidation of the logistics functions, including the procurement of common items of supply and services, has been underway in the Defense Establishment for a long time. Certainly, since the end of World War II, the sentiment, especially within the Congress, for faster progress toward consolidation grew markedly stronger. Following the Unification Act, the problem of overlapping logistics functions in the Defense Department drew the repeated attention and criticism of the Congress. Beginning with the recommendations of the Bonner subcommittee in 1952, the efforts of members of this committee in effecting passage of the O'Mahoney

amendment to the 1953 Defense appropriation bill and later the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Reorganization Act of 1958, Congress continually prodded the Department in the direction of truly unified logistics management.

The Defense Establishment, however, moved very cautiously toward that objective with various improvisations such as coordinated procurement, joint procurement agencies, and later the establishment of single managers for common supplies and services and the creation of certain Defense-wide coordinating agencies such as the Armed Forces Supply Support Center. These improvisations, however, did not get to the core of the problem—the need for a single agency charged with the responsibility for procuring and managing all commonly used and centrally procured supplies and services.

I remember a presentation made to me back in 1961 dealing with the lack of standardization in the clothing area. Each service, for example, was buying a different type of butcher smock, each in several sizes—a total of 18 different inventory items. Today we stock only two types in fewer sizes—a total of seven different inventory items. You all know the story of the belt buckles and the exercise bloomers.

Thus one of the first and most pressing tasks I had to face when I assumed the Office of the Secretary of Defense was the solution of this long-standing problem of the management of common supplies and services. In reviewing the efforts that had been made since World War II, I concluded that this problem must be attacked head on. It seemed clear to me, as it had to this committee for many years, that only through the establishment of a separate, single supply support agency could we ever hope to find a lasting solution. The result was the creation of the Defense Supply Agency, which now does the buying, the stocking, and where necessary, the surplus disposal of a wide range of commonly used supplies and services. Within its area of responsibility, it will greatly help to insure that we buy only what we need.

Already, the new Agency has made possible a personnel reduction of 3,700 in the fiscal year 1964 budget with an operations and maintenance saving of \$33 million. Inventory is expected to be reduced by \$232 million during the current fiscal year with a further reduction of \$112 million in fiscal year 1964. DSA now handles about 1 million supply items but the number of different storage points is being reduced from 77 to 11.

The basic principle that there should be a single agency to procure and manage common items of supply or services for all users is, as this committee has repeatedly pointed out, as valid for the Government as a whole as it is for the Department of Defense. Therefore, in our own efforts to obtain greater efficiency through the consolidation of common logistics support activities, we should not restrict ourselves to Defense agencies alone. Whenever we find that it is more economical to use the capabilities or facilities of other Government agencies, with no loss in military effectiveness, and at the same or less cost, we should not and have not hesitated to do so. The General Services Administration annually buys for us about \$770 million of common-use items such as office supplies, furniture and automatic data processing equipment. This agency also helps us in the screening and disposal of surplus property, in the leasing and maintenance of real property, the storage of records, the purchase of utilities, etc.

BUYING AT THE LOWEST SOUND PRICE

Once we have determined what it is we need to buy, the next problem is to procure it at the lowest sound price considering, of course, quality and delivery dates. For over 100 years, formal advertising has been the

preferred method of Government procurement. This method not only insures that the price discipline of the competitive system is harnessed to the advantage of the Government but it also minimizes the risk of bias and preferential treatment in the awarding of contracts. However, since the end of World War II only a small portion of defense procurement has been awarded on a formally advertised basis. To a major extent this was unavoidable, as only conventional classes of equipment and supplies, purchased repetitively in volume, lend themselves fully to procurement by this method.

Formal advertising is inappropriate for virtually all research and development work and for the acquisition of many of today's sophisticated weapon systems, where it is impossible to draw up detailed specifications in advance and make firm fixed-price contracts, with selection based on price alone. Moreover, there are a number of other situations where formal advertising is not applicable by law; for example, small business set-asides, small purchases (under \$2,500), emergency purchases, the procurement of perishable subsistence, and items subject to military security classification. These, too, serve to reduce the portion of defense procurement that can be accomplished through formal advertising.

Notwithstanding these limitations, we are making a vigorous effort to expand the use of formal advertising. In this connection, the so-called two-step procurement procedure recently approved by the GAO should prove extremely helpful where precise design is not as important as specific performance characteristics. Under this procedure bidders are first asked to submit proposals to meet specific performance criteria without providing a price quotation. These proposals are then examined by the Government engineers and buyers, and those which meet the desired performance characteristics are approved. In the second step, bidders whose products have been approved then submit sealed bids and the contract is awarded to the lowest responsible bidder under the formal advertising procedure.

INCREASING PRICE COMPETITION

But the fact that for much of our procurement we cannot rely on formal advertising does not mean that we should not demand and facilitate competition for defense contracts. This, in fact, has been one of my principal objectives, not only in the procurement area but also in research and development.

One way in which we can increase competition is to minimize sole-source procurement wherein, for example, we automatically buy spares and spare parts from the original producer of the end item. By breaking out these spares from the main contract we can procure them separately through competitive procedures. This, of course, entails the identification of the spares or spare parts, the preparation of procurement specifications and the seeking out of sources of supply in order to permit competitive bidding. In this effort, we have concentrated first on the high dollar value items already in the defense supply system. Now we are seeking to apply this technique to new items as they enter the supply system and to develop uniform procedures for screening and identifying such items in current and future procurements.

We are also trying to introduce competition at an earlier stage in our procurement process at the point where a new item is ready to be moved from development into production. If successful, this would enable us to avoid paying a price premium on the first large-scale production buy. But use of this method does open up a whole series of new and difficult problems. In order to introduce competition early in the procurement cycle, we must see to it that the nec-

essary drawings and technical data are produced during the development phase so that they may be available at the time the first procurement is made. This is not always possible, especially where time is critical or where the design is still subject to major change. Also, where large engineering and tooling costs are involved, it is unlikely that any new source would be able to compete successfully against the development contractor who may have already completed a large part of the production engineering and tooling.

Experience has demonstrated that very large savings can be achieved by increasing competition. We estimate these savings at about 25 cents on each dollar shifted from noncompetitive to competitive procurement and this is the basis upon which we have computed the savings of nearly \$500 million per year to be achieved by fiscal year 1965.

REDUCTION IN COST-PLUS-FIXED-FEE CONTRACTS

It has long been recognized that cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts usually provide no incentive for economy, or superior performance. Nevertheless, in recent years, an increasing share of our procurement has been carried out under cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, rising from about 13 percent in 1952 to nearly 38 percent during the first 9 months of 1961. To some extent this shift to cost-plus-fixed-fee contracting was unavoidable because of the exploding technology of the 1950's which introduced unprecedented complexity and sophistication in our equipment.

However, even where firm fixed-price contracting is not feasible, penalties and rewards can still be utilized. There are other techniques available through which we can provide incentives to the Defense contractor to perform economically and efficiently. The most important method is the use of incentive contracts in which the contractor's fee is increased if he betters the target price or target performance goals, or conversely, is reduced or eliminated entirely if he fails to meet the contract targets. By fiscal year 1965, we hope to reduce cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts to about 12½ percent of our total contract awards, with an eventual annual savings of nearly \$700 million. Already in the first 8 months of the current fiscal year we have reduced the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts to about 23.3 percent of the total as compared to 38 percent in the first 9 months of 1961.

REDUCING OPERATING COSTS

An equally important part of our cost reduction program is our effort to reduce the day-to-day costs of operating the Defense Establishment. One important aspect of this effort has been our program for the closing of unneeded bases and installations. To date, we have announced plans to close or reduce in scope some 330 activities, of which 72 are located overseas and 258 within the United States. As Assistant Secretary Morris will report in detail later, good progress has been made in carrying out these announced closures and continued studies are being made to identify additional installations and bases that can be reduced or closed in future years. We expect by the end of fiscal year 1965 to have initiated actions which will eventually save over \$440 million per year. Progress to date is shown in the table below:

Actions announced as of Dec. 31, 1962

	Total
Number of locations.....	330
Acres to be excessed.....	274,000
Acquisition cost (millions).....	\$1,922
Personnel to be released.....	44,923
Annual savings when action completed ¹ (millions).....	\$270

¹ Many actions require 2 or 3 years to complete.

In an organization as large as the Department of Defense, efforts to simplify procedures can yield surprisingly large savings. Therefore, we are examining our contractor reporting requirements, our requisitioning and transportation procedures and other types of logistics paperwork with the aim of eliminating unneeded or overlapping procedures and achieving the greatest degree of standardization where elimination is not practicable. Substantial success has already been achieved, and we expect to make even greater progress in the coming years.

Another area where increased management effort can yield significant monetary savings, as well as greater combat readiness, is equipment maintenance for which we spend about \$11 billion a year. Actions which we have already taken and plan to take through fiscal year 1965 should produce savings of about \$300 million a year. But this is an area in which we have barely scratched the surface. To insure top level attention to this function and to coordinate the efforts of the entire Department a full-time Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Equipment Maintenance has recently been appointed.

One of the key ways in which we can make savings in the operations of the Department is through the consolidation of like activities. I have already mentioned the Defense Supply Agency but I am sure you will agree that the underlying principle applies to other areas of Defense activity as well. The swiftly expanding requirements for modern military communications, for example, and their even more swiftly rising costs have made departmentwide management of certain portions of the communications system both militarily necessary and financially imperative. Accordingly, a new Defense Communications Agency has been established to guide the development of unified long-line communications systems for use by all elements of the Department. This Agency is also responsible for other important functions such as the development and support of the National Military Command System and the supervision of the military communications satellite development program.

Still another area where consolidation appeared to be a necessity was in headquarters intelligence activities. For this reason, we created the Defense Intelligence Agency not so much, in this case, to reduce costs but rather to utilize more effectively our resources in this vital area.

Real property management, including military family housing, provides another area for reducing operating costs. We have now brought family housing under centralized management in each Department and established a new cost accounting system to facilitate better management. And with the cooperation of the Congress, we hope to bring together in a single appropriation all funds for construction, operation, maintenance, improvement and leasing of family housing.

Our efforts to improve the management of the entire logistics spectrum have resulted in some important changes, not only Department of Defense-wide, but also within the military departments. The Air Force in 1961 substantially realigned its organizational structure to meet better the management requirements imposed by the radical change in the nature of modern weapon systems. The Army has virtually completed its reorganization started last year, and has significantly reduced the operational complexity and administrative overlapping of the former Technical Services. And now the Navy, too, is considering a substantial realignment of its organization to fit it better to the demands of modern warfare.

Mr. Chairman, the task of management in the Defense Department is never done. New problems arise as old ones are solved, as evidenced by the constant flow of GAO reports. I can assure you that these reports, as well as constructive criticism from any

other source, receive top level attention in the Defense Department. For example, I examine all GAO reports as they come into the Department and all of the written replies are reviewed and initiated by either Mr. Gilpatrick or me, in terms of approving their substance, before they go back to the GAO.

I am sure that the logistics management improvement program, which I have outlined here this morning will not prove to be the final word. But I am equally sure that this program will correct many deficiencies of long standing and result in savings of several billion dollars per year.

Department of Defense procurement and logistics cost-reduction program

(Dollars in millions)

	Recurring annual savings to be realized from actions in fiscal years 1962 through current year				
	As estimated Jan. 15, 1963			As reported to President	
	1963	1964	1965	1963	1967
1. Buying only what we need:					
a. Refining requirements calculations:					
(1) Major items of equipment.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	0	0
(2) Initial spares provisioning.....	\$104	\$157	\$210	0	0
(3) Secondary items.....	420	502	550	\$150	\$300
(4) Technical manuals.....	8	25	30	0	0
Total from refinement of requirements.....	532	684	790	150	300
b. Increased use of excess inventory in lieu of new equipment:					
(1) Equipment and supplies.....	189	284	394	225	450
(2) Idle production equipment.....	2	10	21	0	0
(3) Excess contractor inventory.....	20	20	20	0	0
Total from increased use of excess inventory.....	211	314	435	225	450
c. Eliminating "goldplating".....	\$64	\$100	\$100	\$64	\$100
d. Inventory item reduction.....	\$1	\$4	\$5	0	0
2. Buying at the lowest sound price:					
a. Shift from noncompetitive to competitive procurement:					
Total percent competitive ¹	(37)	(38.4)	(39.9)		
Amount of saving.....	\$281	\$402	\$494	\$160	\$480
b. Shift from cost-plus-a-fixed-fee to fixed or incentive price:					
Total percent cost-plus-a-fixed-fee ²	(25.8)	(19.1)	(12.3)		
Amount of saving.....	\$322	\$502	\$684	\$100	\$600
3. Reducing operating costs:					
a. Terminating unnecessary operations.....	292	357	442	257	600
b. Standardizing and simplifying procedures:					
(1) Consolidation of 16 requisition systems into 1 on July 1, 1962.....	10	20	20	20	20
(2) Consolidation of 81 transportation documents into 1.....	0	22	32	30	30
(3) Reduction of contractor reports.....	1	4	25	30	30
c. Consolidating and increasing efficiency of operations:					
(1) DSA operating expense savings.....	31	33	42	28	50
(2) DCA and communication system savings.....	16	20	25		30
(3) Improvement of transportation and traffic management.....	17	23	23	40	65
(4) Improvement of equipment, maintenance and management.....	108	199	297	48	300
(5) Administrative vehicles.....	3	9	11	0	0
(6) Improvement of military housing management.....	6	11	19	3	27
(7) Improvement of real property management.....	24	34	45	0	0
Total program.....	1,919	2,738	3,489	1,155	3,082

¹ Savings will be reported as identified. In fiscal year 1962 requirements for major items of equipment were reduced by \$24,000,000,000. In fiscal year 1963, the Army reduced 1964 pipeline requirements by \$500,000,000; and substituted an expanded production base for a mobilization reserve inventory, saving a net of \$36,000,000, a total saving of \$536,000,000.

² Fiscal year 1961 was 32.9 percent; total annual conversion from sole source of \$1,900,000,000; savings are 25 percent per dollar converted.

³ For the last 9 months of fiscal year 1961, cost-plus-fixed-fee was 38 percent; a reduction of \$6,000,000,000 is required to reduce that percentage to 12.3 percent; savings are 10 percent per dollar converted.

⁴ Fiscal year 1963 goal reported in July 5, 1962 memo to President, on a conservative basis, as \$750,000,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the distinguished majority leader on a very important statement insofar as the general welfare of this country is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT] on the budget appear in the RECORD immediately following my remarks on the Youth Corps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'BRIEN of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

THE TWO-PRICE COTTON SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend

my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to express my continuing concern for the economic well-being of our Nation and those individuals who earn their livelihoods in the great American textile industry. On many occasions I have called to the attention of my colleagues the plight of American textile workers and employers as a result of the inequitable two-price cotton system.

A great American, commenting upon this problem on September 6, 1962, made this statement:

Thus, the inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry, for which a solution must be found in the near future.

The great American who uttered those words was the President of the United States when he commented upon this question immediately following the Tariff Commission's rejection of the Department of Agriculture's recommendation of an import fee of 8½ cents per pound on the raw cotton content of textile imports as authorized under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

When this statement was made great hope was engendered in the minds of those of us who have been so concerned about the problem. Today, after the passing of approximately 6 months, we seem no nearer a solution of this tremendous problem. As a matter of fact, it appears that we are further away from the desired solution than we were at the time the President uttered the truth which I have just quoted.

Since the two-price cotton system is bringing great injury to the domestic textile industry, I would like to review with you briefly some of the basic economic facts relating to the importance of the textile industry to my home State of North Carolina and to the United States.

Because of my desire to give to my colleagues an unbiased picture of the importance of the textile industry to Americans, I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to make an objective study of the importance of this industry to the economy of our Nation. The report, even though based on the census of manufactures taken in 1958 by the Bureau of the Census, revealed many interesting facts. I will now undertake to briefly state the basic facts reported by the experts in the Industrial Organization and Corporation Finance Economics Division of the Library of Congress.

Textile manufacture is North Carolina's leading industry, and North Carolina ranks first among all 50 States in the production of textile goods. North Carolina's textiles find their way into the marketplaces of the Nation and throughout the free world.

Because it provides clothing and contributes so extensively to shelter, the textile industry is basic to our American economy. Furthermore, textile production is essential to the national security. In this new era of space exploration, textiles are indispensable. As American men and vehicles whirl through space, textiles are playing an ever-expanding role, from the rocket nose cone to the astronaut's protective clothing and his recovery chute.

The annual value of all textile manufactures in the United States is well over \$13¼ billion. Although the industry is concentrated in the Southeast, its 8,000 plants are scattered throughout 44 States. With more than 950,000 employees the textile industry has a payroll of at least \$3½ billion.

Textile mills in the United States consumed 8,131,756 bales of cotton in 1958. Other raw materials important to textile production are wool and manmade fibers.

Each year the textile industry utilizes about \$85 million in fuels, and almost \$120 million in electricity.

Estimates place expenditures on new plant and equipment by the textile industry during 1962 at about \$620 million.

Furthermore, outlays on research in the combined textile and apparel industry totaled \$29 million in 1959, the latest year for which such data are available.

These then are the broad dimensions of the American textile industry.

The annual value of textile manufacture in North Carolina amounts to well over \$3.1 billion, or one-fourth of the total value of American textile production. The textile industry of North Carolina produces in value almost a fourth of all broad woven cotton goods in the United States; more than a third of the manmade fiber fabrics; and almost 10 percent of all woolen and worsted goods.

North Carolina's spinning mills turn out nearly half of all cotton sales yarn produced in this country while its knitting mills produce about half of the Nation's entire hosiery output.

In 1958, according to the Census of Manufactures, value added by manufacture of textiles in North Carolina's plants amounted to more than \$1 billion—\$1,012,404,000—or about one-third of total value added by manufacture of products in all North Carolina's manufacturing establishments. Furthermore, the figure for the textile industry was approximately two-thirds higher than the corresponding data for cigarette production—\$604,165,000.

For other industries important to North Carolina's economy the value added by manufacture in 1958, in order of magnitude, was as follows: food and kindred products, \$235,207,000; furniture and fixtures, \$210,457,000; chemical and allied products, \$150,565,000; electrical machinery, \$143,130,000; apparel and related products, \$115,244,000; paper and allied products, \$102,679,000; and lumber and wood products, \$101,720,000.

Wages and salaries paid out by North Carolina's textile industry totaled \$609,740,000 in 1958. Second to textiles in that same year was the furniture and fixtures industry, with a payroll of \$122,958,000; followed by food and kindred products, \$99,370,000; cigarette production, \$73,837,000; apparel and related products, \$69,742,000; lumber and wood products, \$65,654,000; electrical machinery, \$59,621,000; chemical and allied products, \$53,364,000; and paper and allied products, \$52,171,000.

North Carolina's textile industry and its employees pay more than \$29 million annually in corporate and individual income taxes and sales taxes. This amounts to almost one-third of the State's total collection from these three sources.

North Carolina's textile industry is essential to the State's agricultural economy, tied to the cotton producers of the entire South.

Currently, more than 2.5 million bales of cotton are utilized a year by North Carolina's textile plants. This is almost nine times the total crop of 280,000 bales of cotton grown on the State's 4,827 commercial cotton farms in 1961.

According to the Census of Manufactures, in 1958, consumption of raw cot-

ton by the textile industry of North Carolina totaled 2,387,000 bales. Of this aggregate, cotton weaving mills accounted for 1,163,000 bales and cotton yarn mills, 1,136,000 bales. The remainder was used by synthetic weaving mills, thread mills, and mills manufacturing miscellaneous textile goods.

The woolen and worsted mills consume many more pounds of fibers than are produced from the State's woolen clip.

The North Carolina textile industry is also a major source of income for other sectors of the State's economy.

Capital expenditures by the textile industry of North Carolina totaled \$48,666,000 in 1958. Such outlays benefit especially the textile machinery manufacturers.

Other important industries in North Carolina which her textile production helps to boost are chemical and dyestuff manufacture, corn starch production, utilities and transportation.

In the present 10th Congressional District of North Carolina consisting of Gaston, Cleveland, Rutherford, Avery, Catawba, Mitchell, and Burke Counties, there were 344 textile mills in 1958, or 32 percent of the State's total.

Gaston County is the leading textile manufacturing county in the Nation. It consumes more cotton and has more active spindles than any other county.

The entire American textile industry faces the crucial problem of severe competition from low-priced textile imports, especially cotton goods. The agricultural subsidy on our cotton crop is in large part responsible for this situation. The two-price system for American raw cotton imposes an unfair strain upon the domestic cotton textile industry. Let us see how this cotton subsidy operates. In order to bolster cotton growers, the U.S. Government subsidizes exports of raw cotton in the amount of 8½ cents per pound to make American cotton competitive on the world market. However, the American textile manufacturer then pays 8½ cents more for cotton than the foreign purchaser. Consequently, the foreign textile manufacturer gains a double advantage over his American counterpart. In addition to cheaper labor abroad, the foreign textile manufacturer benefits from lower raw materials costs. No wonder, then, that the American textile industry has been plagued with heavy competition from imports of inexpensive cotton goods.

Furthermore, on September 6, 1962, the Tariff Commission rejected a proposed increase in duties on foreign-made cotton textiles. This proposal would have raised the levy on imported cotton textiles by 8½ cents a pound, thus offsetting the price advantage that overseas manufacturers now receive on cotton purchased from the United States.

Bills were then introduced during the last session of the 87th Congress to remove the injustice of the two-price system for domestic cotton. No final action was taken.

During the present session of the 88th Congress similar legislation was again introduced into Congress. If this proposed measure is enacted into law it will provide an "in-kind subsidy" to cotton trad-

ers. For example, traders or middlemen would receive surplus cotton from the Government stockpile, thus enabling them to sell more cotton to domestic textile manufacturers at a lower price.

Other measures have already been instituted to deal with the threat of imports of cheap cotton textiles. A short-term arrangement covering the year ended September 1962 was agreed upon in Geneva. This arrangement was designed to limit imports of cotton textiles and apparel into the United States to about the level of imports during the base period, that is, the year ended June 30, 1961.

During the short-term arrangement actual imports into the United States were the equivalent of 187 million square yards, or 33 percent in excess of the planned limit.

The temporary arrangement was then followed by a 5-year international arrangement. Import quotas were set under the terms of this long-range agreement with all textile importers to the United States.

The textile industry is fundamental to the economy both of the United States and North Carolina. Textiles supply us with clothing and much of our household furnishings. Their role in the national security is crucial. Moreover, textile manufacture boosts sales of countless other industries.

The textile industry of the United States, including that of North Carolina, has been adversely affected by extensive imports of low-priced cotton goods. Steps have already been undertaken to assist the textile industry. First, the 5-year international arrangement, limiting imports of cotton textile goods into the United States, should prove to be helpful to the American textile industry. Congressional action providing for import fees on cotton products would overcome the inequities of the present two-price system in our domestic cotton market. This seems to be the very least that an American textile worker could receive at the hands of his own Government.

Mr. Speaker, another segment of our population has an interest in a fair and equitable cotton pricing program which, in my judgment, is as vital as the interest of the domestic textile worker and his employer. I refer to the cotton farmer and his family.

In testimony before the House Agriculture Cotton Subcommittee I have tried to persuade my brethren of the necessity for the elimination of the two-price cotton system as a necessary step if the cotton agricultural economy is to survive. On several occasions I have brought this to the attention of my colleagues in speeches that have been made here in the House of Representatives. The same representations have been made by me to officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I see evidence of belief on the part of all except those in the Agriculture Department who have a responsibility in this area. Apparently they, even today, do not understand the seriousness of this situation as it relates to the American cotton farmer. A casual consideration of recent experi-

ence should be adequate warning to all who profess an interest in either our agricultural economy or the textile industry.

For the year ending August 1, 1961, domestic consumption and exports of cotton amounted to 14,757,000 bales; whereas it is estimated that on August 1, 1963, this figure will have dropped to 12,625,000 bales. CCC stocks of cotton for the year ending August 1, 1961, were reported to be 1,484,000 bales; whereas it is estimated that on August 1, 1963, there could be as much as 8,200,000 bales unless the recent action of the Secretary of Agriculture in his dumping operation lowers that figure.

As we recently saw in the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, the Commodity Credit Corporation investment in cotton is skyrocketing, and it may well be that the figure will approach \$2 billion for the cotton program in its various aspects before the end of this fiscal year. These facts point to some of the dangers that confront the agriculturalist who is dependent upon cotton.

Another and equally important threat to the cotton agricultural economy has been pointed out on many occasions as we have discussed the matter here in the House of Representatives. I refer to the rapid conversion of textile production equipment from the processing of cotton to the processing of manmade or synthetic fibers. I will not dwell upon that in any detail today except to call to your attention a typical news story which I have recently read with great interest. On Saturday, March 2, 1963, there appeared in the Southern Textile News a story under the heading "Cotton Pricing May Force New \$7 Million Plant to Synthetics." I make that news story a part of my remarks:

COTTON PRICING MAY FORCE NEW \$7 MILLION PLANT TO SYNTHETICS

GRANITEVILLE, S.C.—The president of the Graniteville Co., one of the oldest producers of cotton cloth in the South, Thursday, told a group of Texas cotton farmers that its new \$7.5 million plant, now being constructed, might turn out blends or synthetic fiber fabrics rather than cotton cloth.

Francis A. Townsend made the remarks before a group from the Lubbock, Tex., area, an area in which the Graniteville Co. is one of the largest single buyers of cotton.

He told the touring group that initially the company had hoped the new spinning and weaving plant would help us maintain and improve the position we have gained in cotton textiles.

But, he said, the company felt it had to hedge our bets because of the pricing policies that control the purchase of American-grown cotton by American textile manufacturers.

He referred to the two-price system which forces American textile manufacturers to pay one-third more for American cotton than their foreign competitors have to pay for the same cotton.

"The Graniteville Co., which began operations as a cotton textile manufacturer in 1845, was an all-cotton operation until 2 years ago," he said.

"The competitive price of raw cotton will determine how large a proportion of our production will be in blends next year and the year after," he said.

The new plant is being designed so that it can turn out blends and manmade fiber fabrics as well as cotton with few machinery adjustments.

"We feel that we owe this versatility to our stockholders, to our employees, and to the communities in which we operate," he said.

COTTON PRICING

The Texans, 48 strong, were on a 2-day tour of textile operations in the Horse Creek Valley area of South Carolina, just north of Augusta, Ga. The tour was sponsored by the American Textile Manufacturers Institute and the Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., of Lubbock.

The group toured manufacturing facilities at Graniteville Thursday after a day of touring facilities of the United Merchants & Manufacturing Co. at nearby Clearwater on Wednesday.

There V. O. Roberson, U.M. & M. vice president had illustrated the price disadvantage of cotton by comparing manufacturing costs of two competitive fabrics, one of cotton only and one about half cotton, half synthetic fiber. The filling yarn in the half-and-half fabric had a manufacturing cost 17 cents a pound below that in the all-cotton fabric.

The startling announcement made by the president of the Graniteville Co. was made to a group of some 40 large acreage cotton growers who were being conducted on a tour of United Merchants & Manufacturers textile operations at Clearwater, S.C., and Graniteville Co., Graniteville, S.C.

The tour was designed to give major cotton producers an insight into textile operations in order to bring about a better understanding between the segments of the cotton industry. They were to see firsthand how the raw fiber they produce is converted into yarn and cloth.

Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1963, a story appeared in the same publication quoting a prominent official of the textile industry with reference to the encroachment of manmade fibers upon the cotton farmer's domestic market. As a part of my remarks at this time I would like to include the story which is entitled "Rapid Switch to Manmade Fibers Foreseen by Lowenstein Official":

RAPID SWITCH TO MANMADE FIBERS FORESEEN BY LOWENSTEIN OFFICIAL

NEW ORLEANS.—America's present two-price cotton system may be more detrimental to farmers than to the textile industry, the president of a major textile chain's cotton buying operation said here Monday at the annual meeting of personnel of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's cotton division.

Robert W. Smith of Anderson, S.C., president of Lowenstein Cotton & Storage Corp., pointed out that the Government's two-price policy requires U.S. mills to pay \$42.50 more per bale than foreign buyers pay for American-grown cotton.

"It is inconceivable to me that the textile industry will continue to try to operate in the face of such a staggering inequity as two-price cotton," he said. "The end effect, I believe, will not be so much of a question of what the textile industry will do as what the farmers will do," Mr. Smith added.

MILLS SWITCHING OVER

Textile mills, Mr. Smith said, are "switching to manmade fibers on an increasingly broad basis, and the effect has been dynamic for some of the manmade fibers. Rayon has been received in the past 5 years and is booming along at record levels—and at prices from 8 to 11 cents cheaper than cotton. Nylon has been similarly revived and is in the midst of a striking boom, with its low-waste characteristic offsetting a slightly

higher price. Other manmade fibers are prospering."

On the other hand, he added, cotton's domestic market is deteriorating and its export market is disappearing.

"The Commodity Credit Corporation is becoming more and more the real 'market' for U.S. cotton," he said. "A distressingly large proportion of our crop is going into government warehouses, where it is of absolutely no value to anyone. Cotton is good for only one thing, and that is to be processed into a textile product."

Mr. Smith also called for stricter classing cotton to conform more closely with the fiber's spinning characteristics. He said inconsistent classing practices affect the price of cotton by failing to reflect spinning values and, also, by varying basic loan values.

Mr. Speaker, further indication of the dangers that the American cotton farmer will continue to lose great portions of the domestic textile industry market is apparent when one considers the rapid decline of the export market for American cotton cloth. In the Southern Textile News of March 16, 1963, a report by John W. Murray, secretary-treasurer, Textile Export Association of the United States, set forth most interesting data on this subject. As a part of my remarks I include that report at this point:

EXPORTS OF AMERICAN COTTON CLOTH HITS ALLTIME LOW AS IMPORTS HIT A NEW HIGH

(By John W. Murray)

Exports of American cotton cloth last year dropped to an alltime low as imports rose to an alltime high. Shipments to overseas markets amounted to 417,393,000 square yards as against 437,794,000 square yards in 1961. The alltime peak was reached in 1947 when close to a billion and a half yards were rushed to a war-stricken world famished for textiles.

Following is the chronology of exports in thousands of square yards since the removal of wartime emergency restrictions early in 1947:

1947	1,478,000
1948	940,440
1949	880,204
1950	557,595
1951	802,479
1952	760,709
1953	621,006
1954	604,788
1955	539,466
1956	511,614
1957	553,386
1958	500,501
1959	472,602
1960	437,794
1961	469,676
1962	417,393

This steady decline in shipments is rather easy to explain. In the first place, many countries have rebuilt their textile facilities to the point where they are not only able to provide basic clothing necessities but produce a surplus for export. These same countries for the most part have succeeded in sheltering their industries within invulnerable fortresses composed of exorbitant tariffs, license requirements far more strict than the surveillance regulations of the toughest criminal parole board, hidden surtaxes and a thousand and one customs vexations.

Over the last several months, in order to prevent the dissolution of the domestic industry, the U.S. Government, in conformance with the International Cotton Textile Agreement, has seen fit to impose restraints on imports from a number of foreign suppliers who regard such actions as a violation of their vested, sovereign interests. In this connection, it may be inter-

esting to compare shipments from these whining suppliers with their purchases from the American industry.

CHIEF SUPPLIERS

Chief suppliers of cotton goods to the U.S. market in 1962 were: Japan, 134,769,300 square yards; Hong Kong, 110,206,900 square yards; Taiwan, 44,053,500; India, 32,775,300; Portugal, 25,987,700; France, 19,219,200; Egypt, 17,171,800; Pakistan, 15,097,200; Yugoslavia, 13,767,200; Korea, 8,316,300; Spain, 7,911,700; West Germany, 7,511,500. Total—436,787,600.

In the same period these same countries purchased from the American industry these meager quantities: Japan, 490,742 square yards; Hong Kong, 206,891; Taiwan, 30,771; India, 69,991; Portugal, neg.; France, 16,833; Spain, 4,975; West Germany, 2,040,733. Total—8,517,073. Neg. means negligible, that is too small to be recorded.

These restrictions have caused world trade in cotton textiles to languish. Shipments from the main non-Communist exporting countries in the third quarter were about 4 percent less than in the corresponding period of 1961 following a decrease of about 7 percent in the first half of the year. Shipments from the United Kingdom, most of the continental European countries except Portugal, the United States, and Hong Kong were smaller than a year earlier while exports from Japan, India and Pakistan were greater.

Most of the drop in American shipments last year came as a result of restrictions imposed by Canada, the Philippines and Venezuela. Exports to Canada, far and away the industry's most important market, amounted to 189,690,076 square yards in 1962 as compared with 216,444,399 square yards in the previous year, a loss of 26,754,323 square yards. Faced with a financial crisis and a tumbling currency, the Canadian Government last June imposed surtaxes and other restrictions on imports which they promised to remove once the emergency was surmounted. Canada now is in the throes of a general election and it is unlikely that any action along these lines will be taken until the new government is chosen and settles down.

BOOSTS TARIFF

In August the Philippine Government boosted tariffs about 400 percent on cotton piece goods. The trade could not help but note that this action was taken only after Congress approved war claims payments to Manila of about \$68 million. As a result, exports to this longtime traditional market dropped from 35 to 28 million square yards.

Increased exports to a number of markets such as South Africa, Dominican Republic, Australia, and the Congo failed to offset losses in other directions.

On the other hand, world trade in manmade fiber piece goods continued to improve. Shipments from most of the main exporting countries were larger than in the previous year. Exports from the United States of America, amounting to 139,590,409 square yards as against the postwar low of 138,684,698 square yards in 1961.

Following is a comparison of shipments in square yards to major markets, with 1962 given first, followed by the figure for 1961:

Canada 29,112,505, 1962; 28,460,056, 1961; United Kingdom 11,391,802, 1962; 14,764,968, 1961; South Africa 10,490,277; 1962; 8,583,110, 1961; Australia 8,083,948; 1962; 4,641,072, 1961; Hong Kong 6,941,983; 1962; 4,290,816, 1961; Sweden 6,540,627; 1962; 6,206,033, 1961; West Germany 6,275,290; 1962; 4,926,807, 1961; Switzerland 5,742,475; 1962; 3,714,236, 1961; Belgium 5,631,672; 1962; 10,755,068, 1961.

Mr. Speaker, the National Cotton Council has also sounded a warning that synthetic fibers constitute a serious threat to the future of cotton agricul-

ture in this country. No other organization in the Nation has been so fully dedicated to the cause of the promotion of cotton and all facets of the cotton economy as has the council. In testimony before the Cotton Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives the council made a strong case for the preservation of our domestic cotton economy in all of its facets by the elimination of the inequitable two-price cotton system.

Had the Department of Agriculture heeded the warning of the experts from the National Cotton Council and the industry, as they testified upon the legislative proposal to eliminate the two-price cotton inequity, I believe that we would today have had legislative relief. Unfortunately, the Department officials did not accept the superior knowledge of those who sought to give them guidance through their testimony and recommendations.

The reversal of form which surprisingly occurred during the course of the hearings before the House Agriculture Cotton Subcommittee came as a tremendous shock to all of us who had been dealing with that Department in connection with the section 22 application which the Department had filed with the Tariff Commission. In that application the Department made out an excellent case for an 8½-cent offset fee to be imposed upon all foreign-made cotton textiles coming into this country. The sudden and indefensible shift of position in testimony at the Cotton Subcommittee hearings constituted the first public contention by Department officials that equality could be obtained at a lesser figure than 8½ cents per pound. If it had been the thought of the spokesmen of the USDA that less than 8½ cents per pound, or \$42.50 a bale, would constitute equality in the pricing of cotton as between our domestic industry and foreign industry this was the first expression of that thought. This, however, was not the last jolt to be administered to domestic textile people by the Department.

The Secretary of Agriculture thereafter fixed the support price for cotton at 32.47 cents per pound, thereby holding the support price at the level of the previous year. This meant that notwithstanding previous testimony by the Department spokesmen that less than 8½ cents per pound might bring about equality in pricing as far as industry was concerned that they were not going to reduce the differential by lowering the support price for the current crop. Whether this support price was proper or necessary when considering the welfare of the cotton farmer is not relevant to this discussion. Whether the support price was fixed at a proper or improper level, the fact remains that there was no reduction of the differential which existed last year with the price paid for American-grown cotton by our domestic textile industry as compared to the price paid by the foreigner.

So, we see that the Department was not willing to reduce the differential through the means of a lower price support. But this was not all that the De-

partment did to further confound and disturb the American people who depend upon the textile industry for their jobs and their livelihood.

On March 29, 1963, the Department of Agriculture announced a cotton sales-for-export program. At this point I make the news release issued by the Department of Agriculture on March 29 a part of my remarks:

[Released by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Mar. 29, 1963]

UPLAND COTTON EXPORT SALES PROGRAM ANNOUNCED

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today announced a cotton sales-for-export program. Cotton purchased under the new program must be exported during the 1963-64 marketing year (August 1, 1963-July 31, 1964). Because of the relatively high proportion of cotton stocks now in Commodity Credit Corporation inventory and under price support loans, a new export sales program is deemed necessary to assure that adequate stocks of American cotton of all different grades and staples will be available for export, U.S. Department of Agriculture officials said.

Under the cotton export sales program announced today, stocks of Commodity Credit Corporation cotton in inventory will be offered for sale periodically on a competitive bid basis. Final settlement for the cotton will be subject to adjustments based on the reclassification of cotton by boards of cotton examiners and the reweights of the cotton. Substitution will be permitted. A quantity of cotton equal to that purchased from Commodity Credit Corporation under the new program must be exported without any export equalization payment.

Cotton covered by offers accepted on and after August 1, 1963, will be delivered to the purchaser as soon after acceptance as possible. Cotton covered by offers accepted prior to August 1, 1963, will, upon the purchaser's request, be delivered to him as soon after June 30, 1963, as possible.

The Department also announced that the payment-in-kind export program will be continued during the 1963-64 marketing year. The payment-in-kind rate will be established periodically at a level calculated to make such program supplement the cotton sales-for-export program. The initial rate of payment under the 1963-64 payment-in-kind cotton export program will be 8½ cents per pound. This rate will apply to sales made under such program on and after date of this release and registered with Commodity Credit Corporation in accordance with the provisions of such program. The rate of payment will be subject to change without prior notice.

Under the export sales program, the cotton will be sold and exported under the terms and conditions of Announcement Nos. NO-C-22 and CN-BX-18, respectively. These announcements together with the payment-in-kind program announcement are currently being developed and should be available for distribution within the next few days.

The ASCS Commodity Office, New Orleans, La., will distribute copies of the announcements to all persons on its mailing list, and copies of the catalog listing cotton available for sale to its catalog subscribers as soon as they are available. Others desiring copies of the announcements and catalog may obtain them from the New Orleans office.

Mr. Speaker, immediately upon the issuance of the news release spokesmen for the domestic textile industry again expressed well-founded alarm at the attitude of the Department toward the preservation of the domestic textile industry.

I have talked to a great number of knowledgeable textile leaders since this announcement was made by Secretary Freeman's office. Without exception they tell me that this announcement came to them as a complete surprise, notwithstanding the fact that representatives of the industry had been in constant contact with the Department of Agriculture in an effort to bring order out of the chaotic cotton economy situation. As far as we have been able to ascertain, no representative of the textile industry had any indication that the Department of Agriculture was about to make such a move.

This auction plan offered by the Department, in the judgment of textile people with whom I have talked, merely serves to give foreign cotton buyers an added bonus on the purchase of American cotton. The present export subsidy of 8½ cents, plus carrying charges, has been sufficiently severe upon our domestic industry, but this new brainchild of the Department of Agriculture will seem to make the differential from 9¾ cents to 10 cents per pound, since carrying charges on the cotton would be wiped out. There is a probability that the net effect of this unfortunate decision may be a subsidy equaling 11 cents to 12 cents per pound to the foreign competitor of American mills.

This new program could have the effect of inducing a greater wave of exports of cotton textiles from foreign mills into the United States.

Another possible result of this surprise program could be a charge by cotton-producing nations in other parts of the world that the United States is engaging in a dumping operation in unloading American cotton on the world market in a precipitous manner. This, obviously, could result in a further reduction in the world price of cotton as foreign cotton-growers seek to preserve their markets in the textile-producing countries outside of the United States. This, in turn, could result in the necessity of a further reduction of the price of American cotton on the world market in such a way as to broaden the subsidy enjoyed by foreign textile manufacturers in their competitive pursuits with the domestic textile industry.

A very interesting newspaper article dealing with this export sales program appeared in the Kannapolis, N.C., Independent on Sunday, March 31, 1963. Since this article points out clearly some of the results of the new decision by the Department of Agriculture, I make it a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

FOREIGN MILLS' COTTON PRICE ADVANTAGE WIDENED

(By Bill Workman)

U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has dumped American cotton on the world market at prices foreign mills are willing to pay for it. He calls it a competitive bid basis. It is really an auction.

This action, which caught the domestic cotton and textile industries completely by surprise, made it apparent that the Department of Agriculture had panicked under the combination of declining exports of cotton and the diminishing domestic consumption of cotton. Since 1961, the Government's

stockpile of cotton has increased from 1.5 million bales to 10 million bales. It will be an estimated 8.5 million bales by the end of this cotton year next August. The storage cost has climbed from \$17 million in 1961 to \$70 million this year.

The immediate effect of Freeman's action is the widening of the price advantage foreign mills have over U.S. mills in the purchase of American cotton. This difference has been 8½ cents a pound; there is no telling what the margin will be now, but informed sources are guessing it will be in the neighborhood of 10 cents. The availability of this cotton at competitive prices is certain to affect the world market price.

This action may also increase the cost of the export subsidy from \$200 million to \$240 million. This cost is borne by American taxpayers. The Agriculture Department sets the subsidy rate at a figure designed to make up the difference between the world cotton price and the U.S. support price.

Secretary Freeman took this costly step during the weekend in spite of the fact he recently requested—and got—\$508 million to buy and carry the excess cotton in the Government's stockpile.

At the same time Secretary Freeman was getting that \$508 million, he was turning down a proposition by American mills that he sell American cotton to them for \$600 million to help maintain employment in the textile plants and to give farmers a chance to plant more acres in cotton. The mills' proposal would have meant that \$600 million would have been pumped into the U.S. Treasury instead of \$508 million being taken out to finance the further building of the stockpile. This would have meant a real saving of more than \$1 billion to taxpayers.

It had been a foregone conclusion that panic would eventually hit the Agriculture Department, because of the steady buildup of the cotton stockpile.

Last year, the Agriculture Department's export program supplied one bale out of eight that was consumed in the world cotton market outside the United States. This year, the United States is supplying 1 bale out of 20 needed in the world market. Historically, the United States should supply one bale out of every five the world market needs; it should export about 20 percent of world needs.

Even while exports of American cotton were dropping sharply and the Government's stockpile was increasing at a frightening rate, the Agriculture Department torpedoed every approach to make American cotton available to American mills at the same prices that foreign mills purchase the same cotton. Officials have claimed repeatedly the cost of this one-price system for cotton would be too great. However, the Government has given away, this year, \$75 million worth of cotton to foreign countries under Public Law 480 and has shipped an additional \$50 million worth of cotton to foreign lands under long-term credit or barter conditions (it is doubtful this cotton will ever be paid for).

This action by the Secretary of Agriculture was announced late Friday afternoon in face of a conference called by the Department for Monday to consider American mills' request for a one-price system for cotton.

Also, this action follows the Department of Agriculture pattern of torpedoing President Kennedy's statement of September 1962 that the inequity of the two-price system for cotton should be removed.

On more than one occasion, when it appeared there might be some possibility of putting the President's statement into action, the Secretary of Agriculture has taken precipitate action, without notice to the trade, which has made more difficult every approach to solution of textile problems.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that a bewildered domestic textile industry is having difficulty understanding the gyrations of the Department of Agriculture at a time when all persons seem to agree that simple justice requires that the American textile worker and his employer are entitled to a fairer treatment at the hands of our Government?

The President of the United States has often taken note of the absolute necessity that something be done to equalize the situation existing in the world textile picture if we are to preserve our domestic industry. Certainly, the Department of Agriculture, as a branch of the Executive Department of our Government, has a duty and obligation to discontinue policies which are contrary to the expressed desire of the Chief Executive about a solution of this vexatious problem.

Mr. Speaker, the leaders of a great industry and the thousands who work in that industry are crying out for fairness and equity. I believe that it is the responsibility of the Congress to see that that plea is heard and acted upon. I urge my colleagues to join me in demanding that the two-price cotton system be eliminated without further delay or debate.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I want to commend the gentleman very much for his again bringing to the attention of the House in a very thoughtful manner the situation in regard to the two-price cotton system.

I also want to commend the gentleman for his vigilance and the frank and heroic manner in which he has fought and is now fighting to see that something is done about this most inequitable situation.

Recently I have received in the mail several letters from constituents. I would like at this time to read two of them to you. Here is one that was sent to me on March 21, 1963.

MARCH 21, 1963.

Congressman HORACE KORNEGAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am an employee of Pickett Cotton Mill and have been since June 9, 1941.

We have been on short time since the last of August 1962 in our opinion. Our short-time operation is a direct result of the flood of unfair foreign imports of cotton textiles into this country. The cotton textiles that are entering this country in 1 year would run Pickett Cotton Mill at least 50 years full time.

It is impossible for us to feed, clothe, and educate our children on 3 days a week—24-hour pay amounts to \$27 after tax deduction.

Sir, if there is anything on your part that you can do to help this matter, it would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Here is another letter, a thought-provoking letter, Mr. Speaker, which I received on March 28, 1963.

It reads:

DEAR SIR: We are running short time and according to what I read in the papers and

hear on radio and television it is mostly because the mills have to pay 8½ cents a pound extra for their cotton.

This doesn't seem right to me. Looks like to me I have to pay too much for shirts and socks and also underwear because of this.

I don't see any reason why we should have to pay more for our own cotton than anybody else in the world. Looks silly to me.

Please stand up and be counted real loud for correcting this mess. We ought to pay the same price as anybody else for our own cotton—if not a little less.

And also the other countries don't pay wages as high as ours. Looks like our tariffs might go up a little to help even up that score.

Please help get it all straightened out.

These two letters, Mr. Speaker, come from people who work in the cotton mills. They ask thought-provoking questions.

Mr. Speaker, I have one other letter that I would like to call to the attention of the House. This does not come from one who actually works in the mill, but from one of the officials of a mill in my area.

He says:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KORNEGAY: What should I tell our employees when they ask me why the Japs can buy cotton raised here in North Carolina for less money than North Carolina textile manufacturers? If the two-price cotton system costs them their jobs, how do we justify it? We have a feeling of frustration.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman has a feeling of frustration just as I have and just as many others who have been greatly concerned over this problem. I would like to do as I have done on many occasions before, and taking the admonition from the lady who wrote me saying that she worked in the cotton mill, to speak out loud and, I hope, clearly in protest against this inequitable system of two-price cotton.

The other day I received a picture in the mail showing a bale of cotton in the lobby of the bank in my hometown. I only wish that this picture could be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but of course we have no pictures in the RECORD. This picture shows a big bale of cotton with a sign on it that says:

This bale of U.S.-grown cotton costs	
a local mill.....	\$182.50
This same bale can be bought by a	
foreign mill for.....	140.00

You, the American taxpayer,	
pay that difference of.....	42.50
Is this fair to: A million textile people?	
Every American taxpayer? You?	

Of course it is not fair, and it is about this unfairness that my colleague from North Carolina, and on certain occasions myself associating with him, have risen on the floor of this House to urge upon the President, the Department of Agriculture, the Tariff Commission, and many other agencies of our Government to do something about it.

We now have legislation pending before the Agriculture Committee of the House. There have been hearings held, and it is certainly my hope and earnest belief, Mr. Speaker, that the Agriculture Committee backed up by the appropriate agencies of the Government will come forth as soon as possible with some solution to correct this highly unfair and

inequitable situation which now exists, in order that we may have a clear and loud answer to these people who are losing their jobs, whose hours are being cut back.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me and again congratulate him on making this presentation.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] for his usual fine contribution to this discussion. I may say to the gentleman that I, too, have received a great number of letters similar to those which the gentleman read. Our people in North Carolina who work in the textile industry are gravely concerned about the inequitable situation with reference to domestic mills buying cotton, and I know that if we can get the message to the Nation as to the unfairness of the situation, that the basic sense of fair play and justice which all Americans have will demand that something be done immediately to eliminate this inequity.

Were I in the district of the gentleman who has just spoken I should say to the ladies and to the other people who have written to him that I could give personal testimony of the effective contribution that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] has made and is making in this battle for North Carolina and American jobs.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield.

Mr. KORNEGAY. As to the point that the gentleman from North Carolina has so ably made about the effect of two-priced cotton on the cotton producers, I would simply like to say that 30 years ago—and I am quoting this from an article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star today written by John Bacon, staff writer:

Thirty years ago cotton had about 93 percent of the total fiber market. Today it has about 67 percent. In the past 12 years the consumption of cotton per person in the United States has dropped from 30 to 22 pounds.

A most significant fact, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITENER. Well, I again thank the gentleman for his contribution and say to him that I have already today asked that the article by Mr. Bacon which appeared in today's Washington Evening Star be made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this date. I know that it will be read with great interest by many of our colleagues and many others who read the RECORD.

Candor compels me to state, however, as I have already stated in the body of the remarks heretofore made, that I fear that Mr. Bacon in writing his article was not aware of the unfortunate experience which we have had with the Department of Agriculture in recent days, as I have indicated heretofore the Department's variance occurring when they testified before the Committee on Agriculture that less than 8½ cents would be an equalization of the cotton pricing situation. Then that was followed by fixing price support of cotton at the same level as last year, 32.47 cents per pound. This action, as I have already said, whether we think it was to the best interests of

the farmer or not, certainly indicated that the textile manufacturer and the folks working in the mills were still going to be faced with at least an 8½ cents disadvantage in their competition with foreign markets.

Then this was followed on March 29 by the order which I have already referred to by the Secretary of Agriculture setting up the so-called export sales program which certainly holds out no promise of a reduction in the differential in the cotton price paid by our domestic people, as compared to the foreign manufacturers. So this, I think, is something that Mr. Bacon has overlooked, but it was not overlooked by the author of the article in the Kannapolis, N.C., Independent, which I made a part of my remarks earlier today.

Mr. Speaker, I could only say again to the gentleman and to my colleagues that this is a matter of great interest in the State of North Carolina. But even more so it is one which is of great interest to all the people who are familiar with it.

Just last Sunday Mr. John Knight, publisher of the Knight Newspapers, in his weekly letter which is carried by the Charlotte Observer and other newspapers owned by the Knight organization, said in effect that it seemed to him to be just elementary that the textile people should be given what they have asked for when they say that we are only asking for an opportunity to buy cotton grown in America at the same price that our Government sells it to foreign manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] and say to the gentleman that I welcome him and all the others into this battle which seems to be a continuing one, but which we hope will result in a victory for the American people in the not-too-distant future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ANDREW JACKSON, SOUTH CAROLINIAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'BRIEN of New York). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I feel most fortunate in the fact that accurate historians record the birth of Andrew Jackson as having taken place in my district. I am sure that I exhibit here the understandable pride that any Congressman would have in having a man, so near and so dear to the people of his generation and those of succeeding generations, claim birthplace in his congressional district. I am sure that North Carolina would prefer to continue the abortive claim that Andrew Jackson was

born in North Carolina but such is not the fact, and we cannot afford to rely upon false claims of such an important event.

On Friday, March 15, 1963, the author of a new and intriguing book entitled "Andrew Jackson, South Carolinian," made a significant and timely presentation of his new book at Lancaster, S.C., under the auspices of the Lancaster County, S.C., Historical Association. The occasion was a day honoring the 196th anniversary of the birth of Andrew Jackson in Lancaster County, S.C.

At the same time, Dr. Daniel W. Hollis, professor of history at the University of South Carolina, delivered an address at the birthday celebration at Lancaster. His speech emphasized the participation of President Jackson in the nullification crises of another day. I pause to remind you that Dr. Hollis is a native of my district, and succeeding generations will accord him praise for permanent and significant accolade because of his magnificent effort to research and record the history of South Carolina, of its sons, its daughters, and its contributions to the growth and permanence of a great Nation.

I had hoped to be present at the celebration but was unable to leave Washington in time to attend the various events which the patriotic citizens of Lancaster County had scheduled. I was able to get from the papers some of the stories which I think are significant. Of particular interest is the story of the apathy of North Carolina on the occasion of the anniversary birthday.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the newspaper accounts as follows: From the Columbia (S.C.) State of March 15, 1963; from the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer of March 16, 1963; from the State, Columbia, S.C., of March 16, 1963; from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C.; from the March 16 edition of the State, Columbia, S.C.; from the Lancaster News, March 14, 1963; from the Kershaw News-Era, Kershaw, S.C.

Not only do I commend Author E. Don Herd for a magnificent contribution to the literature and history of my own native State, but I salute those fine citizens of Lancaster County who gave of their time and efforts to make this birthday anniversary a significant recording of the history of our great President.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 15, 1963]

CELEBRATION SET TODAY—STATE HAS SOLID CLAIM ON JACKSON—SENATE COMMITTEE HAS JACKSON HOLIDAY BILL

(NOTE—A bill which would make Andrew Jackson's birthday, today, a legal South Carolina holiday, is being considered by a senate committee. The measure is now in the senate judiciary committee for study. The bill was introduced by Senator Frank L. Roddey, of Lancaster.)

(By Ron Wenzell)

LANCASTER.—The author of a new book entitled, "Andrew Jackson, South Carolinian," is convinced beyond all doubts that the seventh President of the United States was born in Lancaster County, S.C.

The book by E. Don Herd, director of the University of South Carolina at Lancaster, goes on sale Friday in conjunction with the

celebration of Jackson's 196th birthday at Andrew Jackson State Park in Lancaster County.

EIGHT MONTHS' WORK

Herd spent 8 months gathering information and writing the 70-page defense of South Carolina's claim to the fabled Revolutionary War hero and Chief Executive known affectionately as "Old Hickory."

"I took every claim to Jackson, and there are several, and tested them against the facts surrounding his birth," Herd told the State Thursday, "and there is no doubt in my mind that South Carolina has the only valid claim."

Contrary to popular belief, South and North Carolina aren't the only States at odds over where Jackson was born.

According to Herd, Virginia and West Virginia have filed claims to the hero of the Battle of New Orleans and even more surprising, Scotland, England and Ireland have at one time or another claimed to be Jackson's birthplace.

OFF THE COAST?

"One of the strongest hearsay claims has Jackson born at sea off the coast of North America," Herd said.

Herd dismisses North Carolina's claim to Jackson as one of the easiest to "disprove."

"None of North Carolina's affidavits will stand up because none of them are signed by an eyewitness to Jackson's birth. They are all secondhand accounts," he said.

The author also sheds some light on what he terms "important errors in North Carolina's claims to Jackson and the Tar Heels have made three separate claims."

The hard-bound editions of the book, which is being limited to 500 printings, includes pictures. There is also a paperback printing.

OVERWHELMING

"The evidence is overwhelming for South Carolina in the controversy," Herd said, "and some of the most conclusive evidence I present in my book are 16 letters written by Jackson in which he refers to Lancaster County, S.C., as his place of birth."

Both the hardback and the paperback editions of Herd's book will be on sale Friday at the State park. The hardback sells for \$3, the paperback for \$1.50.

An autograph party will be held from 2 to 4 p.m. at the Lancaster branch of the University of South Carolina.

The Jackson celebration at the State park begins at 10 Friday morning with Dr. Daniel Hollis, professor of history at the University of South Carolina, the main speaker. Hollis' topic is "Andrew Jackson and the Nullification Crisis."

The program is under the direction of the Lancaster city schools, the South Carolina State Commission of Forestry, and the Lancaster County Historical Commission.

LARGE CROWD

One of the largest crowds ever is expected for the annual event with thousands of South Carolinians anticipated and hundreds of tourists from other States.

In honor of Jackson's birthday, the Carolina Museum at Lancaster will be open from 2 to 6 p.m. Friday and will feature exhibits of the Jacksonian period.

The festivities end Friday night with a concert by world-famous David Rubinoft at the Lancaster Senior High auditorium beginning at 8:15. The concert is being sponsored by the Lancaster Rotary.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Mar. 16, 1963]

TAR HEELS IGNORE THEIR ANDY BUT THAT FELLOW BORN IN SOUTH CAROLINA GETS A ROUSING BIRTHDAY PARTY

(By Dwayne Walls)

LANCASTER, S.C.—South Carolina ended a week of historical billing and cooing over

President Andrew Jackson Friday on Jackson's 196th birthday.

A couple of hundred history buffs and another 800 school pupils attended an hour long birthday ceremony in Andrew Jackson State Park 10 miles north of here.

Later there was a luncheon and autographing party for Don Herd of Lancaster, author of a new book proving again that Jackson was born in South Carolina.

The birthday ceremony was held at the site of Jackson's disputed South Carolina birthplace—a windswept hilltop hard by the North Carolina State line.

A couple of miles away, at Jackson's equally disputed North Carolina birthplace, there was no celebration and only one visitor to the stone monument.

The lone visitor snaked over rough unpaved roads from Waxhaw into South Carolina and back into North Carolina to make sure the Jackson monument was still standing.

It was. The visitor also reported that he found a lot of tall weeds, one rusty beer can and two sardine cans gracing the monument grounds.

Obviously that is one reason the South Carolinians are proud as peacocks of their 360 acres of Jacksoniana, which includes a picnic area and a two-story museum built 8 years ago and stocked with historic oddments.

One of the speakers at Friday's ceremony apologized for the fact that the lawn was wet and muddy in places.

He blamed it on a bad weather front that swooped down from North Carolina—one of several polite hee-haws the crowd got off at the expense of the Tar Heels.

University of South Carolina history Prof. Daniel W. Hollis noted in a speech that Jackson threatened long before the Civil War to use the Nation's troops to uphold Federal law in South Carolina.

Jackson's political views were so unpopular with South Carolinians, Hollis said, that the State refused to support him in his bid for reelection in 1832.

Now, however, the State has laid out upward of \$50,000 to build a Jackson shrine. Lancaster County schools have been observing his birthday all week, and the South Carolina General Assembly is considering a bill to make Jackson's birthday a legal State holiday.

The Carolinas have been feuding with one another for more than a century over Jackson's birthplace.

The North Carolina version has it that Jackson was born at the home of a sister, Mrs. George McCamline on Waxhaw Creek in North Carolina, while Jackson's mother was traveling to the home of another sister, Mrs. James Crawford.

South Carolinians claim that Mrs. Jackson continued on to the Crawford home a couple of miles away before delivering.

The controversy will be around for several years yet.

Meanwhile one wag suggested another interesting possibility Friday.

"It's obvious," he said, "Ole Andy was twins."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State,
Mar. 16, 1963]

DR. HOLLIS SPEAKS ON SEVENTH PRESIDENT'S TERM—ANDREW JACKSON'S BIRTHDAY IS CELEBRATED AT LANCASTER

LANCASTER.—An audience that came to honor Andrew Jackson on the 196th anniversary of his birth Friday heard how the controversial President threatened long before the Civil War to use the Nation's troops to uphold Federal law in South Carolina.

Dr. Daniel W. Hollis of the University of South Carolina told the assembly in Andrew Jackson Historical State Park how Jackson's support of protective tariffs and strong Cen-

tral Government and his uncompromising opposition to nullification made him so unpopular that South Carolinians withheld their support from "Old Hickory" in the presidential election of 1832.

The Andrew Jackson celebration had the three-way sponsorship of the Lancaster City Schools, S.C. Commission of Forestry, and Lancaster County Historical Commission.

C. West Jacobs, director of State parks, presided at the patriotic and historical ceremony.

SHARP CONTRAST

Dr. Hollis' discourse on Jackson and nullification provided a sharp contrast in South Carolina attitudes toward the pre-Civil War President—then a Unionist who outraged his fellow South Carolinians now a revered memory as one of the Nation's all-time great statesmen and soldiers.

The University of South Carolina history professor explained the enigma of Andrew Jackson by quoting James Parton, first biographer of the general and President, who said he was both "a patriot and a traitor * * * one of the greatest of generals and wholly ignorant of the art of war," a brilliant and "elegant" writer who couldn't set down a correct sentence or spell four-syllable words.

There was more to the Parton list of Jacksonian contradictions, but History Professor Hollis turned to later evaluations:

"Historians were long similarly divided in their interpretations of Jackson. Depending upon whether they had an anti-Jackson Whig bias—as did Richard Hildreth—or a pro-Jackson Democratic bias like George Bancroft.

"In later years, however, they have agreed in ranking Jackson high among American Presidents."

GREAT PRESIDENT

Dr. Hollis said a 1948 survey of "75 distinguished historians" placed Jackson in the category of "great presidents" with Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt.

But a similar survey last year dropped Jackson a notch to "near-great." Nevertheless, his name appeared among the seven leading presidents of the United States, Dr. Hollis said.

In the South Carolina of his day, Jackson first disappointed the majority by failing to carry the banner for low tariffs, then drew the wrath of Palmetto leaders and voters by his Proclamation of December 1832, which rejected nullification and warned the "deceived and deluded" South Carolinians that the nullification road would lead to "ruin and disgrace."

Jackson's native Lancaster District—along with Greenville, Spartanburg, Chesterfield and other districts—was unionist in sentiment, but this "strong minority" was faced by the larger contingent composed of nullifiers led by Calhoun and Hayne.

ANTI-JACKSON FEELING

In 1832 the voters showed their anti-Jackson feeling at the polls when the South Carolina elector choice was John Floyd of Virginia in what Dr. Hollis called a "futile protest" against candidates Jackson, the Democrat, and Henry Clay, the Whig.

Dr. Hollis finds it "interesting to note" that although U.S. Senators Calhoun and Hayne of South Carolina bitterly protested the high import duties of 1828 and 1832, the State's present Senators, Johnston and Thurmond, are asking for higher tariffs.

The difference in viewpoint is attributable to the State's transition from an economy based almost entirely upon farming to one in which industrialization has grown in importance.

Where once South Carolina had a "cotton economy" that could profit from a low-tariff policy, it now has a textile industry that seeks higher tariffs as protection against low-wage foreign competition.

JACKSONIAN DEMOCRACY

"Andrew Jackson is remembered today chiefly because of his association with the movement known as 'Jacksonian Democracy,' for his destruction of the second U.S. Bank, and for his staunch advocacy of the Union in the Nullification Crisis," Dr. Hollis said.

"His name is linked to other issues such as the Mayesville Road veto, the removal of the Indians to west of the Mississippi, and the liberalization of Federal land policies.

"Yet, in each of these his role is not altogether clear, and many historians assert that Jackson came to office in 1829 with no program whatsoever."

Whether or not Jackson had a program, Dr. Hollis made it clear that Old Hickory could hardly have made himself more unpopular in his native South Carolina if he had preplanned every move—particularly his indifference toward tariffs, opposition to Nullification and threatened use of Federal troops in this State to enforce the high tariff of 1828.

CELEBRATION MUSIC

Music for the Jackson celebration was provided by the Lancaster Senior High School Band directed by Ben L. Watkins and the school's Sextet directed by Mrs. Esther M. Graves.

Lancaster National Guard units performed the flag-raising ceremony; Eagle Scout Robert H. Mobley, Jr., of South Junior High School, led the Pledge of Allegiance; Superintendent G. T. Myers of the Lancaster schools and Chairman Joe H. Croxton of the Lancaster County Historical Commission welcomed the audience; Miss Nancy Crockett, principal of H. R. Rich Elementary School, introduced Dr. Hollis; and ushers were Chris Benton, Emil Emanuel, Dixie Faulkenberry, Laurie Gardner, Sue McCaskill, Lee Montgomery, Bobbie Revels, and Iris Rutledge.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State,
Mar. 16, 1963]

JACKSON HAD SABER SCAR FROM WAR

LANCASTER.—Andrew Jackson got an early start in learning about the facts of war and life.

Throughout his adult life he bore a scar on his cheek which he received during the Revolutionary War from the saber of a British officer.

Viola C. Floyd writes in "Lancaster County South Carolina Tours:"

"As a lad of 13 Andrew Jackson took up arms in the Revolutionary War in defense of his own country. He was permitted to accompany his kinsmen to the Battle of Hanging Rock where he said he took part in the fighting.

"He helped his mother nurse the wounded soldiers who were carried to Old Waxhaw Church. He was captured following the skirmish at Waxhaw Church and was carried by the British to Camden.

"There he was thrown in prison where he received scant attention even though he had a saber cut across his face as the result of an argument with a British officer. Jackson had refused to polish the officer's boots.

"He contracted smallpox while in prison and was finally returned to his family in an exchange of prisoners."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 15, 1963]

TWENTY NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOLCHILDREN VISIT JACKSON CELEBRATION—JOIN 1,000 OTHERS

(By Ron Wenzell)

LANCASTER.—Some 20 elementary children from North Carolina crossed over into South Carolina Friday to help Lancaster County celebrate the 196th anniversary of the birth of Andrew Jackson.

The youngsters were from Jackson Elementary School in Jackson Township, just inside the North Carolina State line, and their visit to Andrew Jackson State Park, where more than 1,000 South Carolinians gathered Friday to commemorate the birth of Jackson in 1767 in Lancaster County, came as something of a surprise since North Carolina has disputed the Palmetto State's claim to the seventh President of the United States in a controversy that dates back more than 100 years.

"North Carolina schools teach that Jackson was born in North Carolina, but I thought our students would enjoy South Carolina's celebration," School Principal J. R. Taylor, who chaperoned the group, told the State.

Asked how he personally handled the controversy surrounding Jackson's birthplace when teaching history to pupils in a border community, Taylor said:

"I try not to make an issue of it. I tell the boys and girls that it's not too important whether President Jackson was born on this hill or that one, but most historians agree he came from around these parts."

While some North Carolinians still contend that Jackson was born near Waxhaw, N.C., no formal observance of his birth date was held in the Tarheel State and the vast majority of historians now accept South Carolina as Jackson's birthplace.

Some 770 students from Lancaster's South Junior High School attended the ceremonies as well as students from the senior high and other schools around the State.

Also in attendance were Lancaster State Senator Frank L. Roddey, Representatives Garrett Mobley and Tom Mangum and officials from the State forestry commission.

The program was sponsored by Lancaster city schools, the forestry commission and the Lancaster County Historical Commission.

[From the Lancaster (S.C.) News]

ONE HUNDRED NINETY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY—ANDY'S BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION BIGGER AND BETTER THAN EVER—ENTHUSIASTIC CROWD HONORS NATIVE SON

Red, white and blue, green, pink and gold, band music, blue skies, the precise order of National Guardsmen in flag-raising ceremonies, solid ranks of pink-cheeked school students, sung prayers, relaxed dignitaries, pleasant adults. These formed the background and set the mood for the 1963 celebration of Andrew Jackson's birthday, held at the site of his birthplace in Andrew Jackson State Park near Lancaster.

But the celebration was compounded of more than sound and music and color. It was a ceremony of loyalty that stems from the hearts of people who play an important role in keeping the name of Andrew Jackson ringing down through history.

Although the announcement was not made in so many words, officials indicated that the stiff breeze which swept the hillside was an ill wind blowing from across the North Carolina border where discomfited diehards were fuming while the celebration at Jackson's birth site was in progress.

Welcome visitors from North Carolina, however, were some 20 students from Jackson Elementary School in Jackson Township, just across the North Carolina State line, and their chaperon, the school's principal J. R. Taylor, who doesn't make an issue of the seventh President's birthplace.

The audience that came to honor Andrew Jackson on the 196th anniversary of his birth, Friday, March 15, heard how the controversial President threatened long before the Civil War to use the Nation's troops to uphold Federal law in South Carolina.

Dr. Daniel W. Hollis, of the University of South Carolina, told the assembly how Jackson's support of protective tariffs and strong Central Government and his uncompromis-

ing opposition to nullification made him so unpopular that South Carolinians withheld their support from "Old Hickory" in the presidential election of 1832.

The celebration Friday was sponsored by the Lancaster city schools, the South Carolina Commission of Forestry, and the Lancaster County Historical Commission, and climaxed a period of special commemorative programs produced by the Lancaster city schools. High praise is heard for these programs, arranged by teachers and historians, with special music and scripts.

Providing spirited music for the celebration was the Lancaster Senior High School Band, under the direction of Ben L. Watkins. The invocation and the benediction were sung by the Lancaster Senior High School Sextet, directed by Mrs. Esther Graves.

Lending added color in their pioneer costumes were the ushers, Chris Benton, Emil Emanuel, Dixie Faulkenberry, Laurie Gardner, Sue McCaskill, Lee Montgomery, Bobbie Revels, and Iris Rutledge.

Lancaster National Guard units performed the flag raising ceremony and Eagle Scout Robert H. Mobley, Jr., of South Junior High School led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. West Jacobs, State park director, presided at the patriotic and historic ceremonies. Dr. G. T. Myers, superintendent of the Lancaster city schools and Joseph H. Croxton, chairman of the Lancaster County Historical Commission, welcomed the assembly. Miss Nancy Crockett, principal of H. R. Rice Elementary School, introduced Dr. Hollis.

Dr. Hollis' discourse on Jackson and nullification provided a sharp contrast in South Carolina attitudes toward the pre-Civil War President * * * then a Unionist who outraged his fellow South Carolinians * * * now a revered memory as one of the Nation's all-time great statesmen and soldiers.

ENIGMA

The University of South Carolina history professor explained the enigma of Andrew Jackson by quoting James Parton, first biographer of the general and President, who said he was both a patriot and a traitor * * * one of the greatest of generals and wholly ignorant of the art of war, a brilliant and elegant writer who couldn't set down a correct sentence or spell four-syllable words.

There was more to the Parton list of Jacksonian contradictions, but history Professor Hollis turned to later evaluations:

"Historians were long similarly divided in their interpretations of Jackson. Depending upon whether they had an anti-Jackson Whig bias—as did Richard Hildreth—or a pro-Jackson Democratic bias like George Bancroft.

"In later years, however, they have agreed in ranking Jackson high among American Presidents."

Dr. Hollis said a 1948 survey of 75 distinguished historians placed Jackson in the category of great Presidents with Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt.

But a similar survey last year dropped Jackson a notch to near great. Nevertheless, his name appeared among the seven leading presidents of the United States, Dr. Hollis said.

In the South Carolina of his day, Jackson first disappointed the majority by failing to carry the banner for low tariffs, then drew the wrath of Palmetto leaders and voters by his Proclamation of December 1832, which rejected nullification and warned the deceived and deluded South Carolinians that the nullification road would lead to ruin and disgrace.

Jackson's native Lancaster District—along with Greenville, Spartanburg, Chesterfield, and other districts—was unionist in sentiment, but this strong minority was faced

by the larger contingent composed of nullifiers led by Calhoun and Hayne.

ANTI-JACKSON

In 1832 the voters showed their anti-Jackson feeling at the polls when the South Carolina elector choice was John Floyd of Virginia in what Dr. Hollis called a "futile protest" against candidates Jackson, the Democrat, and Henry Clay, the Whig.

Dr. Hollis finds it interesting to note that although U.S. Senators Calhoun and Hayne of South Carolina bitterly protested the high import duties of 1828 and 1832, the State's present Senators, JOHNSTON and THURMOND, are asking for higher tariffs.

The difference in viewpoint is attributable to the State's transition from an economy based almost entirely upon farming to one in which industrialization has grown in importance.

Where once South Carolina had a cotton economy that could profit from a low-tariff policy, it now has a textile industry that seeks higher tariffs as protection against low-wage foreign competition.

"Andrew Jackson is remembered today chiefly because of his association with the movement known as Jacksonian Democracy, for his destruction of the second U.S. Bank, and for his staunch advocacy of the Union in the nullification crisis," Dr. Hollis said.

"His name is linked to other issues such as the Mayesville Road veto, the removal of the Indians to west of the Mississippi, and the liberalization of Federal land policies. "Yet, in each of these his role is not altogether clear, and many historians assert that Jackson came to office in 1829 with no program whatsoever."

Whether or not Jackson had a program, Dr. Hollis made clear that Old Hickory could hardly have made himself more unpopular in his native South Carolina if he had pre-planned every move—particularly his indifference toward tariffs, opposition to Nullification, and threatened use of Federal troops in this State to enforce the high tariff of 1828.

ATTENDANT EVENTS

Following the park ceremonies, out-of-town guests and dignitaries were entertained at a luncheon at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph H. Croxton, and from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. the public was invited to an Autograph Party at the Lancaster Center, University of South Carolina honoring Elmer Don Herd, Jr., author of the important new book "Andrew Jackson, South Carolinian."

Members of the Waxhaws chapter, DAR, Mrs. P. H. Emanuel, regent, were hostesses for the party which attracted a number of guests both from Lancaster and from out of town.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 16, 1963]

NULLIFICATION CRISIS CREATED FRICTION—JACKSON ONCE UNPOPULAR IN SOUTH CAROLINA?

(By Ron Wenzell)

LANCASTER.—While South Carolina is vigorously defending its claim to Andrew Jackson as a native son now, the Palmetto State hasn't always been so anxious to have its brand on the seventh President of the United States.

According to Daniel W. Hollis, professor of history at the University of South Carolina: "There was a time back in 1832 and 1833 when President Jackson was as unpopular with most South Carolinians as President John Fitzgerald Kennedy is now."

Hollis drew the parallel between the two Democratic Chief Executives during his remarks Friday at a celebration in honor of Jackson's 196th birthday at Andrew Jackson State Park in Lancaster County.

"The position taken by President Jackson in the nullification crisis of 1832 and 1833 was directly opposed to the stand taken by

the majority of South Carolinians," Hollis said, "and Jackson and John C. Calhoun engaged in a bitter personal controversy on the issue of whether the States had a right to nullify acts of the Federal Government."

"Despite the nullification crisis, however, South Carolina never completely forgot its pride in Jackson nor did he ever lose his love for his native State," Hollis said.

Hollis described Jackson as a "strong President, one who supported the Union on most issues, but did at times strike a blow for States rights."

By way of poking fun at North Carolina's claim to the man, Hollis told the more than 1,000 persons gathered at the State park, "It's not much of a controversy any longer. I think South Carolina has pretty much repelled North Carolina imperialism," he chided good naturedly.

[From the Lancaster (S.C.) News, Mar. 14, 1963]

ANDREW JACKSON: ORPHAN OF THE REVOLUTION—THE WAR FOR INDEPENDENCE LEFT INDELIBLE MARKS ON THE PERSONALITY OF THE GREAT, AND CONTROVERSIAL, SOUTH CAROLINIAN—ANDREW JACKSON

(By Willie Llew Griffin)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This story, "Orphan of the Revolution," by Willie Llew Griffin, appeared in the Sunday, March 10, issue of the News & Courier, Charleston. It is used by the Lancaster News through the courtesy of the News & Courier.)

Andrew Jackson, even today, remains one of the most controversial figures in American history. One historian, writing of Jackson more than a hundred years ago, when many who knew him were still alive, stated that after years of research in Washington, the Carolinas, and Tennessee, he was bewildered at the conflicting mass of reports. Jackson was pictured as a patriot; a brilliant writer who could not spell a four-syllable word; a democratic autocrat; the greatest of generals and as a man totally ignorant of the art of war.

That he was ignorant of the art of war is to be questioned, for war came at an early age to Andrew Jackson. Nine years old when the Declaration of Independence was signed, he was 13 when the war reached to Waxhaw settlement in South Carolina where he lived. To this community the war brought hardships and terror and left a path of desolation in its wake. Before he was 16, Andrew Jackson was a hopeless orphan of the Revolution.

Hugh Jackson, Andrew's older brother, had joined Col. William Richardson Davie before the war reached Waxhaw and died after the battle of Stono. Robert Jackson, another brother, died of smallpox contracted while a British prisoner in Waxhaw stockade. His mother died after a mission of mercy to help the suffering prisoners confined in the British prison ships in Charleston.

Andrew Jackson survived but the years spent in this war-charged atmosphere molded the boy into the man he was to become.

Jackson's first war service was helping care for the wounded after Tarleton's massacre at Waxhaw in 1780. One hundred and thirteen patriots were killed here and 150 wounded and left to be cared for. The old Waxhaw meetinghouse was converted into a hospital and here Andrew and his brother Robert helped their mother care for the wounded. High-spirited Andrew, it is said, worked more in anger than in pity, burning with fury and vowing vengeance for the wounded and for the death of his brother Hugh. Tarleton had surprised a detachment of militia in the Waxhaw settlement and his ruthless attack kindled the flames of war in that region of the Carolinas.

When Sumter made his gallant attack on the British post of Hanging Rock, near Waxhaw, both Andrew and his brother were present. This attack which began so favor-

ably was later lost when the patriots unfortunately captured a supply of rum which they consumed too early, thereby losing the engagement. In this engagement the Jackson boys were led by Colonel Davie, the same colonel who commanded the troops to which Hugh Jackson had belonged at Stono. With the rest of Davie's men, the Jackson brothers retreated before the British force.

Being only 13 at the Battle of Hanging Rock, it is doubtful if young Andy was actually a member of the company. More probably he just went along to observe. Attached to the company or not, it is generally conceded that being with the troops and hearing their discussions and comments on war he received a firsthand lesson in the art of war. It is said that Colonel Davie always remained General Jackson's ideal of a model soldier.

After the Battle of Hanging Rock the boys returned to Waxhaw. When General Cornwallis moved toward Waxhaw after General Gates' defeat in August 1780, the Jacksons were forced to move north out of the path of war. There seems to be no information on how Robert and his mother made the journey, but, according to an eyewitness, on a hot September afternoon 5 miles below Charlotte, N.C., Andrew passed, riding on a grass or swamp pony, long legs dangling, covered with dust and with a big, worn hat flapping over his face. The story is told that years later when the fame of Andrew Jackson reached the little town of Charlotte, it was hard for this witness to reconcile the gangling apparition to whom she had talked that September day with the hero Andrew Jackson.

In 1781 the Jackson family and many of their neighbors returned to their ravaged homes in Waxhaw. A small fierce warfare of Whig against Tory continued—brother against brother and father against son. In this charged atmosphere Andrew Jackson and his family lived during the formative years of his life. Andrew and his brother now began in earnest to become a part of the small parties of militia that went out on many reprisal engagements.

Lord Rawdon, whom Cornwallis had left in command, hearing of the activities of the Waxhaw Whigs, sent a body of dragoons to the neighborhood. The Waxhaw settlers, hearing of this hostile force, decided to meet them in open fight. Forty armed and mounted Whigs, among them Andrew and Robert, assembled at the old Waxhaw meetinghouse to await reinforcements of neighbors. The British were apprised of their move by a traitor and surprised the gallant band before help could arrive. Eleven of the patriots were taken prisoners and the rest escaped. Andrew and Robert escaped to the home of a Lieutenant Crawford, a cousin but, again, a traitor hearing of their presence set a party of dragoons on their trail. The house was surrounded and Andrew and Robert were taken prisoners. Mrs. Crawford and her small children were completely helpless but in spite of this the soldiers destroyed the entire contents of the house, even the clothes of the family.

It was in this house that occurred the incident that left Andrew with scars that he carried to his grave and a wound to Robert from which he never recovered.

The British officer ordered young Andrew to clean his boots, but Andrew refused, saying that he was a prisoner of war and expected to be treated as such. The officer slashed at his head with his saber. Seeking to ward off the blow with his left hand, Andrew received severe wounds on both his head and hand. Robert also refused to clean the officer's boots and also was disabled with a sword blow on his head.

All prisoners captured at Waxhaw were taken to the British depot at Camden. Although only 40 miles distant, accounts of brutality to the miserable prisoners on the march and the wretchedness of the prison at

Camden form a revolting chapter of history at that time. Two hundred and fifty prisoners were confined in a small enclosure with no beds. No medicine or medical attention was provided, and a small amount of stale bread was their only food. Here, Parton says in his "Life of Andrew Jackson," Andrew spent some of the most wretched days of his life. Smallpox broke out among the prisoners and only the dead were not miserable among the sick and the well and the dying.

Andrew Jackson's second lesson in the art of war came when he watched the engagement of General Greene's brave little army attempting to rescue them and Lord Rawdon's forces on Hobkirk's Hill. Knowing that there would be an engagement the next day, young Andy had carved out a knothole in the prison fence with a razor during the night so that he and the other prisoners could witness the conflict. When General Greene's forces were routed and put in full retreat, the prisoners despaired.

Andrew Jackson, soon after the Hobkirk's Hill disaster, came down with smallpox. Soon Robert also showed symptoms of the dread disease. Mrs. Jackson, on hearing of the condition of the prisoners, journeyed to Camden, and here the heroic mother succeeded in effecting an exchange of prisoners: the Whigs gave up 13 captives for the Jackson brothers and five neighbors. By now Robert and Andrew were wasted with disease and near death. Andrew dragged himself home barefooted and with his garments filthy and torn. Robert rode one of the two horses, supported by the other prisoners. Mrs. Jackson rode the other horse.

Robert died 2 days after reaching home and only Mrs. Jackson's medical skill and nursing saved Andrew from a similar fate.

In the summer of 1781 a cry of despair came from the Charleston prison ships where some of Mrs. Jackson's kin and neighbors were prisoners. Again this good woman set out on a mission of mercy, one from which she never returned. Andrew was now out of danger and Mrs. Jackson set out on the 160-mile journey. General Jackson, it is said, always thought that his mother and two companions made the trip on horseback, but according to neighborhood tradition, the three women were supposed to have walked. It is known, however, that they did reach Charleston safely and brought much joy to the prisoners. She died shortly thereafter with "ship fever" at the home of a relative near Charleston and was buried nearby.

In 1782, when peace was restored, those of the Waxhaw settlers who had survived, among them Andrew Jackson, returned to their homes. Young Andrew had now completely recovered in health and his high spirits and love of life returned in spite of the fact that he mourned the loss of his heroic mother and his brothers.

An orphan at 16, he had lived years of war, had all but given his life and his sanity for the cause of freedom—all this even before becoming of age to be a soldier. While still in his teens he had seen and endured more suffering and hardships than most men experience in a lifetime.

[From the Kershaw (S.C.) News-Era]

ORIGINAL ANDREW JACKSON DAY PROGRAM AT FLAT CREEK SCHOOLS

Weeks of preparation in memorizing speeches and choral music went into the presentation of an impressive assembly program by the seventh grade at the Flat Creek Elementary School, March 15, under the guidance of Mr. John Bunyan Faile, the seventh grade teacher, and Mr. Mack Israel, choral director. The theme of the program was "Andrew Jackson Day."

The stage was decorated by the students with native cedar and wild magnolia foliage. The auditorium was darkened and as the program began, the stage lights were turned

on and the curtains opened slowly to the singing of an early American frontier religious song, "The Promised Land." This was followed by the Lord's Prayer led by Della Jane Sims, the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States led by Marvin Starnes, and the Flat Creek Schools alma mater sung by the entire elementary student body.

Della Jane Sims spoke on "South Carolina Flies New Claim to Andy" and Stanley Hinson presented a long and well-memorized biographical sketch entitled "Life and Boyhood of Jackson." These speeches were followed by the patriotic song, "This Land Is Your Land."

Next on program was Joanna Kennington who spoke on the topic "Andrew Jackson's Family" and Wanda Catoe who spoke on the topic "Analysis of Jackson." These interesting historical sketches were followed by an original poem, written by Mrs. Oleen T. Hinson, mother of seventh grader Ann Hinson. The poem "The Great Patriot" was recited by Ann Hinson and Linda Robinson as Della Jane Sims played a soft piano accompaniment of "The Star Spangled Banner."

The poem, in recitation included, "There are conflicts, some great, some small; About who claims good, old Andrew Jackson, or his birthplace, least of all, North Carolina claims him, South Carolina gives proof of clues; As if Andrew Jackson had a chance to choose.

"As to where he would be born, in Carolina, North or South; could it be one State is jealous? They want no historic doubt. There's one thing for certain, he was a patriot true-blue; so, as for me, I'll make a choice and say, 'Andy, here's South Carolina for you.'"

Following the poem, the seventh grade sang "Land of Hope and Glory."

In conclusion, Brenda Payne delivered "The Political and Public Activities of Jackson" and Dianna Kennington, "Andrew Jackson as President." The seventh grade sang "America" and the Flat Creek schools' fight-song, "Cheer, Cheer for Old Flat Creek High," paraphrasing the "Notre Dame Victory March."

Morris MacDowell, principal, congratulated the seventh grade on a job well-done before dismissing the students.

EXPENDITURE REFORMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy that the Democratic leadership and many of the Members of the House on the Democratic side have taken seriously the question of expenditure reforms. I am going to read with a great deal of interest all the material that has been placed in the RECORD so that we can get an orderly story as to what they say is going on. I wish that we had been notified on our side of the aisle that this endeavor was going to be undertaken. I am sure more of the Members on our side would have been present to participate.

Mr. Speaker, the primary comment that I think needs to be made at this time, even without the complete record, on the basis of what was said that not once was the point of the revenue side of the budget mentioned; not once was there any attention directed to the limitation of our taxing power and our ability to gather revenue. Not once was there any mention of the Federal debt.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] is a member of

the Committee on Appropriations, and he pointed out that in the last Congress many bills were passed, appropriation bills, and they would expect, of course, the Congress would expect the administration and the executive branch to carry out these expenditures and, would we not? As a matter of fact, this is exactly the issue I presented to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, when he testified before the Committee on Ways and Means about 4 or 5 weeks ago at which time he told us that in November 1962 on their semiannual review the executive department found that their revenue estimates had fallen \$7.5 billion short of what they had anticipated when they sent the budget for fiscal year 1963 to the Congress.

I said, "Mr. Secretary, what did the President do when he found out that his revenue estimates were \$7.5 billion short?" And the answer is, "Nothing was done—nothing was done."

In fact, the Secretary gave the same answer that the gentleman from Oklahoma presented; "Well, after all," he said, "Congress voted these appropriations."

And I said, "But, Mr. Secretary, the Congress did not have this knowledge that your revenues were falling \$7.5 billion short." As a matter of fact the Congress had been presented with a balanced budget and when they passed these appropriation and authorization bills they did so in the context of a balanced budget which was presented to us last year. I am satisfied that had the Congress realized that the budget was out of balance and that the revenue estimates were \$7.5 billion short, a great deal more care would have been taken on the expenditure side of the ledger. It is this issue that has been completely neglected in the presentation by the Democratic leadership, this issue of revenues, because when we do not collect the taxes there is only one thing we can do and that is to try to sell more U.S. Bonds. And when we go to marketing additional Federal bonds we run into serious difficulties. The problems involved in debt management from the standpoint of inflation, in context with our balance-of-payments picture today and the gold flow situation, are such that it behooves us all to view this situation with considerable concern and I would say considerable alarm.

It just passes belief that a responsible political party would spend 2 hours, with all these statements discussing the expenditure side of the ledger without any reference at all to what our income might be. Yes, indeed, there seems to be an issue for the people of this country to consider; the puritan ethic, whether or not it is important for Government as well as individuals, corporations, businesses, to live within their budget and what are the consequences when you continually overspend and overspend.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman think that politics in the worst connotation of that term and the use of that word had

anything to do with the delayed announcement of the unexpected budget deficit of the last Congress, recalling the time that that announcement came after the November 6 election?

Mr. CURTIS. This question was raised and the Secretary of the Treasury assured us that this was a coincidence, that they had discovered this on November 15, after the election. I do note, though, that in a previous November, in 1961, this was after the same semiannual review, the President with a great deal of publicity announced that he had called his Cabinet together and told them that they had to exercise economy. I asked Secretary Dillon about this. I said, "What was the result?" He said, "Well, we were able to cut \$1 billion back in our expenditure rate."

But I would note this, that this semiannual review is for the end of October and knowing enough, as I do, about how one collects these statistics, I am certain that the knowledge was well within the purview of the executive branch of the Government before election day in November last year.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. It is true that in the past 8 plush years there has been a majority on the Democratic side of the House and I like to exercise the thought that the timing of the Cuban quarantine and the announcement of the \$500,000 that was expected up to the time of the election as a \$7.8 billion deficit after the election, and the reversal of those two might have had a great effect on the majority side of the House.

Mr. CURTIS. It could be. However, I think we have got enough here for the future for the public to consider in this matter of fiscal responsibility.

I want to go on and point out that here is a political party, that is advocating a tax cut at this time without any concern, apparently, and I say that in the light of what has gone on here this afternoon, with the imbalance between expenditures and revenues. In light of this, the administration, and backed apparently by its leadership in the House, is willing to go along and create further deficits, which I might point out are not just for fiscal 1964. Even under the administration's own theory the budget will not be balanced under this fiscal program until 1967, and under better estimates, I might state, those that are based upon the increased expenditure rate that has occurred under this administration, and projecting it out instead of cutting it off, as the administration does, instead of getting that balance in 1967 the budget will not be balanced until 1972. The additional deficit will be \$75 billion at the most conservative estimate. Others estimate it at over \$100 billion. Yet to this very minute neither the President nor his Council of Economic Advisers nor any one of the leaders in the Democratic Party have discussed the implications involved in the management of the debt and the consequences to the country in the light of the gold flow.

Just last week the Secretary of the Treasury came before the Committee on Ways and Means requesting that we amend or repeal the Silver Act of 1934. What is the significance of this? In repealing the Silver Act of 1934 we are going to release \$2 billion of silver bullion, which is the reserve behind \$2 billion of silver paper certificates, leaving our gold, which is already a reserve for the currency we have outstanding, to be the sole reserve for an additional \$2 billion of the currency. In other words, we are withdrawing from the metallic base, the precious metal base that backs up our currency, \$2 billion.

I regret to say that the fiscal situation of this country is such that there is no other course but to do this, but the implications are quite clear that this is the first step that is necessary in order to devalue the dollar, which some people close to the President are already saying must come about. I must say this, whether we devalue it officially or not, if we pursue this kind of economic and fiscal policy that has been so clearly demonstrated by the majority here on the floor this afternoon that is the only course that will follow, and we will then be one other has-been Nation that at one time had its preeminence and its place in the sun.

This is why those on our side of the aisle have said that expenditure reform is so badly needed. You can see from this demonstration on the floor today why we regard carefully our itemization of where these cuts are going to come. The display, if I may use such a word, and I think I can back it up, of demagoguery, saying we were trifling with the lives of people if we were going to cut here, here, or here, wherever it might be proposed, if we were going to cut out the school lunch program, one could immediately get the picture that was in the minds of the democratic leadership to immediately stir up every pressure group in the United States so that they would be asking what this country can do for them, not what they can do for this country.

Yes, that is what would happen in the process of trying to get on top of our expenditures and bring this thing into line.

But let me now relate this a bit to expenditures, because there is a lot of confusion in the public's mind, and I can tell confusion exists in the minds of some of the Democratic Congressmen who were speaking. When we talk about cutting the budget, we are talking about fiscal 1964, we are talking about the \$108 billion new obligational authority. Now that is not obligational authority even if approved, which would be spent in fiscal 1964. A good bit of it will be, but much of it will be spent in fiscal 1965 and some of it in fiscal 1966 and some of it in fiscal 1967. This is a new authority to spend. On June 30, 1963, the administration will have \$87 billion of previous obligational authority to spend that has not been used, and that will be added to the \$108 billion, if it were granted to them to make a total of \$195 billion authority to spend in fiscal year 1964. It is only the President

who says his expenditure rate would be \$99 billion. Note the big difference. The expenditure rate for fiscal 1964 is presumed to be \$99 billion. The request for new obligational authority which tells us where we are going to go on in the future is \$108 billion. The \$10 billion to \$15 billion cut that has been talked about relates to the \$108 billion, and if we did cut it by what I happen to think is the right figure, about \$13 billion, this would cut back the expenditure rate of fiscal 1964 by about \$4 or \$5 billion to hold to the expenditure level of fiscal 1963.

Incidentally, there is a good way to look to see where we can trim because this is not blocking out items from various programs or chopping it out, as has been described. This is taking a look at the way these programs have grown and the way they are predicted to continue to grow. But I again point to the figures: \$81 billion was our expenditure rate the last year in which Eisenhower was President.

The first year in which President Kennedy took over was \$87 billion. Next year which ends June of this fiscal year is \$94 billion, and for the next year is \$99 billion, an increase of \$18 billion in the expenditure rate in the period of 3 years contrasted to an increase of about \$13 billion the previous 6 years. Now this is what is alarming—it is this increased rate of expenditure. Let me say this, and I put this in the minority views of the Republicans of the Joint Economic Committee. These increases in expenditures have not been in defense primarily. The tables that I put in there for 1961, 1962, and 1963 show a total increase of Federal expenditures of 15 percent while defense showed an increase of only 8 percent. HEW was an increase of 38 percent, as I recall the figures. Agriculture was an increase of around 30 percent. And, yet, the public is being hoodwinked into thinking that these increases that have occurred under the Kennedy administration have been in the defense area. This just does not happen to be the case, any more than the statement of the majority whip that the years under President Kennedy particularly last year had shown the greatest price stability of any period in our history since World War II. The record is there for anyone to see in the President's Council of Economic Advisers own statistics.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I certainly want to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and an outstanding member of the Joint Committee of the House and Senate. He has pointed out beautifully here the difference between legislative authority and the actual act of appropriation; the problem of gold flow and remonetization and of the spending rate as differentiated from the obligational authority to spend. I think we have pretty well established that we do not have a meat ax approach or a shotgun approach, but in

fact we have a rifle pointing at this, and we are just holding our ammunition until we see the whites of the eyes.

I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman what he thinks, No. 1: About whether or not maybe this is not why the leadership is holding up this legislation to the point where we have been dubbed as a do-nothing Congress as well as that side of the aisle being more interested in physical conditions than in the fiscal condition? And, No. 2: I would like to ask, What about this debt ceiling and the legality of it, if the gentleman cares to comment on that?

Mr. CURTIS. I will take the second point first, for I do not know that I can answer why there has been a holdup in these bills other than to say that we saw this afternoon in our first appropriation bill the details of where cuts can occur, and no one was advocating a straight percentage cut across the board. I simply was pointing out that here there was a 10-percent cut, and this carried across the board would mean \$11 billion.

There is another bill I happen to know about, carrying much larger sums than the billion we dealt with today, because it deals with several billions, where the cut is going to be around 25 to 30 percent. Some of them will be below 10 percent, because this is not a meat-ax approach. But, here is a very interesting thing. With all the Democrats here on the floor today we did not hear from the Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee where the responsibility lies to raise the revenue. I did not hear them speak out here because they know where the pinch is; and the administration, I am happy to say, knows that there is a pinch, because about 6 weeks ago they came before the Ways and Means Committee and asked them to continue the debt ceiling at \$308 billion. After public testimony—and I talked about some of it—even Secretary Dillon pointed out that they find out they are 7.5 billion short of their anticipated revenues, and after public hearings the Ways and Means Committee in its wisdom refused to go along with the administration, and on yesterday the debt ceiling went down to \$305 billion. I have always said that the debt ceiling is a very cumbersome way in which to exercise discipline in expenditures by the Congress because we have already appropriated the money and have given the President the authority to spend it. However, the Executive does have considerable flexibility. As has been pointed out, he will have \$195 billion if he gets his \$108 billion, which I do not think he will, but if he were to have it in fiscal 1964 he himself has anticipated only a \$99 billion expenditure rate. Every Executive has cut back on programs, held them down, accelerated some more than others, just as the President said he did in November of 1961, that he held down expenditures by \$1 billion.

This is bringing about discipline in the White House right now, the \$305 billion ceiling, and this is going to be with us for the month of April and the month of May, and I think the administration realizes that there is a will on the part of the Congress to do something

about expenditures. I know there are many members of the Democratic Party who feel just as strongly as I do on this business of the need for fiscal responsibility. But they were not party to this operation that the administration requested the administration congressional leaders be put on here because they understand that we have to have the revenues to make expenditures.

If the gentleman will permit me one other line of thought, because I do want to get this across.

A lot of mockery was made of those who are trying to cut the budget. A Wall Street Journal article, by Mr. Otten, was mentioned. I thought this was one of the most unfair and poorly timed articles I have read, although I do have a high respect for Mr. Otten. I was sort of pleased in a way to see him needle the "economy but" boys. That is, when it comes to something in a Member's district, they want to run away. Here is why I say the article was unfair and why the comments on the other side of the aisle about these men who are in the forefront in trying to bring about expenditure reform were unfair. Of course, we all have public works projects in our districts, we all have post offices and other expenditures that are legitimate. We are not talking just solely about programs which are wasteful and foolish. Many of the programs we feel we have to cut back on are good programs. It is a question of establishing priorities. How much can we afford in this particular year, how much can we afford next year? We have always done that in public works and in post offices. We scheduled them as we can build them so that we get them within our revenues. We have established, over a period of years, established lines of procedure whereby we get our programs authorized.

Mr. Otten did not mention the fact that most of these proposals of the Congressmen he was talking about were adhering to the regular lines of procedure, taking their turn, as it were, and that these economy-minded Congressmen would subject the projects in their districts to the same kind of discipline that we seek to subject all of the projects.

This business of cutting the budget is difficult because every program has its sponsors: sincere people. Many of these are good programs. You could say if we have the money they certainly would be desirable to be pushed forward. But there is only one way to go forward in this business of getting discipline into expenditures and that is to set the standards and apply them to all Members of Congress, all communities, all kinds of projects, then just recognize the fact that we must confine our total expenditures to our anticipated revenues.

Yes, we can talk about how our country could use these things and where our defense would be. And when we might get on the moon. But I remind all of you of what Lenin and other Communist leaders have said, that they are not going to defeat America on the battlefield. We will get America to spend itself to death.

And, indeed, if they succeed we will then go down the same trail of oblivion

so many other nations in history have gone. We will not go out in a blaze of glory but in a whimper.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I think the gentleman has demonstrated beautifully that the Republicans do in fact have real muscle and the rifle approach rather than a meat-ax or shotgun approach. I say he has demonstrated there is sense in the budget, not from a biased point of view, and that the fishing expedition has been fruitless.

A FISHY CASE OF "PAID AID"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I feel a little like I should have on my hip-boots and Ozark fishing hat, as I stand here today. You see, I am here to cast out another episode in the "piscatorial paddy mystery."

I think my investigation now has hooked all the details about this project which the United Nations calls aid to the United States.

I have learned that U.S. taxpayers paid a Chinese expert exactly \$5,663.26 for 3 months during which the expert advised the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Arkansas rice farmers about how to grow fish in rice paddies. The U.S. payment went to the United Nations associated agency, the Food and Agriculture Organization—FAO. The payment included salary, transportation, and expenses.

This is the same Food and Agriculture Organization that receives about one-third of its financial support from American taxpayers.

As my colleagues know, I have spent a month reeling in slippery details about this project because U.N. officials cited it to me as a prime example of how the United States of America has received U.N. aid.

In fact, U.S. taxpayers paid for that aid.

But the U.N. does not mention that. And, I am sorry to say that our own bureaucracy liked the arrangement so well, it wants to venture yet again into the same deep waters.

The Department of Interior tells me it is now exploring the possibility of hiring the expert again this summer. The U.N. probably will call that aid to America, too.

The Department of State has told me that it feels it is "not appropriate for the United States to take U.N. aid since we are not an underdeveloped country." The merit of that policy is for U.S. taxpayers to decide.

They are the ones who pay 40 or more percent of most U.N. expenses. But I, for one, insist that the United Nations must immediately cease its citing of this paddy project as aid to the United States—unless the U.N. wants to clearly and carefully point out that the loaning of the expert was only a favor for which Americans paid a high price.

I finally have been able to obtain information about the expert—a Dr. Shao-Wen Ling, of Formosa. I have asked for unanimous consent to include a biography of Dr. Ling in the RECORD.

And, I have landed these details about the hitherto mysterious and mislaid project:

Dr. Ling conducted a field study in Southern States for 3 months in early 1959. His advice was utilized by the Fish and Wildlife Service at a research station at Stuttgart, Ark., and led to construction of a substation at Kelso, Ark.

My colleagues, so that this piscatorial project will not slip back beneath the murky paddy waters, I have asked for unanimous consent to fully document it for history in the RECORD. I direct your attention to these supporting documents:

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Whereas the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (hereinafter designated FAO) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior (hereinafter designated the Service) have common objectives in the development of scientific fish husbandry and the increased production of animal protein food for a growing population; and

Whereas Public Law 85-342 of the United States directs the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program of research and experimentation to develop methods for the production of fish on flooded rice acreage in rotation with ricefield crops; and

Whereas FAO has on its staff recognized experts in the field of scientific fish husbandry; and

Whereas the Service has need for consultation with such an expert in the development of the facilities and program contemplated by Public Law 85-342:

Now, therefore, the parties to this memorandum agree, as follows:

1. Beginning on or about February 1, 1959, FAO will, in accordance with its own applicable rules, regulations, and procedures, send its fishery expert, Dr. Shao Wen Ling, to headquarters of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service at Washington, D.C., and such other points in the United States as may be necessary to give technical assistance and consultation on establishment of a fish husbandry laboratory. The period of the detail shall not exceed 3 months, including travel time between Dr. Ling's headquarters and Washington, D.C., provided such travel is by air.

2. The Service agrees to reimburse FAO for all direct costs of Dr. Ling's assignment, including salary, transportation, subsistence costs en route and while in the United States, and incidental and miscellaneous costs incurred as a result of the assignment.

3. FAO agrees to such post-assignment consultative correspondence between Dr. Ling and representatives of the Service as may be deemed necessary and desirable.

4. The Service agrees to provide FAO with periodical reports of progress on the fish husbandry research.

BIOGRAPHY OF DR. SHAO-WEN LING

Dr. Ling was born in Changchow, China, in 1907. He gained his bachelor's and master's degrees in biology at Yenching University, Peiping, in 1928 and 1930. In 1933 he gained a Ph. D. in limnology (the science of freshwater biology) at Cornell University in the United States. He then returned to China as assistant professor of biology at the University of Amoy. In 1935 he moved to

the University of Shantung, in Tsingtao, as professor and head of the department of biology.

The Japanese invasion in April of 1937 led to his evacuation and the following year he was one of the founders of the National Medical College at Kweiyang, where he served as head of the department of biomorphics (developmental biology). In 1939, the Hong Kong Government invited him to join its fisheries research institute as fisheries biologist. He also served concurrently as guest lecturer at the University of Hong Kong.

When Hong Kong was occupied by the Japanese, Dr. Ling returned to Kweiyang and joined the medical training center of the ministry of national defense. He also was director of the Kweiyang Provincial Science Institute.

With the coming of V-J Day, he was asked by the Ministry of Agriculture to organize a national fisheries research institute in Shanghai, and served as its director.

Dr. Ling joined the staff of FAO in the spring of 1949, and was assigned to the FAO Far Eastern regional office in Bangkok. While in Thailand he was instrumental in interesting His Majesty King Phumiphon Aduldej in fish farming—so much so that the latter converted an abandoned swimming pool on his palace ground for the purpose of raising Tilapia, which were then distributed to the Thai farmers. The interest shown by His Majesty gave a great impetus to fish farming in Thailand, resulting in the creation of a new industry in that country.

Dr. Ling has recently completed an assignment in Ceylon assisting in the development of inland fisheries in that country. He will shortly go to Malaya to help that country with its inland fisheries problems.

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N.Y., June 1959.
FISH FARMING COULD BE BIG U.S. INDUSTRY,
SAYS FAO EXPERT**

A world authority on fish culture recently told correspondents at United Nations Headquarters, in New York, that there were very great possibilities for fish farming in rice-growing areas of the United States.

He was Dr. Shao-Wen Ling, who had been assigned for 3 months to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). He had been advising on the establishment of a research station which is to be established in Arkansas to investigate fish farming problems in the United States.

Dr. Ling said the United States was a food surplus country, but consumption of fish was very low; an average of about 11 pounds per head per year. With some increase in fish consumption levels and with the population increase expected in the next few decades the country would need to increase food production and would find it worthwhile to look to inland water areas for more fish and to scientific fish culture for the most efficient production of this protein food.

Already, said Dr. Ling, a number of Arkansas rice farmers were experimenting with fish farming. They were using farm reservoirs and unplanted fields to raise fish to edible size. But their experiments were haphazard and yielding results which were mostly disappointing. To make a commercial success of these experiments the whole operation would have to be lifted on to a more systematic and scientific plane.

For successful and profitable fish farming, Dr. Ling said, a suitable combination of fish would have to be worked out which would have complementary food habits so that some would live on aquatic weeds, some on the minute organisms in the water, and others off the sediment on the bottom. Thus they would utilize fully all the nutritional

substances found in the pool and grow to edible size without eating one another. There was need for research to determine kinds and quantities of fertilizers which should be added to the ponds to encourage the production of fishfood and what supplementary foods, like corn and soya bean brans, should be added to round out the range of nutrients available to the fish. There were also problems of health to be considered. Fish raised under the crowded conditions of fish culture were susceptible to infectious diseases and attacks by parasites and health measures would have to be planned. On top of these came harvesting, processing, and marketing problems.

And when all these preliminary problems were solved, provision would have to be made to supply the tens of millions of tiny fish which the new industry would require. A big problem was how to induce fish to spawn in captivity, said Dr. Ling. "In their wild state they only spawn when they are happy," he said. "Our problem is how to make them happy in captivity. We might have to feed them special vitamins, make sure they get their calories and even give them hormone injections to make them more peppy."

Dr. Ling said the U.S. Congress had passed a bill authorizing establishment of a research and experimental station to investigate all these problems. He had been assigned by FAO, at the request of the U.S. Government, to advise on the selection of a site and on the layout of the new station now being drawn up. Dr. Ling said there was no shortage of American workers in the various biological sciences connected with fish culture but there was a shortage of experience in the coordination of these various sciences in the unified field of fish culture and there would be a growing need for training even more scientists to carry on extension service as the program developed.

Dr. Ling said fish farming in the United States could produce not only considerable quantities of food fish, like catfish and buffalo fish, but also game fish like bass. The Soil Conservation Service in Arkansas had calculated that more than half a million acres in ricegrowing areas would be suitable for the industry, he said. He had met many farmers during a 6-week field trip who were ready to invest heavily in the industry when it was put on a scientific basis.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
February 14, 1959.**

FAO LOANS FISH FARMING EXPERT TO FWS

Upon request of the Department of the Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations has assigned Dr. Shao-Wen Ling, one of the world's leading pond-fish culturists, to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for a 3-month period.

Dr. Ling, who has his doctor's degree in limnology from Cornell University, is a native of China. He will act as consultant for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife on the establishment of a research laboratory and experimental station which is to be built in Arkansas to study fish propagation problems in rice-growing areas.

His main task will be to visit possible experimental sites, recommend pond layouts and develop plans for research in the fields of warm-water fish diseases and parasites, genetics, selective breeding, nutrition and other physiological requirements, and to make recommendations on fish-crop rotations.

Before beginning his assignment in the rice-growing area, Dr. Ling will survey research stations and warm-water fish hatcheries in the South and will consult with one of America's leading fish culturists, Dr. H. S. Swingle of Alabama Polytechnic Institute at Auburn.

In spite of the widespread practice of fish culture in foreign countries, the idea never took hold in the United States until in recent years when the rice farmers of Arkansas became interested in fish-farming almost by accident. In bringing new rice acreage into production it was customary to build levees around a tract of land, filling the resulting reservoir with water and letting it stand for a couple of years until the timber died and the decaying vegetation enriched the soil.

Following the procedure, farmers soon found that the water in the reservoirs always contained abundant supplies of the local species of fish. Presently the question arose as to whether better breeds of fish might be raised to bring a greater yield and a more lucrative cash crop to the farmer.

To find the answer to this question, the Congress has authorized the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to establish a laboratory and experiment station.

Dr. Ling has just completed an assignment in Ceylon assisting the Government of that country in the development of its inland fisheries. When he completes his task in America he will go to Malaya to help that newly created independent nation with its fishery problems.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.**

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALL: Your understanding as stated in your letter of March 15, is correct; the Fish and Wildlife Service did request and receive for a period of about 3 months in early 1959 the services of Dr. Shao-Wen Ling, under the terms of a memorandum of agreement with the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. As indicated in this agreement (copy enclosed), Dr. Ling's expert assistance was solicited in planning the research program and experimental facilities authorized by Public Law 85-342 to develop methods for the production of fish as a supplementary or rotation crop in the reservoirs and flooded lands primarily used for rice and other agricultural crops in several Southern States.

Dr. Ling conducted a field study in Southern States and his analysis of the problems and his recommendations were very valuable in the design of our research laboratory, experimental ponds and program. The research station is located at Stuttgart, Ark., with a substation now under construction at Kelso, Ark. In our opinion, the investment in Dr. Ling's services (we reimbursed FAO in the amount of \$5,663.26) has been highly profitable.

We have recently heard that Dr. Ling plans to be in this country on leave this summer. The possibility of again obtaining his aid is being explored. He could be most helpful as a participant in a tentatively scheduled review of the "fish farming" programs and objectives. We would be pleased to reimburse FAO for Dr. Ling's salary and expenses within the United States for a period of perhaps 2 weeks if this second use of his exceptional talents can be arranged.

We appreciate this opportunity of explaining our activities and hope that this letter, together with Commissioner Pautzke's letter to you dated March 18, is fully responsive to your interest.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT M. PAUL,
Deputy Assistant Secretary
of the Interior.

**FRANK WOLFE LOSES HIS JOB BUT
KEEPS HIS SELF-RESPECT**

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, "I know they'll get me for not going along. But all I've got to lose is a job. I'm not going to lose my self-respect."

Mr. Speaker, these are the words of Frank E. Wolfe, formerly an electrician at the Dixon State School, Dixon, Ill., when he rebelled at a blackmail attempt by E. M. Sullivan, Democratic chairman of Lee County in my district, prior to the elections last fall. I reported in a speech on the floor on August 2, 1962, that Mr. Sullivan had ordered all patronage jobholders in the county to contribute 2 percent of their salaries to the party under threat of losing their jobs.

Mr. Wolfe was the spokesman for the group of about six employees who decided to fight the Sullivan order. Mr. Wolfe reported that the blackmail payments would amount to \$13 a month in contributions in addition to \$184 in retroactive payments. The protesting employees charged that Sullivan threatened there were 150 more Democrats just waiting for the jobs of noncontributors.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we see that Mr. Wolfe's prediction was accurate—they finally got him. He was fired March 22, 1963. My colleagues will recall in my speech last August I quoted Mr. Wolfe as saying that although he had been a Democrat since the days of Al Smith and he intended to make voluntary contributions to the party, "I don't like someone to point a gun at me."

I was moved by the fighting statement of this honest man to investigate further into the matter. I found that the Dixon State School was a regular recipient of Federal research grants and would continue to receive Federal funds. Since the Federal Government was, and to my way of thinking, still involved, one would assume that the Department of Justice would investigate in order that justice might be upheld. Mr. Robert Kennedy has always indicated a great interest in this sort of thing.

I wrote to the Attorney General on August 6, 1962, indicating that in my opinion Federal law had been violated and that section 600, just to mention one, of title 18, United States Code, was germane to the instant case.

Mr. Speaker, sections 600 and 601 of the aforementioned title of the United States Code are very explicit in the punishment to be inflicted on those involved with the promise or deprivation of employment or other benefit for political activity.

On August 17, 1962, Mr. Burke Marshall, assistant attorney general for civil rights, wrote to me the following letter which I will include at this point:

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: This refers to your letter to the Attorney General of August 6, 1962. With your letter you enclosed an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 2, 1962, with your remarks under the title, "Kickback From Patronage Jobholders."

Your comments concern a chairman of a county political organization who allegedly threatened local patronage jobholders, including an electrician at a State school which receives some Federal funds, with loss of their jobs unless they contributed a percentage of their salaries to the organization.

Based upon this information, 18 United States Code 600 would not be applicable. You express the view that there are "any number of other Federal provisions" which would apply. Though some States might have statutes which would apply to the alleged activity, we know of no Federal law which does.

Sincerely,

BURKE MARSHALL,
Assistant Attorney General,
Civil Rights Division.

Mr. Speaker, the nonchalance with which the Department of Justice approaches civil rights matters of this nature is appalling. Section 601 states in part:

Whoever . . . threatens to deprive any person of any employment . . . made possible by any act of Congress . . . on account of support to any candidate or any political party in any election, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

I do not think there is any doubt as to the intent of Congress in this or similar sections dealing with elections and political activities.

In Mr. Marshall's letter he indicated that Mr. Wolfe was "allegedly threatened" and I am wondering what he will say in his next letter now that Mr. Sullivan's threat to get Mr. Wolfe's job has become a reality. I intend to write the Attorney General and request that another attempt be made to initiate an investigation. I assume that I will hear from Mr. Marshall in about 2 weeks, as was the case last year, but I hope in that time he will have read through the aforementioned sections and will indicate that he is now cognizant of the intent of Congress in these matters.

Mr. Speaker, if the reply from the Department of Justice is identical to one which I received last year, Mr. Kennedy surely will have "pulled the trigger" on Mr. Wolfe, and in order to prevent this from happening again, the Congress will have to spell out in new legislation, language that the Department of Justice can understand.

TAX CUT HAS ONLY MINOR EFFECT ON NATION'S GROWTH RATE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the dispute between the two schools of economics both advocating Federal income tax reform, the press has tended to emphasize the agreement and to neglect the disagreement. Ironically, this can bring about no tax reform because the areas of disagreement will not have been resolved.

The disagreement about Federal expenditures has received only a modicum

of exposure. The public is aware that one school states there must be expenditure reform before there is tax reform. However, the rationale of the expenditure reformers has been reported mostly through the mouths of those who oppose it. And, therefore, it has not had the proper emphasis or accuracy. It is time the press began reporting directly not vicariously what the opponents of President Kennedy's fiscal policies based upon a tax cut have been saying.

Another area of basic disagreement, however, has hardly been mentioned. President Kennedy's statement that a tax cut is the most important step that can be taken by the Federal Government to stimulate the economy is contradicted. The opposition says that a tax cut based upon expenditure reform or not based upon it, will have little impact by itself upon economic growth. Other economic factors are more important and more basic.

The press has pictured the tax cut debate as a struggle between those who want the tax reduction to go to beef up consumer demand and those who want it to beef up investment funds. This is what the Kennedy spokesmen say is the point of dispute. The opposition says this is relatively minor. The economic facts are that both consumer purchasing power and investment liquidity are relatively high today. Putting more money into either category will only increase an already fairly liquid condition.

Tax reform is needed because of its long-range impact, not its short-range impact. Its impact upon incentive to invest and incentive for the consumer to spend is the key. In our present liquid situation as far as the consumer is concerned the \$100 a year to each Federal income taxpayer which the administration tax cutting bill proposes will do little to his incentive to purchase. The same is true about the incentive to invest whatever money might be released to increase investment dollars.

Incentive will be helped only by the permanency of the reform and in context and in conformity with other reforms. The immediate impact should be designed primarily to give our people reassurance that the administration believes in, understands, and wishes to promote the private enterprise system. To put it bluntly the people need to know whether the administration believes in the morality and efficacy of profits. Right now there is a question in every businessman's mind as to whether this is an accepted ethic of our society in the eyes of the Kennedy administration.

Consumer purchasing power is helped by getting an unemployed person a job more than by a tax cut. One job puts about \$5,000 into consumer purchasing power annually in contrast to a \$100 tax cut. Provide the proper incentives to create new jobs and unemployment can be reduced from 4,200,000 to 3 million thus adding \$6 billion to consumer purchasing power, plus cutting Federal expenditures in welfare and increased Federal revenues.

Incentive to invest is helped by increasing the rate of return on capital invested. We have been in a profits squeeze for some time. Taxes, important

as they are, remain a minor item in the cost-price squeeze. Annual rate of profit after taxes on stockholder equity dropped from an average of 14.2 percent in 1947-51 to a 9.4 percent in the 1957-61 period. Tax reductions will help this picture in tenths of percentage points, labor costs, governmental penalties and subsidies, foreign and domestic, and other economic forces deal in full percentage points. It is the areas other than taxes which must receive much of our attention.

Today it requires around \$20,000 of new capital investment to create one new job. The money is there ready to invest. The new and better goods and services have been invented and are ready to be offered to the public. Why then is not the money risked to produce and market these goods and services so that these new jobs are created, so that \$5,000 units not \$100 units are injected into the aggregate of consumer purchasing power?

The problem is not easy. President Kennedy is talking off the top of his head when he says that tax reform will either make or break this country's prosperity in the ensuing months. He is hiding the real economic problems facing our people with this kind of distraction.

PATRONAGE AND DEFENSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Record an excellent editorial appearing recently in the St. Louis Globe Democrat entitled: "Patronage and Defense."

I do not know the merits of the specific case at point, the TFX fighter plane contract awarded to the General Dynamics Corp. I do know that the Kennedy administration has been inviting just this kind of blowup by the cynical approach it has taken at the highest level toward the handling of all Government business, not just defense.

I have pointed out in public speeches the dangerousness of permitting Congressmen to announce executive department awards of governmental contracts, projects, appointments, personnel moves, and so forth to the people. What, indeed, are the people supposed to think other than that political influence helped to bring about the Government action, rather than the merits involved? This kind of operation encourages the improper procedure of going to the legislative representatives instead of directly to the governmental agency which has the responsibility for making the decisions. It creates a disrespect for law, Government, and politics.

Recent political campaigns have been conducted brazenly on the innuendo of subverting the orderly process of Government by law with Government by influence.

The Kennedy administration for 2 years now consistently has sought to obtain congressional votes by threats and promises involving Government contracts, appointments, and installations.

Last year the techniques became so outrageous that several of us took the floor of the House to protest against them. In this instance high officials in the Defense Department threatened to withdraw contracts from businesses in certain congressional areas if the Congressmen representing those districts did not vote to increase the debt ceiling to \$308 billion.

We have always had a modicum of government by men not by law; indeed history reveals that the graveyards of nations are filled because of the virulence of this disease. The real difference in the United States today in contrast to the past when we had open spoils politics is that this kind of activity is receiving a strange sort of smug and cynical accolade instead of censure by people in high places upon whom we formerly could rely to help set our moral tone. President Kennedy is being praised for his astuteness as a practical politician but the kind of astuteness for which he is praised was nothing new even in Machiavelli's times. Many Republicans and Democrats, regardless of our differing views on other matters, are dedicated to fight against this kind of astuteness. It is the simple issue of corrupt government against good government.

We are seeing in Washington today what I saw in Missouri as a young man under the regime of "Boss" Pendergast and what Time magazine cynically praised last week in Mayor Daly's operations in Chicago.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 13, 1963]

PATRONAGE AND DEFENSE

The administration, specifically the Defense Department, is under the gun and yelling "foul" as Senator McCLELLAN's investigating committee probes the \$6,500 million TFX fighter plane award to the General Dynamics Corp..

The award was made despite the fact the Boeing Co. submitted a bid some \$100 million less and offered a craft the Air Force and Navy military chiefs recommended as better.

The deal has aroused loud cries of favoritism from Democrats and Republicans. It has been layered with a thick suspicion that defense politics has been played in the grant of this huge contract.

With a \$52 billion annual defense budget to disburse, obviously the opportunity for solid-gold patronage cannot be ignored. Dwight Eisenhower warned against "unwarranted influence of the military-industrial complex" when he left the Presidency. Political largesse in billions has been a suspicion in Capitol corridors for years.

Now it is out in the open.

Senator HENRY F. JACKSON, a pro-Kennedy Democrat called the contract "an amazing operation in unreality." Boeing is in Seattle, Wash., the Senator's State, and Mr. JACKSON is riled.

Republican Congressman K. W. STINSON of Washington State flatly hollered "politics." He said it would be more apt to call the plane LBJ instead of TFX. He referred to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas. The General Dynamics plant is in Fort Worth.

Secretary of Defense McNamara released a letter yesterday to Chairman McCLELLAN

of the Senate committee asserting the selection of General Dynamics to build the TFX was proper and in the public interest.

And he leveled a blast at the investigation committee which he charged was undermining public confidence "in the integrity and judgment of the highest officials in the Department of Defense." These "highest officials," all civilians, rode roughshod over the advice of Navy and Air Force experts, who will be responsible for use of the powerful new plane.

Mr. McNamara's outburst came on the heels of an apology by a Defense Department spokesman, Arthur Sylvester, for his comment questioning the fairness of the McClellan committee, which has a top-flight reputation for integrity.

The Nation has every confidence in Senator McCLELLAN. He should probe this contract—perhaps others by the Pentagon—with exhaustive vigor. Complete scrutiny is impressively due.

Rumors, now open charges of political manipulation in defense contracts, have been rife for so long, only the naive in Washington think there is no truth in the reports.

Campaigning Kennedys, as well as other politicians of both parties, have implied or actually promised their election would reap more defense industry for particular areas. John F. Kennedy made precisely such pledges in stumping West Virginia. After he became President, new contracts went to West Virginia.

When Gov. Pat Brown was beating the hustings in California against Richard M. Nixon he boldly asked, "How could the State expect a GOP Governor to get as many contracts and projects for California as a Democratic intimate of the Kennedy administration?"

Senator CASE of New Jersey recently asked from the Senate floor, "Is national interest the sole criterion in awarding Government contracts?"

Washington rumor is that certain Congressmen are seeking to trade votes for major administration legislation—in return for defense or other jobs in their bailiwicks.

Secretary McNamara will testify before the Senate committee later. Perhaps he can justify the highly controversial TFX contract. He certainly will have full opportunity. His explanation should be bared to the Nation.

No one wants arbitrarily or in partisan spleen to sap "the integrity" of Mr. McNamara and discredit the administration. But it has become too pat a gambit of the New Frontier whenever criticism or policy dispute arises, to wrap itself in a mantle of righteousness and howl persecution.

The country has a perfect right to know whether the administration is playing political touch football with multi-billion-dollar defense funds.

WOOL IMPORT THREAT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the entire New England delegation was saddened by an announcement that the Marland Plant of the J. P. Stevens Co. in Andover, Mass., was closing down operations. Over 453 persons will lose their jobs. The New England delegation to Congress has repeatedly asked President

Kennedy to take action to help New England's wool business.

We have sent him telegrams.

We have written letters.

We have made telephone calls.

On February 20, I wrote President Kennedy asking him to take immediate action to save our wool business.

HE HAS DONE NOTHING

I urged him to immediately impose quantitative restrictions on the importation of woolen goods to the country. He has done nothing.

President Kennedy's replies have become increasingly vague. As things stand now, no one in Washington knows whether or not President Kennedy intends to help the wool business.

Here in Congress, we have been besieged by Presidential message. The problems that have concerned the President have ranged from the purely local to State, national, international, and, indeed, outer space. What I want to know and what the Nation wants to know, is when the Presidential concern is going to evidence itself with some tangible and practical action.

COMMUNITIES ARE SUFFERING

People are losing their jobs and their livelihood. Whole communities are suffering. The Kennedy administration has repeatedly promised to help the wool manufacturing industry just as it did for cotton. Equal treatment, fairplay, and the keeping of promises is all the wool industry is asking. Is this too much to ask?

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to the reason for the closing of the Marland plant. Fabrics coming in from Japan, similar to those made at the Marland plant, are being offered for sale at 40 cents per yard under the Marland plant's actual cost.

Someone will probably suggest that the Marland plant has gone out of business because it is marginal. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The J. P. Stevens Co. has spent \$1,550,000 to improve the Marland plant since the Korean crisis. By international standards, it is a modern plant.

During the Korean war, this plant was largely engaged in the production of uniform materials and blankets for our country's Armed Forces. Should we face another Korean-type war, we would have to look to foreign countries to provide the material formerly produced by the Marland plant.

Andover is losing a large payroll. This loss will affect other areas of our great country which supply consumer goods to Andover. When a plant in New England goes out of business, inevitably all sections of our country are affected. On March 27, 1963, Mr. John P. Baum, vice president of the J. P. Stevens Co., made the following statement about the closing of the Marland plant. It says:

TEXT OF MARCH 27, 1963, ANNOUNCEMENT BY COL. JOHN P. BAUM, OF J. P. STEVENS & CO., INC.

After many months of painstaking appraisal and after exhausting all other alternatives, we have reluctantly reached the conclusion that we must discontinue operations at our Marland plant in Andover, Mass. Work now in process there will be run out

and the plant will then be closed down. It is with the deepest regret that we have reached this decision, as it affects the current employment of 453 people.

This decision is unavoidable in view of the losses which the Marland plant has sustained over the last several years due to the disastrous effect of imports from low-wage countries. As an illustration, fabrics from Japan similar to those made in the Marland plant were offered freely in the domestic market at prices approximately 40 cents per yard under our actual cost.

The losses of the Marland plant have occurred despite the fact that the machinery and equipment is thoroughly modern. Capital expenditures of \$1,450,000 have been made in the Marland plant since the Korean crisis.

The closing of the Marland plant with the resultant loss of textile employment is another example of the excessive burden of foreign imports on the American textile industry and its employees. This steadily increasing volume of imports of woolen products reached an all-time high during 1962, when imports were approximately 20 percent of domestic consumption. We, as well as others in the American woolen and worsted textile industry, have hoped for some time that positive action would be taken to correct these inequitable foreign trade problems. To date no such action has been taken.

This action constitutes a further erosion of the textile industry's capability to supply the Armed Forces in the event of an all-out national emergency—for example, during World War II and the Korean crisis, the Marland plant was largely engaged in the production of uniform materials and blankets for our country's Armed Forces.

It is hoped that responsible Federal Government officials will take the necessary corrective action to solve the woolen and worsted import problem before additional American mills are forced to close.

It is our intention to exert our maximum effort and to utilize our fullest resources to maintain full operations in all of our remaining plants.

The closing of the Marland plant is just the beginning. As sure as night follows day, we can expect other plant closings.

In 1960, Candidate Kennedy did a lot of talking about "getting this country moving again." The people of New England are getting fed up with President Kennedy's brand of "moving" that means closing plants and increased unemployment.

POLITICAL ASYLUM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Urr] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the United States has always had particular pride in its tradition of political asylum. Right now we are sheltering over 100,000 refugees from Castro's Communist rule, and rightly so. Even though the guests whom we have sheltered have not always been of our choice, we have consistently maintained this right of sanctuary. It has been an inviolable part of the American tradition.

In the whole history of the United States, there is no instance of a refugee

President or ruler of a foreign country whom we have sent back to his political enemies to be butchered.

Unhappily there are indications that we are about to break this tradition.

Responding to some imperative of the New Frontier foreign policy, there are unmistakable signs that the administration is contemplating the turning over of former President Perez Jimenez of Venezuela to vengeance and probable death at the hands of Romulo Betancourt. The fact that Betancourt and Perez Jimenez are bitter political enemies and that it was Perez Jimenez who upset Betancourt's leftists' timetable by 10 years, by turning him out of the Venezuelan Government in 1948, does not give pause to those in high places who are clamoring for the former President's deportation. The fact that Perez Jimenez, while President, was decorated by President Eisenhower for his staunch support of the United States and for his leadership in the hemispheric fight against communism is disregarded. The demand of the hour is to please Betancourt. And the price which Betancourt has demanded is the life of Perez Jimenez.

The long legal case for Perez Jimenez' extradition, which was initiated immediately after Betancourt came to power, is now entering its last lap. The former President's lawyers have filed papers with the U.S. Supreme Court, for the final legal recourse, an appeal to the Supreme Court. Within 30 days, the answer will come. If it is adverse, Perez Jimenez will be turned over to the State Department for deportation. Only President Kennedy's intervention can save him. And President Kennedy is the man who told Betancourt on February 19 that: "You are the kind of President whom the United States wants to have in Latin America."

What is behind this case? Certainly there is more than meets the eye in this vengeful determination of those high in this administration to destroy Perez Jimenez. It has been brought out that Betancourt's lawyer in this country, who has been permitted to conduct the legal extradition proceedings against Perez Jimenez, is the firm of Covington and Burling, of which Dean Acheson is the senior partner. But there are other influences.

First of all, let us be honest with ourselves. Perez Jimenez is not in danger of extradition because he has embezzled money, the technical charge. Anyone with the slightest acquaintance with Latin America knows that the corruption-in-office charge against his predecessor is routine procedure by every successful revolutionary newcomer to discredit his opponents. Perez Jimenez used this leverage against Betancourt himself, and with some justification, when he deposed him in the coup of 1948. We may disregard this charge as only a convenient pretext. If it had not been embezzlement, it would have been something else.

I have in my possession a copy of an affidavit by Miguel Silvio Sanz Anez, now a prisoner—if he is still alive—in the Venezuelan political prison, San Juan de los Morros. It was smuggled

out of the prison and witnessed by his lawyer, Dr. Benjamin Nunez Escobar. It is dated February 8, 1963.

Mr. Sanz Anez was a section chief of the Ministry of Interior under Perez Jimenez. Imprisoned in 1958, he is still waiting for trial. In his affidavit he makes the following illuminating statement:

The same judge of arraignment who had issued the warrant of arrest to obtain my deliverance from the Embassy of Colombia had me transferred at midnight one day to the Department of Indicted Military Personnel and told me that the Government had authorized him to make the following proposal: If I signed a statement accusing ex-President General Perez Jimenez of ordering the death of several political leaders of the opposition, I would be given a substantial sum of money and would be released and taken to the neighboring island of Curacao, Dutch territory, acquitted of all accusations. Upon my negative answer, I was ordered to be secluded in a place of disciplinary punishment called the "tank."

Since Mr. Sanz Anez risked his life, and that of his lawyer, to make this statement, it is certainly reasonable to believe that he told the truth. The affidavit throws a flood of light upon the way in which the Betancourt government has whipped up its extradition case against Perez Jimenez. When it was unable to get a witness who would perjure himself by charging murder, the government settled for the milder charge of embezzlement. The important thing was to get Perez Jimenez back to Venezuela to one of the notorious Betancourt political prisons.

Of the possibility of a fair trial for Perez Jimenez, once the United States turns him over to Betancourt, Mr. Sanz Anez makes a significant comment. He is to be believed because he has spent 5 years in Betancourt's political prisons and knows the score:

If this is the treatment and nature of proceedings accorded me and those mentioned, what treatment would be accorded to Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez and what would be the nature of the proceedings against him should his extradition be granted and he be delivered to Venezuelan authorities? It is evident that there would be no guarantee for his defense, that the proceedings would be surrounded by all kinds of irregularities and violations of the law that would permit its delay and indefinite paralyzation, that there would not be an impartial and just trial and that his life would be in jeopardy and the danger of death would hover about his head. And if his murder is consummated, it will be disguised in such a form as to permit Venezuelan authorities to excuse themselves and show the U.S. Government that it was all an accident.

If this warning that Perez Jimenez would not receive a fair trial if returned to Venezuela seems unconvincing, the surmise has had grim confirmation in the last 2 months. To test the fairness of Betancourt's Venezuela courts, the lawyers for Perez Jimenez, on February 13, 1963, filed an action with the Supreme Court of Venezuela to annul the embezzlement charge on the ground that the proceedings had not conformed to Venezuelan law.

What was the answer?

Instead of handing down a ruling in the annulment plea which had been en-

tered, the court declared that, inasmuch as Perez Jimenez had not been arrested in Venezuela, he had no right to file or participate in any legal proceedings in Venezuela.

This was a barefaced and naked violation of Venezuelan law.

It happens that in 1928 Venezuela was one of the nations which signed the "Code of Bustamante" on extradition at the Sixth Congress of American States at Havana. This code specifically states—article 369—that:

The person detained may also thereafter use the legal remedies which are considered proper in the state which requests the extradition against the qualifications and resolutions upon which the latter is founded.

In other words, the code which Venezuela has signed specifically covers the situation in which Perez Jimenez now finds himself, and gives him the right to sue in the courts of Venezuela.

In refusing to accept the suit, Betancourt's supreme court plainly shows that it proposes to conduct the trial of Perez Jimenez, if he is extradited, without regard to the law of Venezuela. If he goes back, he returns to be tried in a kangaroo court. His fate is certain.

Can the United States afford to be a party to any such proceedings? Have we sunk so low that we have accepted the role of hangman for Romulo Betancourt? I cannot believe that, upon sober second thought, President Kennedy wants to have such a blot upon his administration.

The United States has gone far in its abject pursuit of the good will of Betancourt's leftist government in Venezuela. Many Americans believe that we have made a major mistake in placing all our Latin American eggs in the Betancourt basket. Many informed people believe that Betancourt, with the help of such leftist and crypto-Communist allies as Haya de la Torre, Arevalo, Bosch, and Paz Estenssoro, is erecting a third force of untrustworthy leftist nations in this hemisphere which will someday be even more dangerous to America's future than is Fidel Castro himself.

Let there be no illusions. Gen. Perez Jimenez, if he is extradited, will have been liquidated because Betancourt regards him as the only Venezuelan of sufficient prestige to rally the conservatives of Venezuela into a dangerous opposition to his permanent rule in that unhappy nation.

His extradition case is a specious political plot. The United States must not play the jackal role for Betancourt in these proceedings.

CUBA AND THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in our preoccupation with the problems of Cuba and the Atlantic alliance, we must never

let our attention drift too far from the brave peoples of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. These gallant souls have been subjected to Communist domination without free elections, without any of the legal processes of a democratic system. Overwhelmingly anti-Communist, these nations deserve a chance to choose their own form of government. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am again introducing a concurrent resolution asking the President to raise the question of the Baltic States before the United Nations and ask that body to request the Soviet Union to withdraw their troops and agents from the three nations, to return the Baltic exiles from Soviet exile and slave-labor camps. The United Nations should then conduct free elections in these three nations.

MINUTEMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is proud of the part it played in the struggle of our Nation for independence. Many of the communities that are a part of what is now the Fifth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, witnessed the first Revolutionary battles.

In order that the battle sites might be preserved, the Minuteman National Historical Park has been established in Concord, Lexington, and Lincoln, Mass.

The National Park Service has recommended an appropriation of \$500,000 for fiscal year 1964 for land acquisition within the park and I am pleased to note that my colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee recognize the historical significance of the area and have approved the appropriation request for the bill which is before us today.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will support this program. Approval of the appropriation request will allow the Service to preserve the proper facilities for the visiting public in accord with Mission 66 launched in 1956. As you know, this is the Service's long-range comprehensive national park protection and use program scheduled for completion in 1966, the golden anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service.

The Service, with the help of Congress, will be allowed to continue to make headway in preserving our Nation's great past.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 4997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COIN CLUB REQUESTS RECOINAGE OF SILVER DOLLAR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the Copper City Coin Collectors Club of my home town of Butte, Mont., is the first, I believe, organized coin club in the United States to request recoinage of our de facto domestic unit of value, the standard silver dollar. Following is a resolution submitted by the above mentioned club:

Whereas we are U.S. citizens and members in good standing of the Copper City Coin Collectors Club of Butte, Mont., and are students of coins and currencies of other nations as well as our own and standard silver dollars are a pre-requisite as media of exchange in our daily trade; and

Whereas the standard silver dollar of 412½ grains, 900 fine or 371¼ grains of pure silver, has not been struck since October 1935 nor has a new design been issued since the December 1921 Peace Dollar and average of major periods for not coining the silver dollar since 1794 has been 26 years and average between new designs has been 42 years; and

Whereas over 60 million standard silver dollars have been withdrawn as uncirculating during last 20 years for an 11 percent reduction of total stock without replacement, nor has there been any allowance made for a 50 percent population increase during last three decades even though standard silver dollars in circulation have risen 1,275 percent to an alltime high; and

Whereas end of December 1962 there were over \$2 billion in bullion on deposit with our custodian in the Treasury of the United States which are now securing working representative certificates, redeemable on demand, with only 76.3 million silver dollars acting as certificate security for one of the smallest coverages of representative paper since 1883, and over 38.5 million silver dollars were reclaimed during year for the largest total redemption in the history of that coin; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury has been authorized by the Congress under section 5 of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 to coin the standard silver dollar and no further authority is required for recoinage nor for a new design as 25 year waiting period between new designs has elapsed; and

Whereas section 4(b) of the act of July 6, 1939 makes standard silver dollar coinage mandatory on all newly acquired domestic silver under that act, excepting seigniorage bullion, and there are over \$80.6 million in representative silver purchase certificates secured by unstruck bullion, so acquired, and delivery of standard silver dollars in that amount is mandatory to owners, who are certificate holders: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the members of the Copper City Coin Collectors Club in our regular monthly meeting assembled, do hereby respectfully and unanimously request the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America to resume immediate coinage of our legal standard silver dollar from bullion now on hand using the Peace Dollar

design to be followed as soon as practical by a new design reflecting the period and times we are living in such as the space age.

UNITED STATES SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR THAT ITS POLICY IN RESTRICTING EXILES WHO PARTICIPATE IN RAIDS ON COMMUNIST CUBA IS NO GUARANTEE OF PROTECTION FOR CASTRO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States should not interfere with foreign based operations against Communist Cuba. While enforcing our neutrality laws we should not deny Cubans the right to leave the United States for any other country of their choice. The United States should support the desire of Cubans to restore Cuba to a democratic society by recognizing a provisional government of free Cuba.

ARMY TANK-AUTOMOTIVE CENTER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely interested in the remarks of my able and hardworking colleague from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] concerning a report from the General Accounting Office "on ineffective repair parts support for combat and combat support vehicles by the Army Tank-Automotive Center." I believe that steps should be taken to correct the conditions described in the GAO report and pledge my support to the gentleman from Delaware in an effort to do so.

The GAO report indicates that ineffective repair parts support results from the failure of the Army Tank-Automotive Center to follow certain parts procurement and reordering procedures which GAO believes would be more conducive to efficient operations.

The Army Tank-Automotive Center is located in Metropolitan Detroit. It is a successor to the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command which was likewise based at Detroit. This Army Ordnance unit has been located in the Detroit area for many years. To the best of my knowledge it was never located in any other place.

During 1961 the Army undertook to dispose of underutilized Government-owned production facilities. As part of that program the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center at Newark, Del., was closed and declared surplus to Army needs. The production that had been performed at Lenape Ordnance Modifi-

cation Center which had been under the supervision of the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command was transferred to other points but was still under the supervision of the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command. There is no indication in the report of the General Accounting Office or elsewhere, that the closing of the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center or production of the M-60 tank at the Detroit tank plant had anything to do with the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of ATAC's repair parts support function.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CURTIS, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. HALL, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 30 minutes, on April 4.

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 30 minutes, on April 4.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORSE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DENT.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. WILLIS in two instances.

Mr. SHELLEY in two instances.

Mrs. HANSEN to revise and extend her remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1089. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 1, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 3, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

629. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that two appropriations to the executive branch agencies for the fiscal year 1963 have been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

630. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting the 15th Annual Report on the National Industrial Reserve, pursuant to Public Law 883, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

631. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize certain amounts received by way of reimbursement for medical supplies and equipment to be used to purchase other medical supplies and equipment"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

632. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend for 3 years the provisions of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

633. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the overpricing of target seeking systems under Department of the Air Force negotiated contract AF 33(600)-38098 with the Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash., for the production of Bomarc missiles and related spare parts and support equipment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

634. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to submitting a draft of a contract relating to proposed drainage work exceeding a total cost of \$200,000 on the Crooked River project, Oregon, pursuant to the act of June 13, 1956 (70 Stat. 274); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

635. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

636. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

637. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting the first annual report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, pursuant to Public Law 87-256 (H. Doc. No. 93); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

638. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to enforce constitutional rights

and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

639. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, entitled "A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 4997. A bill to extend the feed grain program; with amendments (Rept. No. 180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 5367. A bill to designate the Bear Creek Dam on the Lehigh River, Pa., as the Francis E. Walter Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 5368. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5369. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5370. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5371. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 5372. A bill to authorize the establishment of 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; and to authorize State and community youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GLAIMO:

H.R. 5373. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt silver-plated hollowware from the retailers excise tax if sold for use in the purchaser's trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 5374. A bill to provide for the appointment of certain qualified substitutes of record to positions of regular carrier on

vacant rural routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5375. A bill to allow credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain Federal employees for service in Federal-State cooperative programs in a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5376. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5377. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 5378. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the income limitations and rates of pension for veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 5379. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 5380. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for the use of counterpart funds for international agricultural conferences; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 5381. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay for combat duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 5382. A bill to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1960 to provide old-age, survivors, and disability insurance coverage for certain additional hospital employees in the State of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 5383. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 5384. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5385. A bill to bring certain holders of star route and other contracts for the carrying of mail within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 5386. A bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak. and Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 5387. A bill to amend section 409 of title 37 of the United States Code, to provide for payment for the costs of commercial transportation of trailers or mobile dwellings owned by members of the Armed Forces on the same basis as now authorized by law in the case of trailers or mobile dwellings owned by civilian Government officers and employees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5388. A bill to amend section 202(1) of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of lump sum death benefits where the deceased individual had six or more quarters of coverage at the time of his death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 5389. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 5390. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit the recovery by the municipal government of the District of Columbia of amounts due such government in the adjudication of claims under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 5391. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income tax deductions for certain payments made and expenses incurred in providing or securing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 5392. A bill to amend section 302 of title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay for optometrists on the same basis as such pay is provided for medical and dental officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5393. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Johnstown flood; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the depletion allowance for coal and lignite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt a corporation from the corporate income tax where its operations are carried on in an economically depressed area and provide employment for a specified minimum number of persons in that area; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 5396. A bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak. and Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 5397. A bill to permit the State of Michigan to obtain social security coverage, under its State agreement entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, for State and local policemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5398. A bill to assist States in combating mental retardation through construction of research centers and facilities for the mentally retarded; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 5399. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a fully insured individual may qualify for the disability "freeze" and for disability insurance benefits with 20 quarters of coverage, regardless of when such quarters occurred; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 5400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the highway use tax motor vehicles used by certain nonprofit organizations for disaster relief work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5401. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require use of articles, materials, and products of the United States in performing contracts for the construction,

conversion, alteration, or repair of vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 5402. A bill to declare that certain land of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5403. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to authorize the issuance of subpoenas by the U.S. Civil Service Commission in connection with hearings under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5404. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the applicability of benefits under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5405. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 5406. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 368. Joint resolution to reimburse uncompensated leave to Government Printing Office employees earned during the fiscal year 1932; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 369. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim October 6, 1963, as German Shepherd Dog Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution that the President of the United States be requested to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, under its supervision; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H. Res. 303. Resolution relating to a salary increase for the Superintendent of the House Folding Room, Office of the Doorkeeper; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H. Res. 304. Resolution to amend clause 4 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that introduced bills include an estimate of cost, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER: Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 of the Texas State Legislature requesting prompt review of the present Federal two-price-support program on cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON: Joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to prevent by legislation, the curtailment, by depart-

mental regulation, of the acquisition of rights-of-way across Federal lands in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERRY: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Texas memorializing the Congress of the United States to promptly review the present Federal two-price-support program with a view to providing the same assistance through a subsidy or otherwise to American cotton mills, as foreign mills now enjoy, it being our opinion that this action would bring domestic cotton to a competitive price level on world markets and also to a competitive price level with synthetics in the home market, thereby avoiding the prospect of a situation that would ultimately, seriously, and perhaps permanently impair the whole economic structure of our country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of legislation authorizing flood control appropriations to the Yuba County Water Agency; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to taking necessary steps to restore the historic freight rate formula that has existed between westbound livestock to the broad based livestock industry in Oregon which is threatened by undercutting freight rate practices now permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to commending the personnel, military and civil, of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash., for their past and present contributions, their dedication to the security of the Nation, and a performance in speed, efficiency, and economy unmatched elsewhere in these United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 5407. A bill for the relief of Mary Horalek, Blue Rapids, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.R. 5408. A bill for the relief of Jackie Bergancia Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 5409. A bill for the relief of the Mutual Benefit Foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 5410. A bill for the relief of Elias Iambrinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5411. A bill for the relief of Edward Berger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 5412. A bill for the relief of Lee Jung Ae; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 5413. A bill for the relief of Edward P. Drake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 5414. A bill for the relief of Delfina Sanz-Marin and Antonia Sanz-Marin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 5415. A bill for the relief of Dante Giovanni Nomellini, his wife, Lina Nomellini, and their minor children, Adolfo Nomellini

and Rosella Nomellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 5416. A bill for the relief of Irene N. Halkias and Constantine N. Halkias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 5417. A bill for the relief of Mario Menna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 5418. A bill for the relief of 2d Lt. Albert A. Matson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5419. A bill for the relief of Calogero Calco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York.

H.R. 5420. A bill for the relief of Mauro Vescovi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 5421. A bill for the relief of Jose Marques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 5422. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Sgt. John D. Savercool against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 5423. A bill for the relief of Mr. Antonio Balardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5424. A bill for the relief of Youssef Michael Ayoub, his wife, Yvette Maria Michaela Ayoub, and their minor children, Cherif Youssef and Wafih Youssef Ayoub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5425. A bill for the relief of Andrew Angelopoulos Karas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 5426. A bill for the relief of Mario Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 5427. A bill for the relief of Henry Armstrong, administrator of the estate of Ella Armstrong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 5428. A bill for the relief of Theophilos Bouglas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

79. Mr. HANNA presented a petition of the board of directors of Associated Chambers of Commerce of Orange County, Calif., and Orange Typographical Union No. 579, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hon. Gordon H. Scherer and Hon. Morgan Moulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the recently released 1962 Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities contains a resolution of commendation for the Honorable Gordon H. Scherer and the Honorable Morgan M. Moulder, both of whom retired at the end of the 87th Congress after serving in an outstanding manner for a decade or more as Members of the House and of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

At an executive meeting of the committee on September 26, 1962, this resolution was unanimously adopted by their colleagues who expressed the desire not only that it be included in the committee's annual report, but also that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of the House and the public as well would know the esteem in which Mr. Scherer and Mr. Moulder were held by their colleagues. It is a pleasure for me to place this resolution in the RECORD:

Whereas the Honorable Gordon H. Scherer has announced his intention to retire from the House of Representatives of the United States after serving the First Congressional District of Ohio with distinction for 10 years; and

Whereas he is the able and ranking minority member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, on which he has served faithfully and well during his entire tenure in the Congress; and

Whereas he has at all times revered, defended from all enemies and tirelessly promoted those characteristics of freedom which have given this Nation the most cherished and lasting independence the world has ever known; and

Whereas his indomitable spirit and wise counsel will be sorely missed by the 88th Congress; and

Whereas the Honorable Morgan M. Moulder declined to seek reelection to the House of Representatives after serving the 11th District of Missouri with distinction for 14 years; and

Whereas he brought to the committee valuable experience gained by years of work as a judge and also a keen insight into the aims of the Communist conspiracy; and

Whereas his loss to the committee will be keenly felt: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities extend their deep appreciation to Gordon H. Scherer and Morgan M. Moulder for their many years of truly outstanding service to this committee and wish them a most rewarding future in all endeavors they may pursue.

Vice President Tells of Need for Big Brothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a few nights ago many of the Members of this body and our colleagues in the House, attended an affair at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington. The event was the Big Brother dinner, and it is the dream come true of our friend, the renowned columnist, author, and newscaster, Drew Pearson.

Mr. Pearson has done our country a great service in calling to our attention, the need for us to adopt a young boy and to him become a big brother.

The guest speaker at the Big Brother dinner was the Vice President of the United States LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who, in his remarks, illustrated how he, as a big brother to his own brother and sisters, helped them to become useful citizens. But more than that, Vice President JOHNSON made other comments with the great humility which he possesses, that are deserving of the attention of us all.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of the Vice President at the Big Brother dinner be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON JOHNSON AT THE BIG BROTHER DINNER, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 29, 1963

If a fellow could choose his own big brother, I think most would choose one just about the size of Sonny Liston.

Sonny was doing fine in the world until he took up the Republican game of golf. While we all regret what happened to the champion's leg when he swung at the golf ball in Florida and missed, I can't help thinking how much better that golf ball must feel.

I am grateful to Drew Pearson for asking me to come here tonight. The Big Brother program is one of the finest activities of its kind in America, and I think the work he is doing with this program shows the real character of our friend, Drew Pearson.

I feel a strong personal attachment to the concept of this program because in my childhood, I was the big brother for a large family, a family that was both large and poor. There were times when I had to do some of the scrapping to take care of my younger brother and sisters. There were also many times when, as the big brother, I had to sit with my father and mother and talk about the things I could help do to make sure that my younger brother and sisters had the shoes they needed, the clothes they needed, and the food on the table that the whole family needed.

Many years, many miles, and many events have passed since those days. But I never forget them. I never forget that a boy born and raised in such circumstances—working as a bootblack, a goatherder, a highway construction gang laborer—could, under our system, rise to the second highest office of public trust in the strongest and most powerful nation of the world.

Remembering the great distance that has been spanned by my own career, and remembering how great the odds seemed against any opportunity at all when I was a boy in grade school and high school, I live with constant thanksgiving and gratitude that I am an American. I hope that through programs like these we can help many young Americans in our cities and on our farms, to keep the hope they ought to have for their own future and keep the faith they must