We here and the rest of the civilized world could have no better inspiration in pursuing this objective than the glorious history and record of brave Lithuania and her still embattled people. The continuing persecution and subjugation of Lithuania, and the other small nations, is a grave challenge to the moral conscience of America and the United Nations. It will remain so until the cooperative efforts of all free nations have reestablished the great basic principles of liberty everywhere in the world. In simple justice, and for self-survival our Government must perseveringly insist that the Lithuanian people be restored in their inalienable right to govern themselves as they themselves see fit. If we ever neglect this obligation the same thing could happen to us here.

Therefore, we, as fellow Americans, and you as Lithuanian descendants, must pledge today, to undergo any necessary sacrifice to preserve the freedom of the United States against Communist tyranny and restore such freedom to your beloved homeland. In this joint cause we should have and we will have the full support of decent people all over the world. They will join in our prayers and our efforts, under God, to keep the remaining citadels of liberty alive and to insure that your native country will be free to live again in the spirit of her ancient motto: "Be what may, Lithuania will always stay."

ADDRESS OF ANTHONY J. MILLER, ESQ.

As your fellow American of Lithuanian descent, it is a special privilege for me to join with you, and with our great Congressman, HAROLD DONOHUE, in this program commemorating the 43d anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence.

This annual program is dear to the hearts of all Lithuanians because it is held in remembrance of that day in February 1918, which marked the end of over 100 years of suffering under a hostile foreign rule. Lithuania, on that day, stood forth as an independent free Republic. There was cause for rejoicing and hopes for the future were bright. The people in our native country were happy and content in their own sovereignty.

Unfortunately, in this year of 1961 our exercises are touched with sorrow. The fond hopes for Lithuania's freedom are yet covered over by tyrannical restriction. We dwell with sadness upon the continuing tragedy of the suffering enveloping Lithuania under ruthless dictatorship; today Lithuania is a Communist slave state.

The principles of political independence set forth in the declaration by the United Nations and the Atlantic Charter are a shameless sham in view of the present suffocation of Lithuanian liberty. Our native country and her people are undergoing the extreme hardships of brutal conquest by a tyrannical giant.

However, our thoughts of the sufferings of our people at home are comforted by our knowledge that Lithuanians are a race of proven character, courage, and culture.

Our people have a lasting faith that the Russians cannot destroy.

Our people have a persevering courage that the Communists can never conquer.

You and I well know, and history shows, that Lithuania has a national character that will survive when all the force and brutality of Kremlin persecution has vanished from the face of the earth.

Although we are indeed sorrowful about the unhappy conditions existing in our native land we have no real cause for despair. Consistently, through her history, Lithuania has shown that her people will always and eventually overcome the passing and temporary dictatorships that have been visited upon her. The Christian faith which, in 1399, repulsed the Tartar invasion and saved all Europe from barbarism is still with her today. It gives her the spiritual vigor to survive any tyranny. From the knowledge of our own Lithuanian heritage we know, as Lithuanian-Americans, that deep in the heart of every native Lithuanian there is a passion for liberty and freedom which will never die. There is no earthly power that can forever hold in slavery a God-fearing people who are determined to be free.

Today Lithuanians are gathering all over the world to renew their vow to ceaselessly work for the independence of our homeland. Here in the United States I earnestly believe that most of our fellow Americans are increasingly concerned about the fate of Lithuania and the other Communist-dominated states which stand in graphic testimony of our failure to move and act in accord with the principles for which our people have fought and died in two World Wars.

It is, therefore, our duty as loyal Lithuanian-Americans to publicize on every occasion throughout the year, not just today, the harsh facts of the suffocation of self-government that is being thrust upon Lithuania and other states by the Russian Government in their policy of expansion through fraud, force, and threats. We must, as a duty, continue to remind all peoples that World War II was fought with the clear understanding and pledged purpose that common victory would bring restoration of self-government and territorial integrity to the oppressed nations of the world.

We cannot conceive of that war being justified until that pledge has been fulfilled. The great world powers, including our own America, must constantly be urged to combine their efforts for the release of Lithuania and the other nations from the cruel domination of Russian imperialistic terrorism. It is a terrorism which defies and denies every decent concept of self-determination and democracy.

Beyond evidence of our Christian concern for the people in our native Lithuania, this commemoration program serves an even more useful and practical purpose.

It is a vivid reminder to the world of the tragic fate of Lithuania and the other countries who used to be free but are now bound by the chains of Communist dictatorship.

We can and we should make this occasion far more than a temporary expression of our sympathy for our own people and the unhappy people of the other countries barely existing in the darkness of the Iron Curtain. Let us make it a time of reinspiration and rededication in the eternal fight for the freedom and independence of all men everywhere.

These exercises here and throughout other lands where people of Lithuanian descent are living will be heard and become known behind the Iron Curtain. It will clearly demonstrate to our home people that they are not forgotten, that their struggles are the struggles of the freedom-loving world.

It will surely help to keep burning in their hearts and minds the flames of hope for the day of liberation.

Let us then never relax our efforts on behalf of our people, and let us pray that God will grant that glorious day of freedom to be soon realized.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1961

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

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

O Thou who art from everlasting to everlasting, in Thy providence it is our appointed lot to live and toil when, as never before, humanity has struck its tents and is on the march.

We are pilgrims. We cannot go back to any past. We cannot call a halt at any spot where we fain would stay.

Our divine commission is to discard that which has been outgrown, and which, with wider vision, is seen now to be unworthy; and at the same time it is ours to maintain and conserve that which is vital.

Give us to see, we pray, that the priceless wisdom gained in the experience of the yesterdays is to be woven into the changing patterns of the tomorrows. Ordain us anew as custodians of the treasures inherited from the past, and also as stewards entrusted to join experience and adventure to make a better future. As Thy servants, who are the representatives of the people, stand at the great divide between the past and the future, may their gaze these sacred weeks be upon the Christ of the ages, who came, not to destroy, but to fulfill, and in whose arms are all the treasures of ancient good and all the hope of the untried and untrodden days. In His spirit send us forth, not knowing whither we go, but as travelers with high assurance as we follow Him, whose goal is the Kingdom of Righteousness, for whose coming we pray, in His ever-blessed name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 24, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Arthur Alden Kimball, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. WALTER M. MUMMA, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that, pursuant to the provisions of section 712 (a)(2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency had appointed Mr. PATMAN, of Texas, Mr. RAINS, of Alabama, Mr. MULTER, of New York, Mr. McDONOUGH, of California, and Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, as members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production on the part of the House.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 155) to create a joint committee to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the first inaugural of Abraham Lincoln, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE TO FILE BILLS AND REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to file bills and reports during the adjournment of the Senate this week.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet and hold hearings during the session of the Senate today.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONSIDERATION OF JUDGES BILL ON THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, I wish to announce that on Thursday we shall begin debate on the judges bill, which on yesterday was ordered to be reported by the Judiciary Committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States which, by unanimous consent, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 27, 1961.

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

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a draft of a bill to provide Federal assistance to our State and local public elementary and secondary school systems. It carries out recommendations contained in my message to the Congress of February 20, 1961.

Also included in the draft legislation are amendments to extend and improve the two laws (Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, 81st Cong.) which provide for payments to local school districts in areas of Federal impact. These take into account the recommended legislation dealing with general education.

I am convinced that the national interest requires us to provide every child with an opportunity to develop his talents to their fullest. Inadequacies in our school systems handicap this development. I believe that this legislation will help lift our schools to a new level of excellence.

The enclosed letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare describes the proposal in more detail.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

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

REPORT OF GENERAL SALES MANAGER, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the General Sales Manager concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including all sales and disposals, with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support, for the month of October 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON SPECIAL PAY TO CERTAIN OFFICERS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, that the permissive authority vested in the Secretary of Defense to pay special pay to certain officers was not exercised during the calendar year 1960; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ENTITLED "SEMIANNUAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTIONS REPORT"

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Semiannual Research and Development Procurement Actions Report," covering the period from July 1, 1960, through December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Office, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, covering the fourth quarter of 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DR. FERENC DOMJAN AND OTHERS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Dr. Ferenc Domjan and others (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT ON NATIONAL FUND FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that fund, for the year ended December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF WABASH VALLEY INTERSTATE COMMISSION

A letter from the executive director, Wabash Valley Interstate Commission, Terre Haute, Ind., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that commission, dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL REPORT OF BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

A letter from the president, and national director, Boys' Clubs of America, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial report of that organization, for the year ended December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION ON ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC LAWS 874 AND 815

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commissioner of Education on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 4

"Joint resolution relating to legislation concerning domestic gold

"Whereas legislation has been introduced into the U.S. House of Representatives

which would direct the U.S. Treasury to pay $70 per fine ounce for newly mined domestic gold and would require that the Treasury charge $70 per fine ounce on the sale of gold for domestic, industrial, professional and artistic use; and

"Whereas this legislation would encourage and stimulate the domestic gold production industry of Alaska and other mining areas of the United States; and

"Whereas the legislation affects only domestic production and will not disturb or unsettle the international monetary relationships of the United States; and

"Whereas the prosperity of the entire country depends in large part on the successful utilization of our great natural resources; and

"Whereas the present decline in United States gold production results from many facts, including the fixed gold price of $35 an ounce; and

"Whereas the revival of the Alaska and the national gold industry could benefit the entire country and could serve as an aid in halting the loss of national gold reserves; be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska in second Legislature, first session assembled, That the U.S. Congress is respectfully urged to take favorable action on H.R. 2573, raising the price of domestic gold, as introduced by Representative RALPH J. RIVERS; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; and the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; to the chairmen of the Banking and Currency, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of the U.S. House of Representatives; to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, Senators from Alaska; and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, Representative from Alaska.

"Passed by the house January 31, 1961.

"WARREN A. TAYLOR,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"ESTHER REED,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate February 10, 1961.

"——— ———,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Certified true, full and correct.

"ESTHER REED,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 14

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent, that:

"Whereas the Army Corp of Engineer's 308 Review, properly denominated as House Document No. 531, 81st Congress, 2d session, as the same has been later amended and modified by Senate Document No. 51, 84th Congress, 1st session and review of House Document No. 531, dated June 1958, entitled 'Water Resource Development, Columbia River Basin,' clearly points out that the site of the proposed storage dam on the North Fork of the Clearwater River in Clearwater County, State of Idaho, known as Bruce's Eddy, is a great natural location for a multipurpose flood control and hydroelectric dam installation; and

"Whereas Federal funds approaching $2 million in amount have been expended on studies, explorations, surveys, testing and planning of said project, the results of which have fully supported the original recommendation of the Army Corp of Engineers as contained in the above referenced documents; and

"Whereas annual flood damage of considerable proportion exists on the Clearwater River, where a recurrence of the 1948 flood in the Clearwater Valley, based on present conditions, but assuming protection of Lewiston by levees proposed as a part of the authorized Lower Granite lock and dam project on Snake River, would cause an estimated damage of $3 million, of which $1,500,000 would be downstream from the Bruces Eddy Dam site; and

"Whereas the potential for commercial and industrial development in the Clearwater basin cannot be realized until substantial regulation of the flows of the Clearwater River for the prevention of flood control is effected; and

"Whereas additional hydroelectric power will be required in the Columbia basin by the years 1965 through 1970 to meet the increasing electric power demands forecasted for that period in Idaho and the Pacific Northwest; and

"Whereas navigation and recreational benefits are important to the Clearwater area and to the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas the Bruces Eddy project, as recommended by the Army Corps of Engineers, would be a multipurpose project, accomplishing the following, among other purposes:

"1. Flood control: Local flood damages in the Clearwater basin would be reduced annually and major flood problems in the lower Columbia River would be importantly benefited by upstream storage as would be provided by this proposed project.

"2. Power: A Bruces Eddy powerplant would have, at site, an ultimate power installation in excess of 500,000 kilowatts. In addition, storage releases from Bruce's Eddy Reservoir would increase the energy generation at downstream powerplants by 799 million kilowatt hours annually. That the benefit-to-cost ratio of said project, as estimated in Senate Document No. 51, would be 2.14 to 1.

"3. Navigation: The Bruces Eddy Pool would provide important assistance in transportation of logs from the forests to the mills which would yield an estimated benefit of $537,000 annually.

"4. Storage: The reservoir at the project would provide about 2 million acre-feet of usable water storage.

"5. Recreation: The reservoir would be about 50 miles long and will provide many and varied recreational benefits to the people of the State of Idaho: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that Congress expedite such legislation as shall be required to the end that construction of the Bruces Eddy Dam project on the North Fork of the Clearwater River in Idaho shall be authorized and construction be commenced at an early date; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he hereby is directed, to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, to the Federal Power Commission, to the Secretary the Interior, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State and from the States of Montana, Washington, and Oregon."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

"Joint memorial petitioning the Congress of the United States to transfer the Moriarity Air Force site, and access road and all easements appurtenant thereto to the the State of New Mexico for the utilization of such site by the State for the medium security reformatory institution authorized by the 24th Legislature of the State of New Mexico

"Whereas the Moriarity Air Force site, located in Torrance County, N. Mex., has served well in the past as a bulwark of the Nation's defense structure; and

"Whereas the said Moriarity Air Force site has recently been deactivated; and

"Whereas the said Moriarity Air Force site occupies some 83.83 acres owned by the U.S. Government in fee simple, and is surrounded by lands owned by the State of New Mexico, over which the U. S. Government has been granted easements, and the U.S. Government owns the access road approach to said Moriarity Air Force site; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government has constructed at the Moriarity Air Force site many permanent and temporary structures, including family housing units for which special funds were appropriated by the U.S. Congress, which structures should be utilized and not permitted to deteriorate and decay; and

"Whereas the 24th Legislature of the State of New Mexico deemed it advisable that a medium security establishment for the confinement of youthful and certain other criminal offenders be created and designated as the 'reformatory'; and

"Whereas the 24th Legislature of the State of New Mexico created such a reformatory by chapter 29 of the laws of 1959; and

"Whereas the Moriarity Air Force site in Torrance County is ideally situated, constructed and contrived to be utilized by the State of New Mexico for such medium security reformatory; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the 25th legislature that the necessary steps be taken to secure the Moriarity Air Force site from the U.S. Government for use as the medium security reformatory authorized by the 24th legislature: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to pass necessary legislation permitting the transfer of the Moriarity Air Force site to the State of New Mexico with the access road, for utilization as a medium security reformatory, and that all easements presently held by the U.S. Government on surrounding State lands be released by the U.S. Government to the State of New Mexico; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, the Honorable Dennis Chavez and Clinton P. Anderson, U.S. Senators from the State of New Mexico, and the Honorable Thomas G. Morris and Joseph M. Montoya, U.S. Congressmen from the State of New Mexico.

"TOM BOLACK,
"President of the Senate.

"M. E. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"JACK M. CAMPBELL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"ALBERT ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 6

"Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States to declare the counties of Rio Arriba, Taos, Mora, San Miguel, Guadalupe, Socorro, McKinley, Torrance, Colfax, Harding, DeBaca, Sandoval, and Santa Fe, depressed areas in the event of enactment of any program of Federal aid to depressed areas; and urging the President and the Congress to enact a program of Federal aid to depressed areas

"Whereas the people of the counties of Rio Arriba, Taos, Mora, San Miguel, Guadalupe, Socorro, McKinley, Torrance, Colfax, Harding, DeBaca, Sandoval, and Santa Fe in the State of New Mexico have suffered great economic depression; and

"Whereas the people of these counties have sought and struggled to achieve an economic level consonant with and comparative to other areas of the State and the United States, but have been thwarted in these efforts due to the depressed status of the economy in these areas; and

"Whereas the people of these counties are in dire and desperate need of Federal economic aid: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the legislature of the State of New Mexico does hereby memorialize the President of the United States to declare the counties of Rio Arriba, Taos, Mora, San Miguel, Guadalupe, Socorro, McKinley, Torrance, Colfax, Harding, DeBaca, Sandoval, and Santa Fe in the State of New Mexico, depressed areas in the event of the enactment of any program of Federal aid to depressed areas, so that these counties may qualify for this desperately needed supplement to the existing economy; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to speedily enact a program of Federal aid to depressed areas; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate of the United States Congress, and the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ and the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, U. S. Senators from New Mexico; and the Honorable JOE M. MONTOYA and the Honorable THOMAS G. MORRIS, Representatives at Large from the State of New Mexico.

"TOM BOLACK,
"President of the Senate.
"M. E. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.
"JACK M. CAMPBELL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"ALBERT ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 2

"Memorial requesting Congress to undertake a survey of the human and natural resources of the Papago Indian Reservation

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The Papago Tribe is one of the poorest tribes in the State of Arizona although it is second in population, estimated to be 9,000, and in reservation area, 3 million acres. It has not had enacted in its behalf by Congress a long-range development program, although such a program was presented and recommended more than 10 years ago. Consequently, the Papagos have been unable to make any significant development, either socially or economically.

"The Papagos are presently living in chronic and widespread poverty. A large section of the population is on relief. This is not only bad for the morale of the Papagos, but creates a heavy financial drain on government welfare agencies, which can be reduced when Papagos are able to participate in productive economic endeavor and support themselves.

"The progress of this large group, whose population is increasing, is of vital importance to the economic future of southern Arizona, and hence the whole State.

"A tribe, like the Papago Tribe, which needs the help most, but lacks money or influence, receives relatively little attention and is most likely to be neglected. The tribe does not have the funds necessary to hire qualified experts to make the investigations of social and economic conditions to furnish accurate and reliable data needed as a basis for a sound and constructive program of orderly social and economic development. It must look to the Government to provide these funds.

"No adequate studies have been made of the potential natural resources on the reservation or how many tribal members could make a living on the reservation if such resources were developed. The more the reservation can be developed and Papagos participate in the development, the more they will be identified with the area in which they live and they will be able to make an important contribution to its development.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, respectfully prays:

"1. That the Secretary of the Interior be authorized and directed to undertake or to contract by negotiation for such surveys and investigations as he may deem necessary to accumulate and evaluate basic data for the Papago Indian Reservation relating to Indian-owned natural resources, the adequacy of these resources to support the Indian poulation thereon, the extent to which the Indians are prepared by education and vocational training and personal inclination to develop or participate in the development of the reservation resources, and the problems that will confront the Indians who must live and work away from the reservation."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States for the enactment of a law ceding to the State of South Dakota certain lands in the State

"Whereas at the date of the original Government survey of the land situated in the State of South Dakota, there were bodies of water, in the form of lakes and streams, covering in many instances several sections of land; and

"Whereas these lakes and streams were of such proportions that they meandered at the time of the survey; and

"Whereas, since the lands of South Dakota have been subjected to cultivation, these lakes and streams have become dry by evaporation and other causes; and

"Whereas good wildlife management and water conservation practices could be effected to a greater degree after the elimination of the current confusion of ownership and status of these lands; and

"Whereas the lands formerly comprising these lakes and streambeds have become valuable for agricultural, wildlife management, and water conservation use, and there is no means by which title to these lands may be procured, and these lands are not considered Federal waterways and are not within any Indian, military or other reservation; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has transferred to States title to certain public lands after acceptance by the States of original endowments and grants: Be it therefore

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring) do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact a law authorizing and ceding to the State of South Dakota these lands and carrying the provisions into effect: Be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the house January 20, 1961.

"Concurred in by the senate February 14, 1961.

"JOE BOTTUM,
"President of the Senate, Lieutenant Governor.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"CARL BURGEEI,
"Speaker of the House.
"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committe on Public Works:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION D

"Concurrent resolution favoring the early construction of the proposed Pembilier Dam and Reservoir project and urging the Corps of Engineers to expedite the completion of a favorable report thereon

"Whereas the proposed Pembilier Dam and Reservoir project on the Pembina River, near Walhalla, N. Dak., has been under restudy, reexamination, and review by the district engineer, St. Paul district, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, for a number of years, with a view of finding a more favorable benefit-to-cost ratio to better justify recommendations for its accomplishment; and

"Whereas the resulting reservoir would insure a municipal and industrial water supply adequate to care for present needs and insure a supply for developments in the immediate future; and

"Whereas there appears to be potential irrigable areas of up to 25,000 acres, or more, susceptible of development in connection with such project, and there are additional benefits, both direct and indirect, which have not been, but should be, considered in the evaluation thereof, all of which would substantially improve and increase the economic feasibility of the project; and

"Whereas the provincial and federal Governments of Canada, through the Manitoba water control and conservation branch and the Canadian section of the international joint commission have taken commendatory action by visiting the Pembina basin and have indicated their interest in establishing flood control and other beneficial water uses through the construction of a reservoir on the Pembina River in Manitoba to implement the operations of the proposed Pembilier Dam: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"That the 37th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota favors expediting the surveys and establishments of favorable reports whereby the early construction of the Pembilier Dam and complementary Canadian structures for flood control, domestic, municipal, industrial, and agricultural water supplies, power, recreation, fish and wildlife, and other uses, and urges the Corps of Engi-

neers, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Fish and Wildlife and the interested Canadian agencies to expedite the development and completion of a favorable benefit-cost report thereon to the end that congressional approval thereof may be sought in the next flood control bill; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies hereof be mailed by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Public Works, the Chief Engineers, the St. Paul district engineer, and to Senators Milton R. Young and Quentin Burdick, and Representatives Don L. Short and Hjalmar Nygaard, and E. A. Bacon, chairman, American section, and Gen. A. L. G. McNaughton, chairman, Canadian section, international joint commission and the director of the Manitoba water control and conservation board.

"ORVILLE W. HAGEN,
"President of the Senate.
"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"R. FAY BROWN,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 11, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 36TH STATE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WYOMING

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to passing legislation granting to the State of Wyoming funds equivalent to the amount of lost revenue due to the large amount of federally owned land within the State of Wyoming which cannot be taxed

"Whereas more than 50 percent (50%) of all the land within the boundaries of the State of Wyoming are federally owned or controlled; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Wyoming have long been aware of the inequitable lack of sovereignty and loss of revenue from the lands aforesaid; and

"Whereas each year the State of Wyoming and the counties within said State are unable to derive any income from taxation or other assessment on the lands owned or controlled by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the welfare and interest of the citizens of the State of Wyoming demand that funds equivalent to the amount of revenue which would be realized if said lands were taxed be returned annually to the counties and State of Wyoming: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 36th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they hereby are memorialized to fairly and diligently consider the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming who favor legislation returning annually to the counties and State of Wyoming funds equivalent to the amount of revenue which would be realized if said lands were taxed; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies thereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, U.S. Senator J. J. HICKEY and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

"Approved February 21, 1961.

"JACK R. GAGE,
"Acting Governor.
"ALBERT C. HARDING,
"President of the Senate.
"JOSEPH L. BUDD,
"Speaker of the House."

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

"ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION 4, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 36TH STATE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WYOMING

"Joint resolution making application to the Congress of the United States urging the call of a convention on behalf of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States under which expenditures of the Federal Government may not exceed estimated receipts except in emergency and by vote of a substantial majority of the Congress

"Whereas the cumulated net Federal deficit has grown to unmanageable proportions over the past 30 years and in this period there have been 18 deficits in 23 nonwar years; and

"Whereas governments should be required to operate within their income: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 36th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That, pursuant to the provisions of article V of the Constitution of the United States, application is hereby made to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to such Constitution under which, except for trust fund expenditures and receipts, the expenditures of the Federal Government during any fiscal year may not exceed the estimated receipts of such Government during such fiscal year, unless a substantial majority of the Congress, on recommendation of the President and because of war or other grave national emergency, votes to suspend the limitation on expenditures for a specified period of time; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies thereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator J. J. HICKEY, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, and U.S. Senator HARRY F. BYRD.

"Approved February 21, 1961.

"JACK R. GAGE,
Acting Governor.
"ALBERT C. HARDING,
President of the Senate.
"JOSEPH L. BUDD,
Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"JOINT MEMORIAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

"To the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States and to the Honorable Mike Mansfield and the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senators from the State of Montana, and the Honorable Arnold H. Olsen and the Honorable James Battin, Congressman from the State of Montana, relating to the retention of the Connally reservation and that no law shall be passed that will affect the right of self-determination by the United States:

"Whereas the Connally reservation to our membership in the World Court, which reserves to the United States the decision as to whether an issue referred to the Court is governed by American domestic jurisdiction; and

"Whereas the campaign to abolish the Connally amendment and give compulsory jurisdiction over the United States keeps bursting into flame: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the 37th session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to retain the Connally reservation and to pass no law which will affect the right of self-determination by the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives, to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Senators from Montana, and the Honorable ARNOLD H. OLSEN and the Honorable JAMES BATTIN, Representatives in Congress from Montana.

"CLYDE L. HAWKS,
"Speaker of the House.
"TIM BABCOCK,
"President of the Senate."

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

"SENATE MEMORIAL 3

"Memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy; the Congress of the United States; Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Senator Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Congressman Arnold Olsen, of Montana; Congressman James Battin, of Montana; and to the Administrator of the Bureau of Public Roads, Rex M. Whitton; requesting that the laws of the United States, and the regulations of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads made thereunder be reviewed, amended, and modified so as to provide for the elimination of standards of interstate highway construction which result in extravagance and waste, especially in the application of uniform standards to areas within States and areas of sparse densities of population, as well as to densely populated States and areas

"Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, acting under and by virtue of the laws of the United States, relating to the construction of an Interstate Highway System, have established highway construction standards to be followed and met by all States in the construction of interstate highway projects; and

"Whereas the aforesaid standards have been adopted for uniform application throughout the United States; and

"Whereas such uniformity in application of such standards results in wasteful and extravagant construction and right-of-way requirements when applied to States and areas of sparse densities of population, when such standards are required only for States and areas of dense population; and

"Whereas such wasteful and extravagant requirements include, among others, the following:

"(a) Too extreme requirements for right-of-way widths beyond that area which is required for actual construction;

"(b) Requirements for 4-foot parking strip along each side of the median of such highways;

(c) Requirement for 10-foot parking strips along each of the outer edges of the traveled portions of such highways;

"(d) The construction and installation of illuminator poles along the outer edges of such highways;

"(e) The requirement of distances up to 75 feet in the median of such highways between the two opposite flowing traffic lanes;

"(f) Requirements that at grade approaches to two-lane interstate highways in rural areas, of little traffic flow, be limited to two per mile on each side of a two-lane highway and to none on a four-lane highway;

"(g) Requirements and policies that four-lane interstate highways be constructed currently to serve forecast traffic demands of the future; and

"(h) Other requirements of construction in right-of-way which are wasteful and extravagant by being of such a nature as to be inconsistent with the comparatively small amount of traffic being carried over such highways in States and areas of small densities of population: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana, That the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, the Congress of the United States, Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana, Senator Lee Metcalf, of Montana, Congressman Arnold Olsen, of Montana, Congressman James Battin, of Montana, and the Administrator of the Bureau of Public Roads, Rex M. Whitton, be urged and requested to examine, change and modify the laws of the United States and the regulations made thereunder as to construction of the Interstate Highway System so as to realistically set standards of highway construction with reference to the areas through which such highways pass with relation to the density of population in such areas and the amount of traffic being carried over such highways, so as to eliminate wasteful and extravagant requirements which may serve some purpose in areas of dense population, but which serve no logical purpose in States and areas of small densities of population and of comparatively small amounts of traffic flow; and that the following standards and requirements may be modified as indicated:

"(a) That too extreme requirements for right-of-way widths beyond that area which is required for actual construction be modified to limiting such right-of-way requirements to all that is actually needed for purposes of construction so as to insure that no acreages of land be left unused for highway purposes and unavailable for other purposes;

"(b) That requirements for 4-foot parking strip along each side of the median of such highways be eliminated in areas of sparse population or traffic flow so as to lessen construction costs and reduce right-of-way requirements;

"(c) That requirement for 10-foot parking strips along each of the outer edges of the traveled portions of such highways be eliminated or narrowed wherever the same serve no real purpose in areas of sparse population or traffic flow so as to lessen construction costs and reduce right-of-way requirements;

"(d) That the construction and installation of illuminator poles along the outer edges of such highways be eliminated in areas of sparse population or traffic flow;

"(e) That the requirement of distances up to 75 feet in the median of such highways between the two opposite flowing traffic lanes be drastically narrowed so as to limit right-of-way requirements;

"(f) Requirements that at grade approaches to two-lane interstate highways in rural areas, of little traffic flow, be limited to two per mile on each side of a two-lane highway and to none on a four-lane highway be relaxed to a more realistic and practical limitation in areas of sparse population or traffic flow;

"(g) Requirements and policies that four-lane interstate highways be constructed currently to serve forecast traffic demands of the future be modified so that no four-lane highways be constructed until the current traffic flow and demands justify their construction;

"(h) That other requirements of construction in right-of-way which are wasteful and extravagant by being of such a nature as to be inconsistent with the comparatively small amount of traffic being carried over such highways in States and areas of small densities of population be modified or abandoned in the interests of economy and the lessening of local private injury; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of state of Montana to each of the individuals named in the title of this memorial and also to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON and SAM E. RAYBURN.

"TIM BABCOCK,
"President of the Senate."

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Whereas the 86th Congress of the United States of America, at its 2d session, in both Houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, has made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

" 'SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION

" '*Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein),* That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "ARTICLE—

" ' "SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

" ' "A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

" ' "SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." '; Therefore be it

"Resolved, by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Washington; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Administrator of General Services, Washington, D.C., to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

"Passed the house February 9, 1961.

"JOHN L. O'BRIEN,
"Speaker of the House.

"Passed the senate January 31, 1961.

"JOHN A. CHERBERG,
"President of the Senate."

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Auburn, Wash., relating to a merger of the Great Northern and North Pacific Railway Cos.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Albert Levitt, of Hancock, N.H., favoring an investigation of the political activities, within the United States, of the state of Vatican City, its citizens and nationals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the State central committee of the Democratic Party of Hawaii, relating to a recount of the vote in the presidential election of 1960; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

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

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4

"A joint memorial petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact enabling legislation permitting residents of certain Federal and Indian reservations to vote in the event such legislation should become necessary

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas there is now pending before the District Court of the State of New Mexico certain litigation questioning the right to vote of residents of certain areas within the State of New Mexico, to wit: Residents on certain military reservations and residents on the Navajo Indian Reservation, all within the State of New Mexico; and

"Whereas our great country was founded upon the principle that all men are entitled to equal protection, benefit, and rights afforded under the laws of the United States, its States and Territories, and that there be no discrimination concerning such protection, benefits, rights, or duties, and that each and every citizen shall be entitled to equal rights and should assume equal responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That, should it become finally determined that any citizen of the State of New Mexico, otherwise qualified to vote, be denied such right by reason of his residence on certain Federal reservations, including the Navajo Indian Reservation, lying within the State of New Mexico, then and in that event, that the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested and urged to introduce and to enact such legislation as will enable and permit such citizens to be entitled to vote; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial shall be sent to each the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to Senators and Representatives representing the State of New Mexico in the Congress of the United States.

"JACK M. CAMPBELL,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"ALBERT ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"TOM BOLACK,
"President, Senate.

"M. E. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk, Senate."

JOINT RESOLUTION OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a senate joint memorial from the Legislative Assembly of Oregon. This memorial deals with the problems faced by the growers of fine fescue seeds in Oregon.

After a number of recitals of factual findings by the legislative assembly relating to the problems faced by the domestic producers, it is urged that further investigation of this matter be undertaken by the Tariff Commission, and that the executive power of the President be brought to bear to alleviate some of the hardships in this case.

The Willamette Valley of western Oregon and the Grande Ronde Valley of eastern Oregon are the two leading fescue producing centers in the country. The fescue growers have been

hard hit by competition from import of fescue seeds, particularly from Canada.

I urge upon my colleagues the study of this memorial, and I am certain that both the President and the Tariff Commission will give this memorial all the attention it truly deserves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorial, together with the letter of transmittal from Oregon's secretary of state, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD.

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

STATE OF OREGON, DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Salem, Oreg., February 23, 1961.

The Honorable MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: It is with pleasure that I herewith forward to you Senate Joint Memorial 3 from the Legislative Assembly of Oregon. This memorial relates to the establishment of an annual quota on fine fescue seed imports into this country.

Respectfully,
HOWELL APPLING, Jr., *Secretary of State.*

ENROLLED SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

TO HIS EXCELLENCY, THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, your memorialists, the 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the production of chewings fescue and creeping red fescue (known as fine fescues) turf grass seeds is a major agricultural enterprise in the Willamette Valley of western Oregon and in the Grande Ronde Valley of eastern Oregon, with over 90 percent of the production in the United States, which has averaged 11,894,200 pounds annually during the past 5 years; and

Whereas heavy imports, averaging 10,088,800 pounds annually during the 1955 to 1959 crop years, inclusive, with 12,159,000 pounds and 15,955,000 pounds imported during the 1958 and 1959 crop years, respectively, have contributed heavily to a buildup in carryover stocks in the United States, and have demoralized the domestic market, with a continuation of excessive imports indicated for the 1960 crop season; and

Whereas such excessive imports of foreign production, with their demoralizing effects on domestic markets, discourage domestic producers' efforts to satisfy needs of the United States; and

Whereas, given reasonable protection from such excessive imports and their disastrous effects on this country's markets, Oregon growers and other growers in the United States are willing, able and anxious to produce high quality chewings fescue and creeping red fescue seeds in amounts sufficient to assure adequate supplies to meet domestic needs at reasonable prices; and

Whereas the current low import duty of 1 cent per pound on fine fescue seeds does not limit or regulate imports of this important Oregon farm commodity; and

Whereas an import quota of around 5 million pounds annually of fine fescue seeds, as recommended by the Northwest Chewings & Creeping Red Fescue Association to the U.S. Tariff Commission at its hearing held on this matter in August 1959, should lead to equitable sharing of the domestic markets with producers in friendly and free countries; and

Whereas, since that 1959 hearing on this matter, market prices received by producers of fine fescue seeds in the United States have declined nearly 50 percent, to the lowest prices ever received in this country; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives jointly concurring: (1) The 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon respectfully urges the U.S. Tariff Commission promptly to investigate this matter further and to recommend to the President of the United States, for his executive action, the establishment of an annual quota on fine fescue seed imports into this country.

(2) The Secretary of State shall send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the U.S. Tariff Commission and to all members of the Oregon Congressional delegation.

Adopted by senate January 31, 1961.
MEDA COLE,
Chief Clerk of Senate.
HARRY J. BOIVIN,
President of Senate.

Adopted by house February 7, 1961.
ROBERT R. DUNCAN,
Speaker of House.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Legislature has approved House Concurrent Resolution 6, which memorializes the U.S. Congress to give immediate attention to the creation of a Federal evapotranspiration research center in Kansas. Water is very important in our State, and I sincerely hope we can get action on the proposal in this session.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and referred to the appropriate committee.

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

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

Concurrent resolution memorializing the U.S. Congress to give immediate attention to creation of a Federal evapotranspiration research center in Kansas

Whereas more water is consumed in Kansas through evapotranspiration processes than in any other kind of water use, and a sizable portion of this evapotranspiration represents waste of a valuable natural resource; and

Whereas it is estimated that a 5-percent reduction in evapotranspiration in an area where the average annual precipitation is 20 inches would save more than 1 inch of water and would produce $63 million in crops for Kansas; and

Whereas there is a great need for more basic research on soil-plant-water relationships as they exist under the conditions of the Kansas climate and on means of reducing evapotranspiration such as by developing plant strains that require less water and developing practical and economical methods of treating soil, water surfaces, and plants; and

Whereas the problem of evapotranspiration is of concern to many other States, and the Great Plains Agricultural Council has prepared a detailed proposal, which has been submitted to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, for the establishment of a Federal research center in the Great Plains area to study the problem and to experiment with control techniques; and

Whereas Federal financing of such a center would be justified in view of the nature of the work and the broad regional area that would be affected: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein, That the Kansas Legislature respectfully urges the U.S. Congress to give immediate attention to the matter of creating a Federal research center in Kansas to study soil-plant-water relations and to experiment with techniques for evapotranspiration control, with special emphasis on problems in the Great Plains; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is directed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the U.S. Senate, and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the chairmen of the U.S. Senate and House Agriculture Committees, and to each of the members of the Kansas congressional delegation.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body February 1, 1961.
ALLEN L. NUHTELL,
Speaker of the House.
A. E. ANDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 17, 1961.
HAROLD H. CASE,
President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the State of Kansas identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I present a joint resolution of both Houses of the Wisconsin Legislature, regarding the serious economic distress in the northern part of my State. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, together with a letter from the chief clerk of the Wisconsin State Assembly.

There being no objection, the letter and joint resolution were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE,
Madison, February 21, 1961.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: The enclosed joint resolution has been approved by both houses of the Wisconsin Legislature. It was felt that time was important and I am, therefore, sending a copy of the printed joint resolution prior to the time of its enrollment. At such time as the resolution is enrolled, you will receive another copy.

This request has been made through Mr. Hutnik and other authors of the resolution. I trust it may be of some value to you in aid of the people of northern Wisconsin.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,
BOB MAROTZ,
Assembly Chief Clerk.

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE NEED FOR ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE IN THE WINTER RECREATIONAL AREA OF NORTHERN WISCONSIN

Whereas during the past two decades northern Wisconsin has built a strong reputation as a winter recreational area; and

Whereas during the winter of 1959–60 more than 40,000 people visited a single recreational area in northern Wisconsin; and

Whereas it is estimated that more than a million dollars is expended in that area by visitors during a booming winter season; and

Whereas residents of the northern area have invested thousands of dollars to improve the facilities and attract more visitors; and

Whereas the fickle hand of fortune has, during the current season, disrupted the economic opportunities of the area by shunting all the snow to other parts of the Nation, leaving only a token layer as an attraction to the winter sports enthusiasts; and

Whereas the lack of snow has seriously affected the economic opportunities of those engaged directly in the recreational business and also a larger group of residents who are indirectly concerned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring) That the legislature recognize that through no fault of their own, the residents of northern Wisconsin have been gravely affected by the peculiarity of the weather, that the snow drought has had as serious consequences to northern Wisconsin as the absence of rain has had to various agricultural areas of this Nation in the past, and that northern Wisconsin is truly in the throes of a disaster; and be it further

Resolved, That the legislature urge the Administrator of the Small Business Administration of the Federal Government to declare the recreational area of northern Wisconsin a disaster area and make available to the residents thereof the financial assistance which is authorized; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the Members of the Wisconsin delegation in Congress in order that they may lend their assistance to secure such aid.

RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives in the State of Minnesota urging the Congress of the United States to enact a medical care plan for our older citizens to be financed under the social security system be inserted in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

I am indeed pleased to be able to announce to the Senate the passage of this resolution by the House of Representatives of my own State. It should be noted that this resolution was adopted on a rollcall vote on February 14 by a vote of 85 to 42. This action of the Minnesota State House of Representatives is a further indication of the widespread support behind a medical care plan by the way of the social security system to provide adequate benefits for our older citizens to meet their medical care needs.

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

RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO A MEDICAL CARE PLAN UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Whereas existing State and Federal Government aid programs for medical care, voluntary health insurance and private voluntary efforts continue to fall far short of meeting the basic medical care needs of the 16 million aged citizens of our State and Nation; and

Whereas Federal legislation enacting a medical care plan for our aged would help to ease the problems of the aged, of hospitals, public assistance programs and private philanthropy and would relieve voluntary insurance programs of the burden of carrying this high risk group; and

Whereas the social security system should be the basic means of financing the medical care needs of the aged; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota urge the Congress of the United States to enact a medical care plan financed under the social security system and providing hospital, nursing home, and outpatient diagnostic services care for our aged citizens, such medical and hospital benefits would be provided for all citizens past the age of 65 whether they are under the Social Security System or not; be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives transmit copies of this resolution to the Members of the Minnesota congressional delegation.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED—RESOLUTION OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed at the appropriate place in the RECORD a resolution from the General Court of Massachusetts on the subject of medical care for the aged.

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

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PASS LEGISLATION GRANTING MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE AGED UNDER THE FEDERAL SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, AND ELIMINATING THE PAUPER'S OATH

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass legislation granting medical assistance to the aged, funds for such assistance to be raised under the Federal Social Security Act, and eliminating the pauper's oath; and be it further

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

House of Representatives, adopted, January 24, 1961.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence, January 26, 1961.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

LEWIS AND CLARK NATIONAL TOURWAY—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution of the Nebraska Legislature, approved by that body on February 22, with regard to the Lewis and Clark National Tourway, a joint resolution which is pending before this body.

On January 30, 1961, the senior Senator from Washington introduced a joint resolution, as he had in several past sessions, proposing the development of a plan for a system of highways to be known as the Lewis and Clark National Tourway. I was happy to join in the cosponsorship of this resolution.

It is understandable that Nebraska would be interested in this proposal, inasmuch as the route utilized by Lewis and Clark followed the Missouri River which comprises the eastern boundary of our State. The development of many recreational, scenic, and historical features located in the area would be only one of the advantages that can be derived from this project.

Mr. William D. Aeschbacher, director of the Nebraska State Historical Society, has been most helpful in coordinating the various movements and efforts supporting this resolution in our State. Recently he called my attention to a resolution adopted by our State legislature endorsing this proposal.

The considerations enumerated in Legislative Resolution 9 deserve broad circulation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed the text of that resolution which was passed by the Nebraska Legislature on February 22, 1961, at this point in my remarks.

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

LEGISLATURE OF NEBRASKA, 72D SESSION

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 9

Whereas Resolution 40 has been introduced in the Senate of the United States to develop a Lewis and Clark Tourway; and

Whereas the resolution is based on the historic importance of the route, the tourist potential and assistance to conservation; and

Whereas Nebraska is vitally interested in such a tourway because of the vital importance of Nebraska to the Lewis and Clark Tourway and other great highways across Nebraska: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 72d session assembled—

1. That the Nebraska Legislature endorses and supports the above-described resolution and urges the adoption thereof.

2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States.

3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the legislatures of the other 49 States for their information and consideration.

DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
President of the Legislature.

MEMORIAL OF OREGON SENATE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate of the Oregon State Legislative Assembly on January 31, 1961, and the House of Representatives of the legislative assembly on February 7, 1961, adopted Senate Joint Memorial 3. The memorial sets forth the recommendation of the 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon that the U.S. Tariff Commission investigate and recommend to the President of the United States the establishment of an annual quota of fine fescue seed imports into this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Memorial 3 be received and appropriately referred, and, further,

that the text of the memorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, your memorialists, the 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the production of chewings fescue and creeping red fescue (known as fine fescues) turf grass seeds is a major agricultural enterprise in the Willamette Valley of western Oregon and in the Grande Ronde Valley of eastern Oregon, with over 90 percent of the production in the United States, which has averaged 11,894,200 pounds annually during the past 5 years; and

Whereas heavy imports, averaging 10,088,800 pounds annually during the 1955 to 1959 crop years, inclusive, with 12,159,000 pounds and 15,955,000 pounds imported during the 1958 and 1959 crop years, respectively, have contributed heavily to a buildup in carryover stocks in the United States, and have demoralized the domestic market, with a continuation of excessive imports indicated for the 1960 crop season; and

Whereas such excessive imports of foreign production, with their demoralizing effects on domestic markets, discourage domestic producers' efforts to satisfy needs of the United States; and

Whereas, given reasonable protection from such excessive imports and their disastrous effects on this country's markets, Oregon growers and other growers in the United States are willing, able and anxious to produce high quality chewings fescue and creeping red fescue seeds in amounts sufficient to assure adequate supplies to meet domestic needs at reasonable prices; and

Whereas the current low import duty of 1 cent per pound on fine fescue seeds does not limit or regulate imports of this important Oregon farm commodity; and

Whereas an import quota of around 5 million pounds annually of fine fescue seeds, as recommended by the Northwest Chewings and Creeping Red Fescue Association to the U.S. Tariff Commission at its hearing held on this matter in August 1959, should lead to equitable sharing of the domestic markets with producers in friendly and free countries; and

Whereas, since that 1959 hearing on this matter, market prices received by producers of fine fescue seeds in the United States have declined nearly 50 percent, to the lowest prices ever received in this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring):

(1) The 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon respectfully urges the U.S. Tariff Commission promptly to investigate this matter further and to recommend to the President of the United States, for his executive action, the establishment of an annual quota on fine fescue seed imports into this country.

(2) The Secretary of State shall send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the U.S. Tariff Commission and to all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by senate January 31, 1961.

MEDA COLE,
Chief Clerk of Senate.
HARRY J. BOWIN,
President of Senate.

Adopted by house February 7, 1961.

ROBERT B. DUNCAN,
Speaker of House.

AMENDING THE DEFINITIONS AND STANDARDS UNDER FOOD AND DRUGS ACT—PETITION OF WISCONSIN SWISS AND LIMBURGER CHEESE PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently the Wisconsin Swiss and Limburger Cheese Producers' Association petitioned the Food and Drug Administration for an amendment of the definitions and standards under the Food and Drug Act.

The proposed change would allow the addition of harmless artificial coloring to milk used in the manufacture of swiss cheeses.

The industry feels—with justification, I believe—that this would be to the advantage of both consumers and producers of swiss cheese.

Under the law, FDA, of course, can modify the definitions and standards by administrative action. I believe that in this case such action should be taken as soon as possible.

Recognizing, however, that a great many other Members of Congress also have an interest in such modifications of the law, I request unanimous consent to have the petition to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff, by the Wisconsin Swiss and Limburger Cheese Producers' Association, printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PETITION REQUESTING AMENDMENT TO SECTION 19.540, DEFINITIONS AND STANDARDS, TO PERMIT THE DIFFERENCE OF HARMLESS ARTIFICIAL COLORING TO MILK USED FOR MANUFACTURE OF SWISS CHEESE

The undersigned, directors of the Wisconson Swiss and Limburger Cheese Producers' Association, hereby respectfully petition you that section 19.540, subsection C of Definitions and Standards under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act be amended by the addition of the following words: "Harmless artificial coloring may be added."

This action is requested because it is felt that such change would be to the advantage of both consumers and producers of swiss cheese. The following facts can be substantiated.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. A natural light yellow color is traditionally associated with the identification of swiss cheese.

2. Swiss cheese produced from milk of primarily pasture-fed cows has a natural yellow color.

3. In earlier years when most swiss cheese was produced in summer months the color was uniformly yellow.

4. Swiss cheese produced from milk of primarily dry-fed cows, during winter months has a white color.

5. With the greater trend toward winter production, the effect of color variation has become more pronounced, and has been accompanied by some confusion on the part of the consuming public.

6. The addition of harmless coloring to accomplish uniformity would not change the quality or standard of the product.

7. The addition of harmless coloring as here requested has been traditionally permitted in other products, in cheddar cheese, colby cheese, muenster cheese, edam cheese, gouda cheese, blue cheese, gorgonzola, and other dairy products, as well as a host of other food products.

Petitioners further represent to you that their aforesaid organization represents a substantial part of the swiss cheese producing industry of Wisconsin and has been in existence for many years.

That at the annual meeting of their said organization, the following resolution was passed:

"Whereas harmless coloring is permitted in the manufacture of other cheeses, and whereas the addition of a small amount of such coloring could compensate for seasonal variations in swiss cheese color: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Wisconsin Swiss and Limburger Cheese Producers' Association, That the U.S. Food and Drug Administration be petitioned to amend section 19.540 of Cheese and Cheese Products Definitions and Standards to permit the addition of harmless coloring to swiss cheese so that the color may be maintained uniformly and without seasonal variation."

Dated February 18, 1961.

Respectfully presented.

FRANK DEININGER.
JAMES EULA.

STATEMENT OF MID-CONTINENT OIL & GAS ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Mr. D. L. Connelly, president of the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, has recently issued a statement relating to certain concurrent resolutions which have been introduced in Congress providing for the establishment of a Joint Committee on National Fuels Policy; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The statement, presented by Mr. CARLSON, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MID-CONTINENT OIL & GAS ASSOCIATION

(By D. L. Connelly)

The Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, composed of 8,500 members in the petroleum and allied industries operating in the mid-continent area of the United States, previously has expressed unqualified opposition to certain concurrent resolutions which have been introduced in both houses of Congress providing for the establishment of a joint committee on a national fuels policy. Such committee would, among other things, have been authorized to consider the allocation of fuels to particular economic uses. Our opposition was clearly directed toward the resolutions expressed and implied objectives for the establishment of end-use control of fuels, as it was and still is believed that such proposals constituted a definite threat to the development of the Nation's oil and gas resources, with grave consequences to the national economy.

Our Nation already has well-established fuels policies which have provided ample supplies for both economic progress and national security. These policies include free consumer choice among competing sources of energy, and the enactment of conservation laws and regulations by the States. Such policies have resulted in the highest per capita fuel consumption of any nation in the world, and have been a major factor in giving to Americans their high standard of living. Any proposed changes in these policies should, therefore, be approached with great caution.

It seems appropriate for the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association to clarify fully its

position, especially as proponents of these resolutions have suggested that the oil industry, through its opposition, is seeking to avoid a national fuels study. We still remain, and will always be, opposed to any action, whether by national policy or otherwise, which limits a free consumer choice among competing fuels. At the same time, we will support and actively participate in any impartial investigation by the Congress or the executive department of the Nation's energy position.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 449. A bill to extend the time in which the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission shall submit its final report (Rept. No. 54).

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. Res. 86. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to migratory labor; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

S. 912. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 55).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

John Williams Macy, Jr., of Connecticut, to be a Civil Service Commissioner; and

Frederick C. Belen, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Richard S. Morse, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army; and

William F. Schaub, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Walter N. Tobriner, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLAKLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Herbert J. Miller, Jr., of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1076. A bill for the relief of Nancy E. Williamson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAKLEY:

S. 1077. A bill for the relief of Hood County, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1078. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, in order to make permanent the authorization for certain payments under the provisions of such laws; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1079. A bill for the relief of Ellsworth W. Thiele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1080. A bill to amend Public Law 503, 84th Congress, so as to provide annuities for the widows of certain Foreign Service officers who retired prior to the effective date of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 1081. A bill for the relief of Gee Foon Yin; and

S. 1082. A bill for the relief of Manuel Lopez-Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1083. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to authorize the designation of air freight forwarders and international air-freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1084. A bill to establish a national policy for the acquisition and disposition of patents upon inventions made chiefly through the expenditure of public funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. HICKEY):

S. 1085. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property on the Minidoka project, Idaho; Shoshone project, Wyoming; and Yakima project, Washington; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1086. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 1087. A bill to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to the Government of American Samoa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1088. A bill for the relief of Ivan Balog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1089. A bill to amend parts I and III of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to make unlawful certain discriminatory rates, charges, and practices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1090. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800, the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1091. A bill for the relief of Michael Kalligeros;

S. 1092. A bill for the relief of Marija Papic;

S. 1093. A bill for the relief of Sze-Foo Chien;

S. 1094. A bill for the relief of Max Bluemner;

S. 1095. A bill for the relief of John Wong (also known as Nai Hong Wong);

S. 1096. A bill for the relief of Rudolph Carl Bergman;

S. 1097. A bill for the relief of A. E. Waterstradt;

S. 1098. A bill for the relief of Michael Nolan (formerly Michael Pasvanis);

S. 1099. A bill for the relief of the survivors of Gerald E. Splinter; and

S. 1100. A bill for the relief of Sang Man Han; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 1101. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1102. A bill to provide an additional income tax exemption for certain physically handicapped taxpayers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1103. A bill relating to the employment and compensation of retired members of the Armed Forces in civilian offices or positions of the U.S. Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

S. 1104. A bill to amend titles 10 and 18 of the United States Code with respect to activities by retired or former officers of the Armed Forces in connection with sales to the Government and proceedings, contracts, claims, controversies, or other matters relating to activities of the department in which they have served; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1105. A bill for the relief of Sam Abdnor (Abdelnour); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1106. A bill to amend section 8(e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported dates with pits, dates with pits removed, and products made principally of dates; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 1107. A bill to exempt the production of durum wheat in the Tulelake area, Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, Calif., from the acreage allotment and marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1108. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property in the city of San Diego to the regents of the University of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 1109. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. KEATING):

S. 1110. A bill to amend the definition of the term "construction" in section 101 of title 23, United States Code, in order to authorize the inclusion of tenant relocation costs in such term; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 1111. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that, for purposes of determining the annual income of an individual eligible for pension, payments of State bonus for military service shall be excluded; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1112. A bill to extend the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, until March 31, 1968; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 1113. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in celebration of the 100th anniversary of the completion of the first transcontinental telegraph line and to honor the memory of Edward Creighton, a pioneer in American communication; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

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

S. 1114. A bill amending the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act with respect to emergency labor disputes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1115. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program for certain individuals at age 72; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 1116. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of certain calcines and matte proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1117. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1118. A bill to authorize the disposal of all or part of the property known as Ellis Island for purposes consistent with the public interest and welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BLAKLEY:

S. 1119. A bill to provide aid to States for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 1120. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of doctors of medicine under social security, and to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits; and

S. 1121. A bill to increase the benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, and to increase from $4,800 to $6,000 the maximum amount of annual earnings with respect to which benefits under such system may be based; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1122. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, as amended, to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1123. A bill to amend section 13(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the exemption of agricultural employees from the child labor provisions of such act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. HART, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CARROLL, Mr SYMINGTON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 1124. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; and

S. 1125. A bill to provide grants for adult education for migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1126. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1127. A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to assist in the provision of housing for domestic farm labor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1128. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture; and

S. 1129. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide improved programs of recruitment, transportation, and distribution of agricultural workers in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1130. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for improving domestic agricultural migratory workers' health services and conditions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1131. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to further assist States in establishing and operating day-care facilities for the children of migrant agricultural workers; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1132. A bill to provide for the establishment of a council to be known as the "National Citizens Council on Migratory Labor"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 1133. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to withhold the tax credit provided under section 3302 from maritime employers in States that do not meet the conditions required by section 3305(f); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1134. A bill to authorize the payment of per diem to certain members of the Navy and Marine Corps for temporary duty performed after January 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1135. A bill to provide for wheat marketing quotas without acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1136. A bill to amend section 203(k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus property for educational extension activities conducted through 4-H Club organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1137. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1954; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1138. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the States of North Dakota and Minnesota to enter into an agreement with respect to the boundary between such States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. HICKEY, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. McGEE):

S. 1139. A bill to amend the act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the waters of the Little Missouri River in order to extend the expiration date of such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1140. A bill providing a program of financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1141. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Hatta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 1142. A bill to amend sections 1, 17a, 57j, 64a(5), 67b, 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S.J. Res. 56. Joint resolution providing for the designation of April 30 through May 6, 1961, as National Invest-in-America Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S.J. Res. 57. Joint resolution authorizing the establishment in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Albert Einstein; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RESOLUTIONS

RECOGNITION OF DAKOTA CENTENNIAL OBSERVATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. BURDICK) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 97) calling upon the people of the United States to give proper recognition to the Dakota Centennial Observation, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, which appears under a separate heading.)

RULES FOR STANDING, SELECT, OR SPECIAL COMMITTEES OR SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. JAVITS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 98) prescribing rules for the standing, select, or special committees and subcommittees of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"5. The following shall be the rules of the standing, select, or special committees of the Senate and subcommittees thereof, and the term 'committee' as used in any part of this subsection except Paragraph (b) shall mean any such committee or subcommittee:

"(a) Each standing committee of the Senate (except the Committee on Appropriations) shall fix regular weekly, biweekly, or monthly meeting days for the transaction of business before the committee. Additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary.

"A majority of the members of a committee may call a special meeting of such committee by filing a notice thereof with the committee clerk, who shall notify each member.

"(b) A subcommittee of any committee shall be established only by a majority vote of the entire membership of such committee.

"(c) Each committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

"(d) In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the presiding officer of the Senate, without debate, in favor of that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation; but such decision shall be subject to an appeal.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the chairman of each such committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the Senate, any measure approved by his committee and to take or cause to be taken such steps as shall be necessary to bring the matter to a vote.

"(f) Each committee of the Senate, including any subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures (not in excess of $10,000 for each committee during any Congress) as it deems advisable: *Provided*, That no standing committee of the Senate shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate is in session, unless a majority of the members of such committee, including a majority of the minority members, approve such meeting. Each such committee may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, may report such hearings as may be held by it, and may employ stenographic assistance at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers approved by the chairman.

"(g) All hearings conducted by committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

"(h) No committee investigation shall be initiated unless specifically authorized by the Senate or by a majority of the standing, select, or special committee having jurisdiction. Preliminary inquiries may be initiated by the committee staff with the approval of the chairman of the committee. The chairman of each committee shall from time to time and at the earliest practicable date report to the Senate the general nature of any inquiry or investigation the committee proposes to undertake, or, in any case in which he deems the national security might be endangered by such report, he shall advise the President of the Senate in writing of that fact.

"(i) The subject of any investigation in connection with which witnesses are summoned shall be clearly stated before the commencement of any hearings, and the evidence sought to be elicited shall be relevant to the subject as so stated.

"(j) Each committee conducting investigations shall make available to interested persons copies of the rules applicable therein.

"(k) The authority to issue subpenas or otherwise to require the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary material may be delegated by majority vote of any committee to the chairman or to any member.

"(l) No testimony shall be taken in executive or public session unless at least two members of the committee are present, unless the full committee by majority vote may authorize the taking of testimony by a single member. A witness may waive any objection to testifying before one member.

"(m) The subject matter of the investigation in which he is called to testify shall be stated to each witness prior to his appearance.

"(n) All testimony shall be given under oath or affirmation.

"(o) The interrogation of witnesses at committee hearings shall be conducted on behalf of the committee only by members and authorized staff personnel.

"(p) Witnesses at committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel of their own choosing, who shall have the right to advise witnesses of their legal rights and to make objections concerning the relevancy of questions and to matters of procedure, as well as to submit legal memorandums in support of their objections. A witness may be deemed to have waived this right if, after receiving timely notice of his appearance, he fails to provide himself with counsel.

"Rulings on motions or objections shall be made by the member presiding, subject to appeal to the members present on motion of a member.

"(q) It is the policy of the Senate that only evidence which is of probative value shall be received and considered by a committee. The privileged character of communications between clergyman and parishioner, doctor and patient, lawyer and client, and husband and wife shall be properly observed.

"(r) No testimony taken or material presented in an executive session shall be released or used in public session, either in whole or in part or by way of summary unless authorized by a majority of the committee.

"(s) Witnesses shall be permitted brief explanations of affirmative or negative responses, and may submit a concise, pertinent, oral or written statement.

"(t) Witnesses shall be required insofar as practicable to submit written statements of their proposed testimony in advance of the hearing at which they testify.

"(u) A stenographic verbatim transcript shall be made of all committee hearings. Copies of such transcript, insofar as practicable, shall be available for inspection or purchase at regularly prescribed rates from the official reporter by any witness or person mentioned at a public hearing. Any witness or his counsel shall have the right to inspect only the complete transcript of his own testimony in executive session.

"(v) A witness may request, on grounds of distraction, harassment, physical discomfort or physical handicap, that during his testimony television, motion picture, or other cameras and lights shall not be directed at him; such request shall be granted or refused by a majority of the committee.

"(w) Any person who is identified by name in a public session before the committee or in executive testimony subsequently made public and who has reasonable grounds to believe that testimony or other evidence given in such session, or comment made by any member of the committee or its counsel, tends to affect his reputation adversely, shall be afforded the following privileges:

"1. To file with the committee a sworn statement, of reasonable length, concerning such testimony, evidence, or comment, which shall be made a part of the record of such hearing.

"2. To appear personally before the committee and testify in his own behalf, unless the committee by a majority vote shall determine otherwise.

"3. Unless the committee by a majority vote shall determine otherwise, to have the committee secure the appearance of witnesses whose testimony adversely affected him, and to submit to the committee written questions to be propounded by the committee or its counsel to such witnesses. Such questions must be proper in form and material and relevant to the matters alleged to have adversely affected the person claiming

this privilege. The committee reserves the right to determine the length of such questioning; and no photographs, moving pictures, television, or radio broadcasting of the proceedings shall be permitted while such person or such witness is testifying without the consent of such person or witness unless the committee by majority vote specifically determines otherwise.

"4. To have the committee call a reasonable number of witnesses in his behalf, if the committee by a majority vote determines that justice requires such action.

"(x) The chairman or a member designated by him shall consult with appropriate Federal law enforcement agencies with respect to any phase of any investigation which may result in evidence exposing the commission of Federal crimes, and the results of such consultation shall be reported to the committee before witnesses are called to testify thereon.

"(y) The application of this rule shall be supervised in the Senate by the Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which shall, in addition to the authority set out in subsection 1(o) of these rules, have the authority to (1) receive and investigate complaints of alleged violations of the rule filed by persons claiming to be aggrieved or by members; (2) to advise committee chairmen of their conclusions and their suggestions; and (3) to present their findings to the Senate with such recommendations for remedial or disciplinary action, if any, as they deem appropriate.

"(z) Committees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate."

PRINTING OF REMARKS OF SENATOR DODD AT PARIS CONFERENCE

Mr. HRUSKA submitted a resolution (S. Res. 99) to print remarks of Senator DODD at Paris Conference on December 1, 1960, as a Senate document, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HRUSKA, which appears under a separate heading.)

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, President Kennedy's message to the Congress on "American Education" is an inspiring document, stating the problem before us in clear terms and calling on the Congress and the Nation to take those steps necessary to the full development of our most valuable natural resource—the minds and the talents of our youth.

Education is a national concern. The effects of substandard education are felt beyond the boundaries of any State or locality. I have long advocated a program of Federal aid to education, with control of education remaining with the State and the locality.

Our colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], for himself and other Senators, has introduced, at the President's request, S. 1021, the School Assistance Act of 1961, to authorize a 3-year program of Federal financial assistance for public elementary and secondary schools, to amend Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, 81st Congress, and for other purposes.

Because of its effect on certain school districts in California, as it relates to areas of Federal impact, I feel that I cannot lend my name to this significant legislation, although I heartily endorse its larger purposes. The bill would make permanent federally impacted aid programs due to expire on June 30, 1961, but would effect substantial reductions in Federal payments to the school districts concerned.

These recommendations are set forth in Secretary Ribicoff's letter to the President of February 27, the summary of proposed amendments to Federal impact area laws attached thereto, and in the bill itself, and I will not repeat them here.

The proposed cutback in payments to federally impacted school districts would be a severe blow to many areas in my State. The table which I shall ask to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks, one of several furnished to me by the California Department of Education, shows the effect of continuance of present law on California school districts which received in excess of $100,000 from Public Law 874 in 1959–60. The figures have not been adjusted to show the effect of proposals contained in S. 1021, nor do they tell the whole story of the importance of both Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 to the financing of education in California, but they do serve as a graphic example of the program's role in my State's school systems.

I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, in order to make permanent the authorization for certain payments under the provisions of such laws. I hope that it will receive thoughtful consideration in committee, along with the recommendations embodied in titles II and III of S. 1021. I intend at the proper time to offer such amendments as are necessary to S. 1021 to meet what I believe to be a continuing Federal responsibility to school districts whose enrollments are increased on account of Federal activity in their areas.

I offer the bill for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks a table showing the effect of the continuance of the present law on California school districts with reference to Public Law 874.

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

The bill (S. 1078) to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, in order to make permanent the authorization for certain payments under the provisions of such laws, introduced by Mr. ENGLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The table presented by Mr. ENGLE is as follows:

Effect of continuance of present law on California school districts which received in excess of $100,000 from Public Law 874 in 1959–60

County and district	Total entitlement, 1959–60	Entitlement excluding B children	Percent reduction
Alameda:			
Alameda City Unified	$472,882.28	$132,818.71	71.92
Berkeley City Unified	197,169.70	31,417.15	84.07
Hayward Union High School	190,111.00		100.00
Livermore	174,246.87	932.30	99.46
Oakland City Unified	746,861.49	33,150.51	95.56
San Lorenzo	169,492.14		100.00
Contra Costa:			
Mount Diablo Unified	301,496.31	34,450.53	88.57
Richmond City	128,098.02	2,796.90	97.82
Kern:			
China Lake Joint	415,246.42	414,500.58	.18
Kern County Joint Union High	229,755.00	202,544.80	11.84
Muroc Unified	325,221.67	298,137.92	8.33
Los Angeles:			
Antelope Valley Joint Union High	280,931.80		100.00
Bellflower Unified	115,051.77		100.00
Compton City	103,858.22		100.00
Lancaster	291,064.06		100.00
Long Beach Unified	1,318,653.62	349,488.71	73.50
Palmdale	172,475.50		100.00
Pomona Unified	179,944.44		100.00
Torrance Unified	233,678.60		100.00
Marin:			
Novato Unified	100,209.88		100.00
San Jose	160,728.52	134,437.66	16.36
Merced:			
Atwater Union	208,741.97	99,569.64	52.30
Merced Union High	106,678.40	26,669.60	75.00
Monterey:			
Monterey City	742,297.26	445,080.02	40.04
Monterey Union High	241,107.60	119,292.40	50.52
Pacific Grove Unified	104,976.62	866.68	99.17
Napa: Napa Union High	$140,375.80		100.00
Orange:			
Garden Grove	160,914.98		100.00
Santa Ana City	169,771.83		100.00
Riverside:			
Midland	208,462.28	$21,385.46	41.77
Riverside City	264,213.82	2,796.90	98 94
Riverside City High	239,666.00	43,248.00	81.95
Sacramento:			
Arcade	135,556.42	3,729.20	97.25
Arden-Carmichael Union	193,172.56		100.00
Folsom Joint Unified	353,497.11	188,719.57	46.61
Grant Union High	263,452.40	10,812.00	95.90
North Sacramento	147,489.86		100.00
Rio Linda Union	348,959.89	21,442.90	93.86
Sacramento City Unified	491,515.90		100.00
San Juan Union High	335,172.00		100.00
San Bernardino:			
Adelanto	114,952.59	103,112.38	10.30
Barstow Union	174,806.25	55,192.16	68.43
Morongo Unified	157,627.43	93,384.77	40.76
San Bernardino City	382,149.77	559.38	99.85
San Bernardino City High	239,666.00	720.80	99.70
San Diego:			
Cajon Valley Union	121,665.15		100.00
Chula Vista City	306,819.93		100.00
Coronado Unified	261,304.02	10,833.50	95.85
Fallbrook Union	162,966.04	111,130.16	31.81
Grossmont Union High	195,877.40		100.00
La Mesa-Spring Valley	152,617.51		100.00
National	194,104.86	7,271.94	96.25
Oceanside-Carlsbad Union High	116,048.80	31,354.80	72.98
Oceanside Union	349,239.58	184,968.32	47.04

Effect of continuance of present law on California school districts which received in excess of $100,000 from Public Law 874 in 1959–60—Con.

County and district	Total entitlement, 1959–60	Entitlement excluding B children	Percent reduction
San Diego—Continued			
San Diego Unified	$3,104,122.76	$824,212.68	73.45
South Bay Union	225,150.45	5,220.88	97.68
Sweetwater Union High	291,743.80	10,091.20	96.54
Vista Unified	161,419.50		100.00
San Francisco: San Francisco Unified	979,023.40	282,754.35	71.12
San Joaquin: Stockton City Unified	205,511.50	16,250.25	92.09
Santa Barbara:			
Lompoc Union	424,662.65	328,915.44	22.55
Lompoc Union High	164,342.40	118,211.20	28.07
Santa Clara:			
Cupertino Union	112,062.46		100.00
Sunnyvale	141,523.14		100.00
Solano:			
Armijo Joint Union High	$126,860.80	$56,582.80	55.40
Center	100,408.71	99,196.72	1.21
Crystal Union	227,574.43	198,020.52	12.99
Fairfield	157,279.01		100.00
Vaca Valley Union	131,081.39		100.00
Vacaville Union High	100,551.60	51,176.80	49.10
Vallejo City Unified	767,878.48	142,352.19	81.46
Ventura:			
Hueneme	215,174.84	64,515.16	70.01
Oxnard	129,869.39		100.00
Oxnard Union High	161,819.60	31,715.20	80.40

Source: California State Department of Education, Division of Public School Administration, Sacramento, Calif.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO WIRETAPPING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday's Supreme Court decision in the Pugasch case does nothing to clarify the wiretapping muddle. I do not say this in criticism of the Supreme Court. It is Congress, not the Court, which has been derelict in its duty. Despite years of prodding by the Department of Justice, despite the pleas of law enforcement agencies throughout the country, and despite the protests of many deeply concerned citizens, the Congress has refused to clarify its hopelessly uncertain intentions in this area.

The specific problem in the Pugasch case was whether Congress intended to prohibit the use of wiretap evidence in State court trials. A more basic problem is whether Congress intended to permit any wiretapping in the first place, regardless of its use in evidence. On both these questions there is hopeless confusion. This confusion will persist until Congress acts.

This is no academic problem. I have been advised by Edward Silver, the district attorney of Kings County in my State and former president of the National District Attorneys Association, that hundreds of criminal prosecutions are in jeopardy, and that the Supreme Court's decision does not alter the situation one iota. Nothing in the Supreme Court's decision authorizes State district attorneys to engage in any kind of wiretapping without violating the Federal law. It is for this reason that the threat to law enforcement continues unabated.

Mr. President, last year the Senate Committee on the Judiciary reported a bill I introduced to permit wiretapping under the safeguard of court review. Unfortunately, this bill (S. 3340) was allowed to die on the Senate Calendar without being motioned up for floor consideration.

I am today reintroducing this bill. I know that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the distinguished chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, plans early hearings on this subject. At that time, of course, all points of view should be considered.

I have in mind particularly a report of the committee on Federal legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York which contains several recommendations for legislation on this subject which certainly should be explored.

After such hearings let us take action which will permit effective law enforcement without unreasonably impairing personal rights. Personally, I believe that a balance is struck by requiring court supervision of all wiretapping activities and that is the purport of my proposed bill. If an even better balance of interests can be reached that is all to the good and it would have my full approval.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State law, and for other purposes.

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

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

The bill (S. 1086) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State law, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 223 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"§ 3501. Evidence of intercepted communications.

"No law of the United States shall be construed to prohibit the interception, by any law enforcement officer or agency of any State (or any political subdivision thereof) in compliance with the provisions of any statute of such State, of any wire or radio communication, and the divulgence, in any proceeding in any court of such State, of the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of any communication so intercepted, if such interception was made after determination by a court of such State that reasonable grounds existed for belief that such interception might disclose evidence of the commission of a crime."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 223 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting immediately below "3500. Demands for production of statements and reports of witnesses." the following:

"§ 3501. Evidence of intercepted communications."

TRANSFER OF FEDERAL PROPERTY TO GOVERNMENT OF AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to the government of eastern Samoa. The purpose of the bill is to transfer to the Samoan Government land, buildings, and equipment held by the U.S. Navy in Samoa prior to 1951, when the Navy's responsibility for the administration of Samoa ended. Since that time this property has actually been used by the government of eastern Samoa.

The property involved consists of slightly less than 216 acres of land, plus the buildings and docks on the land. This legislation is required to transfer title, since existing law does not permit such transfer without reimbursement. No expenditure of Federal funds is involved.

Since the property has not been used or needed by the United States for 10 years, and since it is essential to the conduct of the government of eastern Samoa, I urge passage of the bill.

A similar measure, S. 3558, was passed by the Senate during the 2d session of the 86th Congress, but died in the House of Representatives. The transfer to be effected by this bill was recommended by the Department of the Interior and not objected to by the Bureau of the Budget.

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

The bill (S. 1087) to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to the Government of American Samoa, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO PERMIT INCREASED EARNINGS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to increase to $1,800 the annual amount of earned income a person may

receive without having his social security benefits reduced.

The Social Security Act provides that persons who are 72 years of age or older may earn any amount without having their social security benefits reduced. Prior to the amendments approved and signed into law last year, persons under 72 had their benefits reduced if their earnings exceeded $1,200 a year. Last year Congress liberalized this provision somewhat by providing that retirees under 72 would have 50 cents of benefits withheld for every $1 of earnings between $1,200 and $1,500 per annum, and $1 withheld for every $1 of earnings in excess of $1,500.

I supported this amendment in the earnings limitation even though I had hoped for a more liberal measure.

It should be remembered, Mr. President, that while many wage earners upon reaching the age of 65 desire to retire, there are others who prefer to continue in gainful employment on either a full- or part-time basis. The present earning limitation, in my judgment, discourages many of our older citizens from continuing to utilize the skills developed over a period of many years. I do not think that this is desirable. Many of our older citizens have valuable talents which our Nation needs and we should be encouraging, rather than discouraging, these people in contributing to the economic well-being of our country.

Second, it should be noted that while the Social Security Act contains an earnings limitation there is no limit whatsoever as to investment income. If a person over 65 years of age earns more than $1,200 a year his social security benefits are reduced, but a person can have investment income—in the form of dividend and interest—of a million dollars a year and still receive full social security benefits.

I have never understood why earned income and investment income should be treated differently. It is my opinion that the earnings limit in the present act should be removed entirely, but I am enough of a realist to know that progress is made only on a step-by-step basis. That is why my bill merely raises, rather than removes, the earnings limitation. I would hope, however, that it will not be too long before the limitation is removed altogether.

I hope, Mr. President, that the amendment which I am offering today will be carefully considered and that it will be approved by this present Congress.

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

The bill (S. 1090) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DISABILITY BENEFITS FOR THE BLIND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I introduce today for appropriate reference a bill to amend the disability benefits provisions of the Social Security Act so as to provide a minimum measure of financial security to America's blind citizens.

Last year I had the unique experience of attending the annual convention of an organization of blind people in my own State of Minnesota.

Not once did I hear a complaint about blindness. But I did hear one complaint and it was repeated often—the lack of employment opportunities for those without their sight, the refusal of employers to give to qualified, trained, skilled blind people the chance to demonstrate their still unimpaired capabilities and talents, to function successfully in a variety of professions, businesses, and occupations.

Blind people need and want help, but the kind of help they need and want is the kind that will enable them to earn a living, to support themselves and their families, to live economically independent lives.

The bill which I introduce today has three provisions:

First. It would incorporate in the disability insurance cash benefits provisions of the Social Security Act the definition of blindness which is generally recognized and used throughout the Nation. This definition, already included in other Federal laws, would provide an opthalmological standard for determining blindness; that is, blindness is central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the field of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20°.

A person whose visual impairment is such as to constitute blindness in accordance with the terms of this definition and who is otherwise eligible would be entitled to receive cash benefits under the disability insurance program so long as the disability of blindness lasts.

This provision would make the Federal program a true insurance program for the blind. It would establish a sound basis for blind people to receive benefits and the right to continue to receive cash benefits under the disability insurance program.

Further, this provision recognizes the problem of loss of income to a workman and his family when blindness strikes at earning power.

It is possible for a person to reshape his life from the chaos of sudden or gradual but final loss of sight. He can learn the techniques of blindness, the ways of operating, blind, in a sighted world, but this takes time and courage and determined effort.

The man who is newly blind needs disability insurance payments when his blindness occurs and while it continues. Even though he is one of the fortunate few who does secure work in spite of his blindness, the work will probably be different from that which he did before his blindness, not because he cannot perform skilled and specialized jobs—blind people are performing such jobs now—but because employers will not hire him for such work.

If he is lucky, he may get a job, but doing unskilled, elementary operations, work which by its nature is uncertain in duration and low paid.

And if he is laid off, he may wait months or years before he is again rehired—and he may never be rehired at all.

Therefore, blind people who are employed, as well as those who are not, need the minimum financial security this portion of my bill would give them.

Second. Another provision of my bill would abolish the present requirement in the disability provisions of the Social Security Act that a person must accept vocational rehabilitational services to qualify for or to retain qualification for cash benefit payments under the act.

This section of the Federal law which conditions receipt of benefits upon a factor other than the existence of a medically determinable disability is a negation of the whole concept of the program as a disability insurance program.

This provision of the present law, which makes acceptance of vocational rehabilitation services a condition of compulsion, is a repudiation of the purpose and spirit of such services.

Vocational rehabilitation services are designed to help a person start life again with stimulation and encouragement. We should not use threats of punishment to force compulsory action by a person who has recently suffered the shattering experience of blindness.

Third. My bill would reduce the length of time blind persons must work in covered employment, to establish eligibility for disability benefits, from the present requirement of 20 to 6 quarters.

Employment for a period of six quarters in covered employment recognizes that for entitlement to receive disability benefits, a person must be a contributor to the program for a substantial length of time. It also recognizes that blindness and the devastation of its effects upon the lives of the beneficiary and his family more than justify eligibility to receive payments in a lesser length of time than that presently required.

Loss of the physical ability to see is but one of the consequences resulting from blindness. New skills and techniques may be learned as substitutes for this loss.

But the newly blinded person must also battle against other consequences of blindness. These other consequences are unreasoned and unreasonable, illogical and irrational—the social and economic prejudices and discriminations about blindness and blind people.

The man who becomes blind needs at least a minimum of financial security at the time he becomes blind and for the years he remains without his sight.

Mr. President, blind Americans can and should be productive Americans. They can and should be full participants in all aspects of our national life, but they need help if they are to achieve these goals. My bill would help them to help themselves, to become more fully self-supporting and independent, to earn

the dignity and self-respect to which every American is entitled.

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

The bill (S. 1101) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PAYMENT OF COSTS OF RELOCATION OF FEDERALLY AIDED HIGHWAY PROJECTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to help thousands of building tenants who are forced to relocate because of Federal highway construction.

The bill would amend Federal highway law, so as to require the Government to pay the costs of relocating building tenants forced to move by federally aided highway projects. The Government now is required to pay only the owners of buildings so affected.

In effect, the bill was asked for today by the President's message on highways; it embodies one of the recommendations made today by President Kennedy in his special message to Congress on highways.

I am thoroughly elated that the administration has decided to support this legislation to correct an inequity to thousands of families and businesses who are displaced by Federal highway projects. Relocation has been a problem on all public improvement projects. The Government has provided for assistance for families displaced by urban renewal projects, but has failed to give the same help to those affected by highway projects.

New York World's Fair highway construction is expected to force the relocation of approximately 3,000 persons in the next 3 years; and other Federal highway works are expected to displace thousands of other persons in New York State alone. While these projects are necessary, it is unfair to expect these people to carry the burden of relocation.

So I am delighted to see the administration indicate its support of this legislation and this program.

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

The bill (S. 1110) to amend the definition of the term "construction" in section 101 of title 23, United States Code, in order to authorize the inclusion of tenant relocation costs in such term, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO DETERMINATION OF ANNUAL INCOME OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS FOR PENSION

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill amending section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that in determining the annual income of a veteran, his beneficiaries, or his dependents for nonservice-connected disability pension purposes, the payment of a State bonus or gratuity for military service shall be excluded.

The bill would simply restore to the law a provision eliminated by Public Law 86–211, enacted in August 1959, and which previously had been in effect since March 20, 1933. The legislation would, of course, be applicable to all States, but it is being introduced primarily with the veterans of Kentucky in mind.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky is at present preparing to pay a bonus to its veterans or to their survivors under provision of legislation enacted by the Kentucky General Assembly in 1960.

Current interpretation of the law clearly indicates that inequities will result not only between Kentucky veteran pensioners and those in other States where bonuses have been paid, but also among Kentucky veterans themselves.

Public Law 86–211 allowed a veteran on the pension roll prior to the law's effective date of July 1, 1960, to choose whether he wanted his pension based on the old pension rates or the new rates. Thus, he had the option of the choice of rates yielding the greater amount of pension. Pension recipients qualifying after July 1, 1960, do not have this option.

I am advised that a veteran or a survivor who qualifies on or prior to June 30, 1960, and elects to receive a pension at the old rate will not have his bonus payment counted for income purposes. However, I am further informed that if the same veteran or survivor chooses the new rate available under Public Law 86–211, his bonus payment would be counted as income. Those qualifying after July 1, 1960, would have the bonus included in the earnings test.

The inequity of the situation is, in my opinion, very obvious. The amendment I have introduced would give Kentucky veterans or their widows and children the same break under the law that residents of other States received where bonuses were paid prior to enactment of Public Law 86–211. It would also assure equal application among all Kentucky bonus recipients on the pension rolls.

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

The bill (S. 1111) to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that, for purposes of determining the annual income of an individual eligible for pension, payments of State bonus for military service shall be excluded, introduced by Mr. MORTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL WOOL ACT OF 1954

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the National Wool Act was passed by Congress in 1954 in lieu of an increased tariff on raw wool recommended by the Tariff Commission. Because of international relations, the administration proposed the passage of the act rather than impose a higher tariff. Congress responded by passing the Wool Act for a 4-year period and again in 1958 renewed it for a 3-year period. Since this was an experimental program, it was considered desirable to take a new look at it at the end of those periods.

Six years of operation of the act have demonstrated that it is a workable program, giving needed support to the wool producing end of the sheep business.

Shorn wool production has increased from 234 million pounds annually at the inception of the act to 265 million pounds last year.

In view of the favorable experience under the program, there is considerable thinking that the next legislation ought not carry a terminal date. The senior Senator from Utah introduced a bill on February 6, 1961, which would make the program permanent in character. However, short of adopting that position, the Congress should recognize the merit in extending the program for a longer term than 3 years.

The sheep industry is a longtime operation, requiring considerable advance planning both for breeding and financial operations.

At the present time, for instance, with the act expiring next year it is difficult for growers to determine the size of their flocks for 1962 and to know how many ewe lambs to buy this spring or how many yearling ewes to buy later in the year. Actually, ewe lambs bought this year will not be producing lambs until 2 years from now. Also, it is difficult to obtain financing for these long term operations since a grower cannot give a bank assurance that the act will be extended and that he will be in a financial position to repay such a loan.

Under present circumstances, with lamb prices at only 65 percent of parity and with lamb imports and other problems affecting the industry financially, a 3-year extension does not offer sufficient inducement for growers to go into the sheep business and does not offer sufficient inducement for some to stay in the business or to expand their operations.

A 6-year extension will more nearly provide for the needed stability and certainty. It will more nearly enable the planning and financing for the operations involved. It is a period warranted by the satisfactory experience of the Wool Act in these past years.

At the same time the period prescribed satisfies the congressional policy of periodical return to the two Houses for review and for affirmative action on their part before additional extension or amendment.

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

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

The bill (S. 1112) to extend the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, until March 31, 1968, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 703 of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1782), is amended by striking out "March 31, 1962" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1968."

SPECIAL SERIES OF POSTAGE STAMPS IN CELEBRATION OF 100TH YEAR OF COMPLETION OF 1ST TRANSCONTINENTAL TELEGRAPH LINE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill on behalf of my colleague [Mr. CURTIS] and myself and ask that it be appropriately referred.

It has for its subject a centenary celebration which will mark the completion of the first transcontinental telegraph line, and which is being planned for October 1961.

This telegraph line which had its eastern terminus in my home city of Omaha, was surveyed and constructed by Edward Creighton, the founder of Creighton University which is located in that city.

In honor of the centenary of that important event and to honor the man who linked the East and the West by wires, it is highly appropriate to issue a special series of commemorative postage stamps depicting this event of national achievement. Because of his intense interest in higher education as reflected in the existence of the highly regarded Creighton University, the bill contains a recommendation that the stamps be issued in Omaha and make reference to the university on the first day cancellation thereof.

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

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

The bill (S. 1113) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in celebration of the 100th anniversary of the completion of the first transcontinental telegraph line and to honor the memory of Edward Creighton, a pioneer in American communication, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. CURTIS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance on October 24, 1961, a special series of postage stamps, of such appropriate design and denomination as he shall prescribe, in celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the completion of the first transcontinental telegraph line in October of 1861, and to honor the memory of Edward Creighton, a pioneer in American communication, whose work was a major factor in completing the first transcontinental telegraph line.

(b) The Postmaster General shall, with respect to the issuance of the special series of postage stamps authorized by this Act, consider the desirability of first offering such stamps for sale in Omaha, Nebraska, the eastern terminus of the first transcontinental telegraph line and the location of Creighton University, which was founded by Edward Creighton, and of making reference to such university on the first-day cancellations of such special series of postage stamps.

ADDITIONAL POWERS TO ENABLE THE PRESIDENT TO DEAL WITH NATIONAL EMERGENCY LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give the President additional powers to deal with national emergency labor disputes, such as the one which recently occurred in New York, and tied up the harbor and the railroads, the recent airplane strike, and the 1959 steel strike.

The bill provides that when strikes affect the national health and safety, the President—when other machinery for settlement is inadequate—may declare a national emergency and may direct his Attorney General to go into court, to seek appointment of a special receiver to take possession of the affected facilities and continue their operation until the strike is settled.

The bill, which amends both the National Labor Relations Act—the so-called Taft-Hartley Act, and the Railway Labor Act, also gives the President additional factfinding authority. He may appoint a public factfinding board to make recommendations for a settlement; and, following issuance of the recommendations, a 30-day "cooling off" period would be enforced, during which time no legal strike could be called.

If this procedure fails, the President then may seek the court-appointed receiver. The bill provides that the receiver would operate the facility to the extent required by the national health and safety, and could utilize the services of regular management and production personnel. During this period, the receiver would maintain existing wages, hours, and other conditions of employment; but the court could direct that adjustments be made within the framework of recommendations made by the factfinding board. Possession of the facility would not be restored to the employer until labor-management relations were again normalized.

During the period of receivership, the employer would have the option of receiving the net proceeds from the operation or accepting from the Government "fair and reasonable" compensation for the temporary use of the facilities.

The bill would not alter the existing factfinding and injunction procedures of the Taft-Hartley Act. It would permit the President to utilize either those procedures or the new factfinding authority, or a combination of both.

Recent labor disputes once again have demonstrated that the existing means of dealing with national emergency labor disputes are inadequate. We must devise new methods to deal with disputes that affect employment, production, and the health and safety of our people so severely as to precipitate a crisis.

During the political campaign of 1960, both candidates for President agreed that the Federal Government needed a wider range of powers to deal with emergency strikes. Our proposal provides these additional powers, and provides them by maintaining and strengthening the traditional American means of settling disputes through collective bargaining.

We reject the policy of compulsory arbitration, which has been suggested, because it tends to force labor and management farther apart and to induce them to await Government action. Under our proposal, the terms of final settlement will be completely within the bargaining power of both parties, and neither can gain from refusing to bargain in good faith.

Last year 20 million man-days of work were lost as the result of labor-management disputes. The loss to our economy is staggering. Thus, as an antirecession move and as a means of more effectively increasing productivity to meet the cold war challenge, this bill is essential. Our system of private enterprise is being put to its supreme test by the challenge of the Soviet Union. It is, therefore, the responsibility of both U.S. management and labor that, in their own self-interest, the process of collective bargaining be strengthened in accordance with the national interest.

Mr. President, both in the interest of winning the cold war and in the interest of the majesty and security of our own Government and our own people, there must be some final authority of the United States to operate, no matter what may be the result of a labor-management dispute; and this bill will at long last confer it.

I hope very much the bill will receive early consideration by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the bill and a list and analysis of the previous seizure statutes, prepared by Justice Felix Frankfurter, in connection with the steel seizure decision of 1951.

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

The bill (S. 1114) amending the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act with respect to emergency labor disputes, introduced by Mr.

JAVITS (for himself and Mr. AIKEN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Emergency Labor Disputes Act of 1961".

SEC. 2. The National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) By adding immediately following section 205 the following new section:

"PUBLIC FACTFINDING BOARDS

"SEC. 205A. Whenever in the opinion of the President, a threatened or actual strike or lockout affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce will, if permitted to occur or continue, imperil the national health, safety, or welfare, and the settlement of such dispute through collective bargaining will be assisted by such action, the President may appoint a public factfinding Board to inquire into the facts with respect to such dispute and, if the President so direct at the time of appointment of the Board or thereafter, to make such recommendations to the parties as to the settlement of the dispute between them as it may deem appropriate. The provisions of section 207 of this Act shall be applicable to the appointment, powers, and compensation of such Board. Within thirty days from the creation of such a Board it shall make a written report to the President, which shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the dispute, including each party's statement of its position, and if the President has so directed, recommendations to the parties for the settlement of the dispute between them. The President shall file a copy of such report with the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Service, and shall make its contents available to the public. Neither party shall be under a duty to accept in whole or in part any recommendation of settlement made by the Board. After the creation of such Board and for thirty days after such Board has made its report to the President, no change except by agreement shall be made by the parties to the controversy in the conditions out of which the dispute arose."

(b) By adding immediately following section 210 the following new section:

"SEC. 210A. Whenever the President finds with respect to a threatened or actual strike or lockout affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, after (a) he has invoked the provisions of section 205A or sections 206 through 210 without settlement of the dispute thereunder, or (b) he has determined that the procedures under the provisions of section 205A or sections 206 through 210 are not applicable to such dispute, that the exercise of the powers and authority provided by this section are necessary to preserve and protect the national health or safety, he is authorized to declare a national emergency relative thereto by Executive order and to direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the employer, for the appointment of a special receiver to take immediate possession in the name of the United States of any plant, mine, or other facility which is the subject of such labor dispute and to use and operate such plant, mine, or other facility in the interests of the United States, and if the court finds that the exercise of the power and authority provided by this section is necessary to preserve and protect the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to appoint such a special receiver, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate: *Provided, however,* That (1) such plant, mine, or other facility shall be operated by the special receiver only to the extent which in the opinion of the court is necessary to protect the national health and safety of the United States or of any material portion of the population or territory thereof; (2) the possession and operation of such plant, mine, or other facility shall not render inapplicable any State or Federal law concerning health, safety, security, or employment standards, and the special receiver while operating such facility shall comply with such laws as if it were privately operated; (3) the wages, hours, conditions, and other terms of employment effective at the time of taking possession by the special receiver shall be maintained without change, provided that the court may, if a public factfinding board appointed under section 205A shall have recommended changes in rates of pay, wages, hours, or other conditions of employment, direct the special receiver to make such recommendations effective in whole or in part in any plant, mine, or other facility which is being operated by the special receiver during such period of operation: *And provided further,* That if no such Board shall have been appointed, the President may in his discretion appoint a special Board which shall be subject to the provisions of section 207 of this Act and shall make such recommendations concerning changes in rates of pay, wages, hours, and other conditions of employment for the period of operation by the special receiver as it may deem appropriate and which the court may direct the special receiver to make effective in whole or in part in any plant, mine, or other facility which is being operated by the special receiver during such period of operation; (4) such plant, mine, or other facility shall be returned to the employer as soon as practicable, but in no event later than thirty days after the restoration of such labor relations in such plant, mine, or other facility that the possession or operation thereof by the special receiver is no longer necessary to insure the operation thereof required for the protection and preservation of the national health and safety; (5) such plant, mine, or other facility shall be operated by the special receiver for the account of the employer: *Provided further,* That the employer shall have the right to elect, by written notice filed with the court within ten days of such taking of possession, to waive all claims to the proceeds of such operation and to receive in lieu thereof just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the period of such possession and operation by the special receiver, to be paid by the United States as follows: (A) The President shall ascertain the amount of just, fair, and reasonable compensation to be paid as rental for the appropriation and temporary use of such plant, mine, or other facility while in the possession of or operated by the special receiver in the interest of the United States, such determination to be made as of the time of the taking hereunder, and taking into account the existence of the labor dispute which interrupted or threatened to interrupt the operation of such plant, mine, or other facility and the effect of such interruption or threatened interruption upon the value to the employer of the use of such plant, mine, or other facility; (B) if the amount so ascertained is not acceptable to the employer as just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the appropriation and temporary use of the property taken hereunder and as full and complete compensation therefor, the employer shall be paid 75 per centum of such amount and shall be entitled to sue the United States in the Court of Claims or in any district court of the United States in the manner provided for by sections 1357 and 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code to recover such further sums as when added to the amount so paid shall constitute just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the appropriation and temporary use of the property so taken. In the event such notice of election is filed with the court, the special receiver shall pay over to the United States the proceeds of the operations of such plant, mine, or other facility while in his possession."

SEC. 3. The Railway Labor Act, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) By adding immediately following section 10 the following new section:

"SEC. 10A. Whenever the President finds with respect to a dispute between a carrier and its employees after (a) he has invoked the provisions of section 7 of this Act without settlement of the dispute thereunder, or (b) he has determined that the procedures under the provisions of section 7 are not applicable to such dispute, that such dispute threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any substantial section of the country of essential transportation service, and that the exercise of the powers and authority provided by this section are necessary to preserve and protect the national health or safety or the health or safety of any substantial section of the country, he is authorized to declare a national emergency relative thereto by Executive order and to direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the carrier for the appointment of a special receiver to take immediate possession in the name of the United States of the equipment and facilities of any carrier which is the subject of such dispute and to use and operate such equipment and facilities in the interest of the United States, and if the court finds that the exercise of the power and authority provided by this section is necessary to preserve and protect the national health or safety or the health or safety of any substantial section of the country it shall have jurisdiction to appoint such a special receiver and to make such other orders as may be appropriate: *Provided, however,* That (1) such equipment and facilities shall be operated by the special receiver only to the extent which in the opinion of the court is necessary to protect the national health and safety of the United States, or of any substantial section of the territory or material portion of the population thereof; (2) the possession and operation of such equipment and facilities shall not render inapplicable any State or Federal law concerning health, safety, security, or employment standards, and the special receiver while operating such equipment and facilities shall comply with such laws as if they were privately operated; (3) the wages, hours, conditions, and other terms of employment effective at the time of taking possession by the special receiver shall be maintained without change, provided that the court may, if a board appointed under section 10 shall have recommended changes in rates of pay, wages, hours, or other conditions of employment, direct the special receiver to make such recommendations effective in whole or in part with respect to the operation of equipment and facilities which are being operated by the special receiver during such period of operation: *And provided further,* That if no such board shall have been appointed, the President may in his discretion appoint a special board which shall be subject to the provisions of paragraphs one and two of section 10 of this Act and shall make such recommendations concerning changes in rates of pay, wages, hours, and other conditions of employment

for the period of operation by the special receiver as it may deem appropriate and which the court may direct the special receiver to make effective in whole or in part in any with respect to the operation of any equipment or facilities which are being operated by the special receiver during such period of operation; (4) such equipment and facilities shall be returned to the carrier as soon as practicable, but in no event later than thirty days after the restoration of such labor relations between such carrier and its employees that the possession or operation thereof by the special receiver is no longer necessary to insure the operation thereof required for the protection and preservation of the national health and safety or the health and safety of any substantial section of the country; (5) such equipment and facilities shall be operated by the special receiver for the account of the carrier: *Provided further*, That the carrier shall have the right to elect, by written notice filed with the court within ten days of such taking of possession, to waive all claims to the proceeds of such operation and to receive in lieu thereof just, fair and reasonable compensation for the period of such possession and operation by the special receiver, to be paid by the United States as follows: (A) The President shall ascertain the amount of just, fair, and reasonable compensation to be paid as rental for the appropriation and temporary use of such equipment and facilities while in the possession of or operated by the special receiver in the interest of the United States, such determination to be made as of the time of the taking hereunder, and taking into account the existence of the labor dispute which interrupted or threatened to interrupt the operation of such equipment and facilities and the effect of such interruption or threatened interruption upon the value to the carrier of the use of such facilities; (B) if the amount so ascertained is not acceptable to the carrier as just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the appropriation and temporary use of the property taken hereunder and as full and complete compensation therefor, the carrier shall be paid 75 per centum of such amount and shall be entitled to sue the United States in the Court of Claims or in any district court of the United States in the manner provided for by sections 1357 and 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code to recover such further sums as when added to the amount so paid shall constitute just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the appropriation and temporary use of the property so taken. In the event such notice of election is filed with the court, the special receiver shall pay over to the United States the proceeds of the operations of such equipment and facilities while in his possession."

The list and analysis presented by Mr. JAVITS are as follows:

YOUNGSTOWN CO. *v.* SAWYER

Frankfurter, J., concurring

APPENDIX I.—*Synoptic analysis of legislation authorizing seizure of industrial property*

Statute	Duration		Scope of authority	Limitations on its exercise	Terms and conditions of employment during seizure	Compensation
	As enacted	As extended or repealed				
1. Railroad and Telegraph Act of 1862, 12 Stat. 334. Enacted Jan. 31, 1862; amended, 12 Stat. 625, July 14, 1862.	Not "in force any longer than is necessary for the suppression of this rebellion."	----------	President may "take possession" of telegraph lines and railroads, prescribe rules for their operation, and place all officers and employees under military control.	a. "When in his [the President's] judgment the public safety may require it." b. President may not "engage in any work of railroad construction."	None	President shall appoint 3 commissioners to assess compensation to which the company is entitled and to report to Congress for its action.
2. Sec. 120 of National Defense Act of 1916, 39 Stat. 166, 213, 50 U.S.C. sec. 30, as amended. Enacted June 3, 1916.	No time limit	----------	President, through the head of any department, may seize any plant and may operate plants through the Army Ordnance Department.	a. Exercisable "in time of war or when war is imminent." b. Plant is equipped for making "necessary supplies or equipment for the Army" or "in the opinion of the Secretary of War" can be transformed readily to such use. c. Owner refuses to give Government order precedence or to perform.	do	Compensation "shall be fair and just."
3. Army Appropriations Act of 1916, 39 Stat. 619, 645; 10 U.S.C. 1361. Enacted Aug. 29, 1916.	do	----------	President, through Secretary of War, may take possession of and utilize any system or part of any system of transportation.	Exercisable "in time of war." [1]	do	Do.
4. Naval Emergency Fund Act of 1917, 39 Stat. 1163, 1192, 1195; 50 U.S.C. 82. Enacted Mar. 4, 1917. (Cf. Emergency Shipping Fund Act of 1917, infra.)	do	----------	President may— 1. "take over for use or operation" any factory "whether [or not] the United States has * * * agreement with the owner or occupier."	Exercisable "in time of war" (or of national emergency determined by the President before Mar. 1, 1918).	do	
			2. "take immediate possession of any factory" producing ships or war material for the Navy.	a. Owner fails or refuses to give precedence to an order for "ships or war material as the necessities of the Government"; refuses to deliver or to comply with a contract as modified by President. b. Exercisable within "the limits of the amounts appropriated therefor."	do	President shall determine "just compensation"; if the claimant is dissatisfied, he shall be paid 50 percent of the amount determined by the President and may sue, subject to existing law, in the district courts and the Court of Claims for the rest of "just compensation."
5. Emergency Shipping Fund Act of 1917, 40 Stat. 182. Enacted, June 15, 1917.	To 6 months after peace with the German Empire, 40 Stat. 182, 183.	Repealed after 3 years, sec. 2(a)(1), 41 Stat. 988, June 5, 1920.	President may— (1) "take over for use or operation" any plant, "whether [or not] United States has * * * agreement with the owner or occupier."	Exercisable "within the limits of the amounts herein authorized."	do	Same as next above, except that the prepaid percentage when the owner is dissatisfied is 75 percent.
			(2) "take immediate possession of any * * * plant" "equipped for the building or production of ships or material."	Failure or refusal of owner of shipbuilding plant to give Government orders precedence or to comply with order.	do	

[1] Government possession of the Nation's railroads taken on Dec. 28, 1917, was specifically terminated by statute on Mar. 1, 1920, prior to the end of the "war." See sec. 299 of the Transportation Act of 1920, 41 Stat. 456, 457.

YOUNGSTOWN CO. *v.* SAWYER—Continued

Frankfurter, J., concurring—Continued

APPENDIX I.—*Synoptic analysis of legislation authorizing seizure of industrial property*—Continued

Statute	Duration		Scope of authority	Limitations on its exercise	Terms and conditions of employment during seizure	Compensation
	As enacted	As extended or repealed				
6. 1918 Amendments to Emergency Shipping Fund Act of 1917. A. 40 Stat. 535. Enacted Apr. 22, 1918.	To 6 months after peace with the German Empire.	Repealed after 2 years, 41 Stat. 988, June 5, 1920.	President may— (1) "take possession of any street railroad."	a. The street railroad is necessary for transporting employees of plants which are or may be hereafter engaged in "construction of ships or equipment therefor for the United States." b. Exercisable "within the limits of the amounts herein authorized."	None	Same as next above.
B. 49 Stat. 1020, 1022. Enacted Nov. 4, 1918.	do	Repealed after 1½ years, 41 Stat. 988, June 5, 1920.	(2) extend seized plants constructing ships or materials therefor and requisition land for use in extensions.	Exercisable "within the limits of the amounts herein authorized."	do	
7. Food and Fuel Act of 1917, 40 Stat. 276. Enacted Aug. 10, 1917. Sec. 10, 40 Stat. 276, 279. Sec. 12, 40 Stat. 276, 279.	To end of World War I with Germany.		President may— (1) requisition foods, fuels, feeds, etc., and storage facilities for them.	The requisitioning is "necessary to the support of the Army or the * * * Navy, or any other public use connected with the common defense."	do	President "shall ascertain and pay a just compensation"; if the owner is dissatisfied, he shall be paid 75 percent of the amount determined by the President and may sue in the district courts, which are hereby given jurisdiction, for the rest of "just compensation."
			(2) take over any factory, packinghouse, oil pipeline, mine, or other plant where any necessaries are or may be "produced, prepared, or mined, and to operate the same."	a. President finds "it necessary to secure an adequate supply of necessaries for * * * the Army or * * * the Navy, or for any other public use connected with the common defense." b. President must turn facility back as soon as further Government operation "is not essential for the national security or defense."	President may make regulations for "the employment, control, and compensation of employees."	Same as in the Emergency Shipping Fund Act of 1917, supra.
Sec. 25, 40 Stat. 276, 286.	To end of World War I with Germany.		(3) "requisition and take over the plant, business, and all appurtenances thereof belonging to such producer or dealer" of coal and coke, and may operate it through an agency of his choice.	Producer or dealer— a. Fails to conform to prices or regulations set by the Federal Trade Commission under the direction of the President, who deems it "necessary for the efficient prosecution of the war." or b. Fails to operate efficiently, or conducts business in a way "prejudicial to the public interest."	President may "prescribe * * * regulations * * * for the employment, control, and compensation of the employees."	Same as next above.
8. Joint resolution of July 16, 1918, 40 Stat. 904.	"During the continuance of the present war."	Terminated on July 31, 1919, by repeal, July 11, 1919, 41 Stat. 157.	President may "take possession * * * of [and operate] any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system."	President deems "it necessary for the national security or defense."	None	Do.
9. Sec. 16 of Federal Water Power Act of 1930, 41 Stat. 1063, 1072; 16 U.S.C., sec. 809. Enacted June 10, 1929.	No time limit		President may take possession of any project, dams, powerhouses, transmission lines, etc., constructed or operated under a license from the Federal Power Commission and may operate them.	a. President believes, as "evidenced by a written order addressed to the holder of any license hereunder [that] the safety of the United States demands it." b. Seizure is "for the purpose of manufacturing nitrates, explosives, or munitions of war, or for any other purpose involving the safety of the United States." c. Control is limited to the "length of time as may appear to the President to be necessary to accomplish said purposes."	do	Owner shall be paid "just and fair compensation for the use of said property as may be fixed by the [Federal Power] Commission upon the basis of a reasonable profit in time of peace, and the cost of restoring said property to as good condition as existed at the time of the taking over thereof, less the reasonable value of any improvements * * * made thereto by the United States and which are valuable and serviceable to the [owner]."
10. Sec. 606 of Communications Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 1064, 1104, 47 U.S.C. sec. 606(c). Enacted June 19, 1934.	do		President may "use or control * * * any such station and/or its apparatus and equipment by any department of the Government under such regulations as he may prescribe."	a. President proclaims that there exists— (1) war or threat of war or (2) a state of public peril or disaster or other national emergency, or b. It is necessary to preserve the neutrality of the United States.	do	President shall ascertain just compensation and certify it to Congress for appropriation; if the owner is dissatisfied, he shall be paid 75 percent of the amount determined by the President and may sue, subject to existing law, in the district courts and the Court of Claims for the rest of just compensation."

YOUNGSTOWN CO. v. SAWYER—Continued

Frankfurter, J., concurring—Continued

APPENDIX I.—*Synoptic analysis of legislation authorizing seizure of industrial property*—Continued

Statute	Duration		Scope of authority	Limitations on its exercise	Terms and conditions of employment during seizure	Compensation
	As enacted	As extended or repealed				
11. Amendments to Communications Act, 56 Stat. 13, 47 U.S.C., sec. 606(d). Enacted Jan. 26, 1942.	No time limit		Same power as in sec. 606(c), Communications Act of 1934, next above.	a. President proclaims a state or threat of war. b. President "deems it necessary in the interest of the national security and defense." c. Power to seize and use property continues to "not later than 6 months after the termination of such state or threat of war" or than a date set by concurrent resolution of Congress.	None	Same as next above.
12. Sec. 8(b) of National Defense Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 676, 680. Enacted June 28, 1940.	do	Repealed in less than 3 months, Sept. 16, 1940, 54 Stat. 885, 893.	Secretary of the Navy, under President's direction, may "take over and operate such plant or facility."	a. Secretary of the Navy deems any existing plant necessary for the national defense. b. He is unable to reach agreement with its owner for its use or operation.	Secretary of the Navy may operate the plant "either by Government personnel or by contract with private firms."	Secretary of the Navy may "fix the compensation."
13. Sec. 9 of Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 885, 892, 50 U.S.C. App. (1946 ed.) sec. 309. Enacted Sept. 16, 1940; amended by War Labor Disputes Act, 57 Stat. 163, 164, q.v., infra.	To May 15, 1945, 54 Stat. 885, 897.	Extended to Mar. 31, 1947, 60 Stat. 341, 342.	President may "take immediate possession of any such plant." (Extended by amendment to "any plant, mine, or facility" capable of producing "any articles or materials which may be required * * * or which may be useful" for the war effort, 57 Stat. 163, 164.)	a. Plant is equipped for or capable of being readily transformed for the manufacture of necessary supplies. b. Owner refuses to give Government order precedence or to fill it.	None	"The compensation * * * shall be fair and just."
14. Sec. 3 of War Labor Disputes Act of 1943, 57 Stat. 163, 164, 50 U.S.C. App. (1946 ed.) sec. 1503. Enacted June 25, 1943.	To termination of this act by concurrent resolution by Congress or of hostilities. Plants seized previously may be operated until 6 months after termination of hostilities.		President may "take immediate possession" of "any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required * * * or which may be useful" for the war effort.	a. Finding and proclamation by the President that— (1) there is an interruption on account of a labor disturbance, (2) the war effort will be unduly impeded, (3) seizure is necessary to insure operation. b. Plant must be returned to owner within 60 days "after the restoration of the productive efficiency."	Same "terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time [of taking] possession," except that terms and conditions might be changed by order of the War Labor Board on application (secs. 4, 5, 57 Stat. 163, 165).	Same as next above.
15. Title VIII, "Repricing of War Contracts," of Revenue Act of 1943, 58 Stat. 21, 92, 50 U.S.C. App. (1946 ed.) sec. 1192. Enacted Feb. 25, 1944.	To termination of hostilities.		President may "take immediate possession of the plant or plants * * * and * * * operate them in accordance with sec. 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended."	a. The Secretary of a Department deems the price of an article or service required directly or indirectly by the Department is unreasonable. b. The Secretary, after the refusal of the person furnishing the article or service to agree to a price, sets a price. c. The person "willfully refuses, or willfully fails" to furnish the articles or services at the price fixed by the Secretary.	None	Do.
16. Selective Service Act of 1948, 62 Stat. 604, 625, 626, 50 U.S.C. App. sec. 456. Enacted June 24, 1948.	No time limit		President may "take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or other facility * * * and to operate it * * * for the production of such articles or materials."	a. President with advice of the National Security Resources Board determines prompt delivery of articles or materials is "in the interest of the national security." b. Procurement "has been authorized by the Congress exclusively for the use of the Armed Forces" or the AEC. c. Owner refuses or fails to give precedence to Government order placed with notice that it is made pursuant to this section, or to fill the order properly.	do	"Fair and just compensation shall be paid."

YOUNGSTOWN CO. v. SAWYER—Continued

Frankfurter, J., concurring—Continued

APPENDIX I.—*Synoptic analysis of legislation authorizing seizure of industrial property*—Continued

Statute	Duration		Scope of authority	Limitations on its exercise	Terms and conditions of employment during seizure	Compensation
	As enacted	As extended or repealed				
17. Sec. 201(a) of Defense Production Act, 64 Stat. 798, 799, 59 U.S.C. App. sec. 2881(a). Enacted Sept. 8, 1950; amended, 65 Stat. 131, 132, q.v., infra.	To June 30, 1951. But see sec. 716(a), 64 Stat. 798, 822.	Extended to July 31, 1951, 65 Stat. 110. Extended to June 30, 1952, sec. 111, 65 Stat. 131, 144.	President may "requisition equipment, supplies or component parts thereof, or materials or facilities necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation of such equipment, supplies, or component parts." 64 Stat. 798, 799. Restricted in the main to personal property by sec. 102(b), 65 Stat. 132.	President determines that— a. Its use is "needed for national defense," b. the need is "immediate and impending," "will not admit of delay or resort to any other source of supply," c. other reasonable means of obtaining use of the property have been exhausted.	None	President shall determine just compensation as of the time the property is taken; if owner is dissatisfied, he shall be promptly paid 75 percent of the amount determined by the President and may sue within 3 years in the district courts or the Court of Claims, regardless of the amount involved, for the rest of "just compensation."
18. Sec. 102(b)(2) of Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951, 65 Stat. 131, 132, 50 U.S.C. App. sec. 2081(b). Enacted July 31, 1951.	To June 30, 1952, 65 Stat. 131, 144.		Court condemnation of real property in accordance with existing statutes.	President deems the real property "necessary in the interest of national defense."	do	Under existing statutes for condemnation. Immediate possession given only upon deposit of amount "estimated to be just compensation," 75 percent of which is immediately paid without prejudice to the owner.

AMENDMENT OF INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Investment Act of 1940.

In the President's press conference of Wednesday, February 8, he referred to what he called "unmoral practices conducted in the American business community." He said that he hoped "that the business community itself will consider what steps it could take to lift this shadow from its shoulder."

The bill which I introduce would encourage boards of directors of registered investment companies and their investment advisers and underwriters to maintain the highest standards of fiduciary responsibility among their own members.

This bill seeks to protect the investor. It provides that responsible officials in the investment industry disclose details of private transactions and dealings in securities in which the companies they manage also had an interest. Safeguards built into the legislation would prevent abuses by bringing the SEC, and ultimately the courts, into the picture when disclosure sought is not voluntarily brought forth.

Members of this body are aware of my deep interest in protecting the consumer. The investment company business is that aspect of the securities industry most directly affecting the consumer-public. In recent years, we have seen a tremendous growth in the number of citizens who have invested small amounts of money in investment companies as a means of participating in the American free enterprise system. Billions of dollars are now being managed by such companies and their boards of directors on behalf of small and large investors. The highest standards of business ethics are required of these money managers.

It is in this spirit that I introduce the bill.

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

The bill (S. 1117) to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, I introduce, and send to the desk for appropriate reference, a bill to provide financial assistance to the States for public education.

No element of our society is more vital to the present and the future than the youth of America and their education and preparation for citizenship.

Costs of education have risen greatly in recent years, but I am not one to say they are too high. We must provide always the finest facilities possible. We must have the best trained teachers, and they should be paid commensurately with the wonderful contribution they are making toward the education of our growing population.

In paying this price, we must, in my opinion, see to it that the educational system remains close to the people themselves. There must be no central control of the entire national system from any single source.

The bill I am introducing, Mr. President, would provide financial aid to the States in maintaining their own locally administered school systems. There would be no Federal control.

The assistance would come by authorizing annual appropriation to each of the 50 States of amounts equal to 5 percent of the Federal income taxes collected within the State during the preceding fiscal year.

Mr. President, this is a simple proposal. It is a proposal that will work—and it will work without doing damage to the educational system that has served us so well through the years.

The Federal Government has preempted the field of taxation to such a degree there is no other adequate source.

The bill specifically provides that the sums thus made available to the States shall not be subject to control, review, or audit by any Federal official or any Federal court.

The bill is based on two simple propositions:

First. We need to provide more money for our schools.

Second. We must avoid Federal control of our schools.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1119) to provide aid to States for educational purposes only, introduced by Mr. BLAKLEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That 5 per centum of all Federal income taxes collected are appropriated and deemed to be revenue for the State within which it is collected, for use for educational purposes only.

SEC. 2. District directors of internal revenue are hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the treasurer, or corresponding official, of the State within which their respective internal revenue districts are situated, at the end of each fiscal year an amount equal to 5 per centum of the Federal income taxes collected within such State during said fiscal year.

SEC. 3. The use and expenditure of the moneys appropriated by this Act shall be solely at the discretion of the State, and

shall not be subject to control, review, or audit by any court of the United States.

SEC. 4. (a) For purposes of this Act, the amount of Federal income taxes collected within each State during any fiscal year is an amount equal to—

(1) the total amount of Federal income taxes collected in the internal revenue district or districts in such State during such fiscal year reduced by

(2) the total amount of credits allowed and refunds paid in such internal revenue district or districts during such fiscal year with respect to overpayments of Federal income taxes during such fiscal year or any preceding fiscal year.

(b) For purposes of this Act, the term "Federal income taxes" means—

(1) the income taxes imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (including payments of estimated tax under sections 6153 and 6154 of such Code);

(2) the withholding taxes imposed by chapter 3 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on the income of nonresident alien individuals and foreign corporations and on tax-free covenant bonds; and

(3) the withholding tax on wages of individuals imposed by chapter 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(c) Each district director of Internal Revenue shall, as soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, report to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of Federal income taxes collected in his internal revenue district during such fiscal year, and the amount remitted to the respective States.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia. The determination of the amount of Federal income taxes collected in the District of Columbia during any fiscal year shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, 11 bills relating to the problems of migratory agricultural workers. A number of my colleagues have kindly joined me in cosponsoring several of these bills. These bills have evolved from 18 months of work and study by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, including public hearings and field trips in eight of the States which use large numbers of migratory farmworkers each year.

The subject matter of the bills I have introduced is broad, Mr. President, because the problem in this area is broad and deep. The specific subjects of the bills are these: First, agricultural minimum wage; second, agricultural child labor; third, education of migrant children; fourth, education of migrant adults; fifth, registration of agricultural labor contractors; sixth, housing aids for farmers; seventh, agricultural labor relations; eighth, stabilization of the farm work force; ninth, improved health services for migrant families; tenth, improved welfare services for migrant children; and eleventh, establishment of a Citizens Council on Migratory Labor.

Many States, local communities, and private citizens are working hard to cope with the problems caused by the seasonal need for farmworkers. Yet the harsh fact is that the progress being made is miniscule in relation to the overall problem. The reason for this is clear, I think. State and local efforts are bearing the full load of a problem which is fundamentally interstate in nature and which remains with us because the Federal Government has not accepted its share of responsibility. The bills I have introduced look toward acceptance of that responsibility and I hope the full Senate will have an opportunity to consider them very soon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills lie on the desk until March 3, to give an opportunity to other Senators to join as cosponsors if they desire to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and other Senators) were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1122. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, as amended, to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1123. A bill to amend section 13(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the exemption of agricultural employees from the child labor provisions of such act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. HART, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 1124. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; and

S. 1125. A bill to provide grants for adult education for migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1126. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1127. A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to assist in the provision of housing for domestic farm labor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1128. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture; and

S. 1129. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide improved programs of recruitment, transportation, and distribution of agricultural workers in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1130. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for improving domestic agricultural migratory workers' health services and conditions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1131. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to further assist States in establishing and operating day-care facilities for the children of migrant agricultural workers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1132. A bill to provide for the establishment of a council to be known as the National Citizens Council on Migratory Labor; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill providing a program of financial assistance to the States for construction of public community colleges.

This is substantially the same bill I introduced in the previous Congress. The situation has changed in only one important particular: the need for action is greater than ever. The longer we delay action, the greater the number of our capable young people who will be unable to better themselves through higher education.

Authorities tell us we must double our educational facilities over the next 10 years. Many in the educational community are already alive to this crisis. Indeed, most colleges and universities are striving to enlarge and improve their facilities on their own. These efforts have been helpful, but they are not enough, by any means.

One of the most widely acclaimed answers to our problem of providing for the expansion of college facilities has been the relatively new and fast growing 2-year community college. Community colleges now make up more than half of the 677 2-year colleges in the United States, enrolling an estimated 900,000 students. The popularity of these colleges is easily traceable to important advantages they afford to the average high school graduate. Community colleges can offer a variety of programs, fulfilling needs of students planning to continue in college at a 4-year institution, students desiring only 2 years of study in the vocational or technical training areas and adults intending to further their education while working.

Community colleges also offer important savings to a student in that it is usually possible for him to live at home and even to work part-time, should he desire to do so. And since community colleges normally have no requirement for costly dormitories, and the like, there are important savings in school construction costs.

It is because I, too, believe that the community college is the best way to meet the growing requirement of our young people for higher education that I again introduce this bill. Assistance to elementary and secondary schools remains essential. But we cannot limit

our goals to either of these areas alone if this country is to meet its responsibilities in the field of education.

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

The bill (S. 1140) providing a program of financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRIORITY OF LIENS IN BANKRUPTCY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and myself I send a bill to the desk which establishes the priority of liens in bankruptcy and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The need for the bill has grown out of conflicting interpretations of the law over the past 5 years which have had the effect of creating considerable uncertainty in the commercial world as to the strength of secured credit.

The bill is identical in form to H.R. 1961 introduced in the other body earlier this year by Congressman POFF. Subsequent to its introduction the Supreme Court handed down its decision in *Lewis* v. *Manufacturers National Bank* (364 U.S. 603) which disposes of one of the problems this bill was designed to correct. After further study of this matter, the committee may however recommend the advisability of statutory clarification notwithstanding this helpful decision. For this reason the bill has not been revised to reflect the court action.

The Congress passed a measure similar in its essential aspects to this one in the closing days of the last session. I refer to H.R. 7242 of the 86th Congress. The two changes which were made were included at the behest of the Treasury Department and worked out with them. At the time the bill was considered in the body, the junior Senator from Michigan inserted excerpts from the report explaining the rather complicated nature of the legislation. They can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 13, pages 17591–17594.

It is hoped that after hearings the remaining objections noted by the President in his memorandum of disapproval dated September 8, 1960, can be removed or ironed out, as the case might be, so that the existing uncertainty as to the status of secured claims and the ensuing inequities will be eliminated.

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

The bill (S. 1142) to amend sections 1, 17a, 57j, 64a(5), 67b, 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL INVEST-IN-AMERICA WEEK, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week of April 30 through May 6, 1961, as National Invest-in-America Week throughout the United States of America and its territorial possessions.

Mr. President, my colleagues may recall that I have been considerably interested in the invest-in-America movement since its original inception in 1949. I have been happy to make numerous public statements in which I have endorsed the worthwhile objectives of the National Invest-in-America Committee, which now has branch committees in over 250 communities throughout our 50 States. In my own great State of Wisconsin, for example, seven individual communities have announced that they plan to hold local observances this year; including Milwaukee, Madison, Janesville, Fond du Lac, Sheboygan, Stevens Point, and Grantsburg. Incidentally, the man who has actively spearheaded these efforts in the Badger State for the past several years is Mr. Roth S. Schleck, who is the able State chairman of the Wisconsin Invest-in-America Committee.

In recent years it has been my pleasure to welcome fellow Senators and Representatives, and to greet members of the National Invest-in-America Committee—as well as local leaders in business and in the executive branch of the Government—at "kickoff" luncheons in the Old Supreme Court Chamber here in the Capitol. These events have initiated annual celebrations of national invest-in-America activities and their purpose has been to dramatize the principles of this constructive program and to stimulate interest in year-round activities.

Mr. President, the invest-in-America program has ably demonstrated that it is a solid growth enterprise and that its objectives are dedicated to promoting the growth of America's economy. These objectives are best summed up in the statement of its principles:

> The American competitive enterprise system was founded on the work and savings of the people and has produced the highest standard of living in history. Our people, of their own free will, have made all forms of investment from Government bonds to venture capital for new enterprise. Competitive enterprise is dependent on the continued supply of these funds, which benefit consumers, workers, and the national interest; as well as investors. Investing in America has helped to make our country great. This idea needs to be brought home to all the people—men, women, and schoolchildren.

We know that today, more than ever before, our Nation is faced with both challenges and opportunities for stimulating the lagging economy. The welfare of our people, our progress as a nation, and the security of our way of life, all depend upon the maintenance of a sound and strong economy. In order to build a bigger and better future for America, it is necessary that the savings of the American people, in the form of retained earnings of corporations, as well as individual savings, provide the capital. It has been estimated that each new job requires at least $14,000 of new capital investment; and these investments in our free-enterprise system represent the lifeblood of our economy. By following an adequate and intelligent program of personal savings and investment, each of us will be able to add immeasurably to our own personal welfare by stimulating production of wealth—and hence prosperity—for our Nation.

It is my understanding that, today, about 13 million Americans own shares in public corporations—which is an increase of about three-quarters of a million per year since 1953. And I am pleased to note that these shareowners in America's future represent a broad cross section of the public, who have received well over $500 million in distributed dividends in the year 1960 alone.

The value of annual observances, and the outstanding work performed by the various nationwide committees in making such observances possible, was recognized by former President Eisenhower, who has stated that "the annual observance of Invest-in-America Week is a good time to reaffirm our belief in the power of work, savings, and investments to create new business and better job opportunities for all our citizens."

Mr. President, by the designation of such a National Invest-in-America Week, our citizens will be called upon to recognize that through this observance we are endeavoring to preserve our economic, religious, and political freedoms on the bloodless economic battlefield of competition in a free-enterprise society.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 56) providing for the designation of April 30 through May 6, 1961, as National Invest-in-America Week, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whereas Invest-in-America Week has been so designated to emphasize to the general citizenry the importance of savings and investments in the American free enterprise system; and
>
> Whereas the basic program of Invest-in-America Week is to demonstrate and point up to the American people the following two vitally important messages: (1) Every American is an investor in jobs, savings, homeownership, insurance, and securities, and (2) every American is a capitalist and partner in American free enterprise if he has a savings account, insurance, stocks or bonds, or owns or is buying his home or other tangible property; and
>
> Whereas the American way of life based upon private capital investment is today the foundation of the free world and the strongest link in our massive bulwark against totalitarianism, communism, and enslavement; and
>
> Whereas our free enterprise system today is faced with the gravest challenge in our entire history, not only from the forces of communism from without, but also from a domestic danger—a lack of basic understanding of the American system among our own citizenry; and
>
> Whereas the American competitive enterprise system was founded and developed upon the sacrifice, work, and savings of the American people, and has produced the highest standard of living in world history; and

Whereas our competitive enterprise is dependent upon a continual supply of funds in order to continue to serve the national interest by providing its benefits to consumers, workers, and investors; and

Whereas Invest-in-America Week hastens to remind us that thrift and intelligent investment are basic and vital to the economic vigor and health of the Nation; and

Whereas it is clear that savings, and the incentive to invest them wisely, provide much of the capital strength for the growth of our great country; and

Whereas industry, business, labor, civic bodies and countless other groups representing a vast cross-section of the community annually support the Invest-in-America observance which has developed from a small unheralded beginning in 1950 to a nationwide observance in over two hundred fifty (250) major cities and metropolitan areas from coast to coast in the short span of ten years; and

Whereas over thirteen million American citizens are now investing in America through stock ownership in publicly held corporations; and

Whereas the enlightened citizen, aware of his stake in the American way of life and the many opportunities it affords, is a far superior, more responsible citizen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of April 30 through May 6, 1961, as National Invest-in-America Week, and to call upon the citizens of the United States to observe such week in recognition of the great endeavor in which the American people are now engaged to preserve their economic, religious, and political freedoms on the bloodless economic battlefield of competition in a free enterprise society.

CENTENNIAL OF ESTABLISHMENT OF DAKOTA TERRITORY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, this is the centennial year of the establishment of the Dakota Territory, the organic act of Dakota Territory having been signed by President James Buchanan on March 2, 1861.

Today I am submitting, together with my colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], a resolution by which the U.S. Senate would note the occasion and urge general recognition of the Dakota Centennial. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the year 1961 marks the 100th anniversary of the creation by President James Buchanan of the Dakota Territory; and

Whereas from this vast empire, greater than the combined areas of France, Germany, and Italy, there have been created and added to the Union two whole States and parts of three other States; and

Whereas such States have contributed greatly to the strength and enrichment of our Nation; and

Whereas the area comprising the Dakota Territory was the scene of an epic westward movement which brought and continues to bring to fruition the American ideal of opportunity for all; and

Whereas the history of Dakota Territory is inextricably woven into the historical fabric of America—into its dreams and deeds, into its legend and history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States officially recognizes March 2, 1961, the centennial of the creation of the Dakota Territory, as being of significance in the history of our Nation, and calls upon the people of the United States to give proper recognition to the Dakota Centennial observation.

Mr. President, in conjunction with the introduction of the resolution, I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks, the text of the Organic Act of Dakota Territory and an excellent article entitled "Dakota Territory Centennial," written by Prof. William H. Cape and printed in Public Affairs, a publication of the governmental research bureau of the University of South Dakota, for February 15, 1961.

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

ORGANIC ACT OF DAKOTA TERRITORY—CHAPTER LXXXVI, 36TH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

An act to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Dakota, and to create the office of surveyor-general therein

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all that part of the territory of the United States included within the following limits, namely: Commencing at a point in the main channel of the Red River of the North, where the forty-ninth degree of north latitude crosses the same; thence up the main channel of the same, and along the boundary of the State of Minnesota, to Big Stone Lake; thence along the boundary line of the said State of Minnesota to the Iowa line; thence along the boundary line of the State of Iowa to the point of intersection between the Big Sioux and Missouri rivers; thence up the Missouri river and along the boundary line of the Territory of Nebraska, to the mouth of the Niobrara or Running Water river; thence following up the same, in the middle of the main channel thereof, to the mouth of the Keha Paha, or Turtle Hill river; thence up said river to the forty-third parallel of north latitude; thence due west to the present boundary of the Territory of Washington; thence along the boundary line of Washington Territory, to the forty-ninth degree of north latitude; thence east, along said forty-ninth degree of north latitude, to the place of beginning, be and the same is hereby, organized into a temporary government, by the name of the Territory of Dakota: *Provided,* That nothing in this act contained shall be construed to impair the rights of person or property now pertaining to the Indians in said territory, so long as such rights shall remain unextinguished by treaty between the United States and such Indians, or to include any territory which, by treaty with any Indian tribe, is not, without the consent of said tribe, to be included within the territorial limits or jurisdiction of any state or territory; but all such territory shall be excepted out of the boundaries and constitute no part of the Territory of Dakota, until said tribe shall signify their assent to the president of the United States to be included within the said territory, or to affect the authority of the Government of the United States to make any regulations respecting such Indians, their lands, property, or other rights, by treaty, law, or otherwise, which it would have been competent for the government to make if this act had never passed: *Provided further,* That nothing in this act contained shall be construed to inhibit the government of the United States from dividing said territory into two or more territories, in such manner and at such times as congress shall deem convenient and proper, or from attaching any portion thereof to any other territory or state.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted,* That the executive power and authority in and over said Territory of Dakota, shall be vested in a governor, who shall hold his office for four years, and until his successor shall be appointed and qualified, unless sooner removed by the president of the United States. The Governor shall reside within said territory, shall be commander in chief of the militia thereof, shall perform the duties and receive the emoluments of superintendent of Indian affairs, and shall approve all laws passed by the legislative assembly before they shall take effect; he may grant pardons for offenses against the law of said territory, and reprieves for offenses against the laws of the United States until the decision of the president can be made known thereon; he shall commission all officers who shall be appointed to office under the laws of said territory, and shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted,* That there shall be a secretary of said territory, who shall reside therein, and hold his office for 4 years, unless sooner removed by the president of the United States; he shall record and preserve all the laws and proceedings of the legislative assembly hereinafter constituted, and all the acts and proceedings of the governor, in his executive department; he shall transmit one copy of the laws, and one copy of the executive proceedings, on or before the first day of December in each year, to the president of the United States, and, at the same time, two copies of the laws to the speaker of the house of representatives and the president of the senate, for the use of congress; and in case of the death, removal, or resignation, or other necessary absence of the governor from the territory, the secretary shall have, and is hereby authorized and required, to execute and perform all the powers and duties of the governor during such vacancy or necessary absence, or until another governor shall be duly appointed to fill such vacancy.

SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted,* That the legislative power and authority of said territory shall be vested in the governor and a legislative assembly. The legislative assembly shall consist of a council and house of representatives. The council shall consist of nine members, which may be increased to thirteen, having the qualifications of voters as hereinafter prescribed, whose terms of service shall continue two years. The house of representatives shall consist of thirteen members, which may be increased to twenty-six, possessing the same qualifications as prescribed for members of the council, and whose term of service shall continue one year. An apportionment shall be made, as nearly equal as practicable, among the several counties or districts for the election of the council and house of representatives, giving to each section of the territory representation in the ratio of its population, (Indians excepted) as nearly as may be; and the members of the council and of the house of representatives shall reside in, and be inhabitants of, the district for which they may be elected, respectively. Previous to the first election, the governor shall cause a census or enumeration of the inhabitants of the several counties and districts of the territory to be taken; and the first election shall be held at such time and places, and be conducted in such manner, as the governor shall appoint and direct; and he shall, at the same time, declare the number of the members of the council and house of representatives to which each of the counties or districts shall be entitled under this act. The number of persons authorized to be elected, having the highest number of votes in each of said council districts, for members of the council, shall be declared by the governor to be duly elected to the council; and

the person or persons authorized to be elected having the greatest number of votes for the house of representatives, equal to the number to which each county or district shall be entitled, shall be declared by the governor to be elected members of the house of representatives: *Provided*, That in case of a tie between two or more persons voted for, the governor shall order a new election, to supply the vacancy made by such tie. And the persons thus elected to the legislative assembly shall meet at such place and on such day as the governor shall appoint; but thereafter, the time, place, and manner of holding and conducting all elections by the people, and the apportioning the representation in the several counties or districts to the council and house of representatives, according to the population, shall be prescribed by law, as well as the day of the commencement of the regular session of the legislative assembly: *Provided*, That no one session exceed the term of forty days, except the first, which may be extended to sixty days, but no longer.

SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That every free white male inhabitant of the United States above the age of twenty-one years, who shall have been a resident of said territory at the time of the passage of this act, shall be entitled to vote at the first election, and shall be eligible to any office within the said territory; but the qualifications of voters and of holding office at all subsequent elections shall be such as shall be prescribed by the legislative assembly: *Provided*, That the right of suffrage and of holding office shall be exercised only by citizens of the United States and those who shall have declared on oath their intention to become such, and shall have taken an oath to support the constitution of the United States.

SEC. 6. *And be it further enacted*, That the legislative power of the territory shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation consistent with the constitution of the United States and the provisions of this act; but no law shall be passed interfering with the primary disposal of the soil; no tax shall be imposed upon the property of the United States; nor shall the lands or other property of non-residents be taxed higher than the lands or other property of residents; nor shall any law be passed impairing the rights of private property; nor shall any discrimination be made in taxing different kinds of property; but all property subject to taxation shall be in proportion to the value of the property taxed.

SEC. 7. *And be it further enacted*, That all township, district, and county officers, not herein otherwise provided for, shall be appointed or elected as the case may be, in such manner as shall be provided by the governor and legislative assembly of the territory. The governor shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the legislative council, appoint all officers not herein otherwise provided for; and, in the first instance, the governor alone may appoint all said officers, who shall hold their offices until the end of the first session of the legislative assembly, and shall lay off the necessary districts for members of the council and house of representatives, and all other officers.

SEC. 8. *And be it further enacted*, That no member of the legislative assembly shall hold or be appointed to any office which shall have been created, or the salary or emoluments of which shall have been created, or the salary or emoluments of which shall have been increased while he was a member, during the term for which he was elected, and for one year after the expiration of such term, and no person holding a commission or appointment under the United States, except postmasters, shall be a member of the legislative assembly, or shall hold any office under the government of said territory.

SEC. 9. *And be it further enacted*, That the judicial power of said territory shall be vested in a supreme court, district courts, probate courts, and in justices of the peace. The supreme court shall consist of a chief justice and two associate justices, any two of whom shall constitute a quorum, and who shall hold a term at the seat of government of said territory annually, and they shall hold their offices during the period of 4 years. The said territory shall be divided into three judicial districts, and a district court shall be held in each of said districts by one of the justices of the supreme court, at such time and place as may be prescribed by law; and the said judges shall, after their appointments respectively, reside in the districts which shall be assigned them. The jurisdiction of the several courts herein provided for, both appellate and original, and that of the probate courts and of the justices of the peace, shall be as limited by law; Provided, That justices of the peace shall not have jurisdiction of any matter in controversy when the title or boundaries of land may be in dispute, or where the debt or sum claimed shall exceed one hundred dollars; and the said supreme and district courts, respectively, shall possess chancery as well as common law jurisdiction, and authority for redress of all wrongs committed against the constitution or laws of the United States, or of the territory, affecting persons or property. Each district court, or the judge thereof, shall appoint its clerk, who shall also be the register in chancery, and shall keep his office at the place where the court may be held. Writs of error, bills of exception, and appeals, shall be allowed in all cases from the final decisions of said district courts to the supreme court, under such regulations as may be prescribed by law; but in no case removed to the supreme court shall trial by jury be allowed in said court. The supreme court or the justices thereof, shall appoint its own clerk, and every clerk shall hold his office at the pleasure of the court for which he shall have been appointed. Writs of error and appeals from the final decisions of said supreme court shall be allowed, and may be taken to the supreme court of the United States, in the same manner and under the same regulations as from the circuit courts of the United States, where the value of the property, or the amount in controversy, to be ascertained by the oath or affirmation of either party, or other competent witness, shall exceed one thousand dollars; and each of the said district courts shall have and exercise the same jurisdiction, in all cases arising under the constitution and laws of the United States as is vested in the circuit and district courts of the United States; and the said supreme and district courts of the said territory, and the respective judges thereof, shall and may grant writs of habeas corpus in all cases in which the same are grantable by the judges of the United States in the District of Columbia; and the first 6 days of every term of said courts, or so much thereof as shall be necessary, shall be appropriated to the trial of causes arising under the said constitution and laws; and writs of error and appeals in all such cases shall be made to the supreme court of said territory the same as in other cases. The said clerk shall receive, in all such cases, the same fees which the clerks of the district courts of Nebraska Territory now receive for similar services.

SEC. 10. *And be it further enacted*, That there shall be appointed an attorney for said territory, who shall continue in office for four years, unless sooner removed by the president, and who shall receive the same fees and the salary as the attorney of the United States for the present Territory of Nebraska. There shall also be a marshal for the territory appointed, who shall hold his office for four years, unless sooner removed by the president, and who shall execute all processes issuing from the said courts when exercising their jurisdiction as circuit and district courts of the United States; he shall perform the duties, be subject to the same regulations and penalties, and be entitled to the same fees as the marshal of the district court of the United States for the present Territory of Nebraska, and shall, in addition, be paid two hundred dollars annually as a compensation for extra services.

SEC. 11. *And be it further enacted*, That the governor, secretary, chief justice and associate justices, attorney, and marshal, shall be nominated and, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, appointed by the president of the United States. The governor and secretary to be appointed as aforesaid shall, before they act as such, respectively take an oath or affirmation before the district judge, or some justice of the peace in the limits of said territory duly authorized to administer oaths and affirmations by the laws now in force therein, or before the chief justice or some associate justice of the supreme court of the United States, to support the constitution of the United States and faithfully to discharge the duties of their respective offices; which said oaths, when so taken, shall be certified by the person by whom the same shall have been taken; and such certificates shall be received and recorded by the secretary among the executive proceedings; and the chief justice and associate justices, and all other civil officers in said territory, before they act as such, shall take a like oath or affirmation before the said governor or secretary, of some judge or justice of the peace of the territory who may be duly commissioned and qualified, which said oath or affirmation shall be certified and transmitted by the person taking the same to the secretary, to be by him recorded as aforesaid; and afterwards the like oath or affirmation shall be taken, certified, and recorded in such manner and form as may be prescribed by law. The governor shall receive an annual salary of fifteen hundred dollars as governor, and one thousand dollars as superintendent of Indian affairs; the chief justice and associate justices shall each receive an annual salary of eighteen hundred dollars; the secretary shall receive an annual salary of eighteen hundred dollars. The said salaries shall be paid quarter-yearly at the treasury of the United States. The members of the legislative assembly shall be entitled to receive three dollars each per day during their attendance at the session thereof, and three dollars for every twenty miles travel in going to and returning from the said sessions, estimated according to the nearest usually traveled route. There shall be appropriated annually the sum of one thousand dollars, to be expended by the governor, to defray the contingent expenses of the territory. There shall also be appropriated annually a sufficient sum, to be expended by the secretary of the territory, and upon an estimate to be made by the secretary of the treasury of the United States, to defray the expenses of the legislative assembly, the printing of the laws, and other incidental expenses; and the secretary of the territory shall annually account to the secretary of the treasury of the United States for the manner in which the aforesaid sum shall have been expended.

SEC. 12. *And be it further enacted*, That the legislative assembly of the Territory of Dakota shall hold its first session at such time and place in said territory as the governor thereof shall appoint and direct; and at said first session, or as soon thereafter as they shall deem expedient, the governor and legislative assembly shall proceed to locate and establish the seat of government for said territory at such place as they may deem eligible; which place, however, shall thereafter be subject to be changed by the said governor and legislative assembly.

SEC. 13. *And be it further enacted,* That a delegate to the house of representatives of the United States, to serve during each congress of the United States, may be elected by the voters qualified to elect members of the legislative assembly, who shall be entitled to the same rights and privileges as are exercised and enjoyed by the delegates from the several other territories of the United States to the said house of representatives. The first election shall be held at such time and place, and be conducted in such manner, as the governor shall appoint and direct; and at all subsequent elections, the times, places, and manner of holding elections shall be prescribed by law. The person having the greatest number of votes shall be declared by the governor to be duly elected, and a certificate thereof shall be given accordingly.

SEC. 14. *And be it further enacted,* That when the land in said territory shall be surveyed, under the direction of the government of the United States, preparatory to bringing the same into market, sections numbered sixteen and thirty-six in each township in said territory shall be, and the same are hereby, reserved for the purpose of being applied to schools in the states hereafter to be erected out of the same.

SEC. 15. *And be it further enacted,* That temporarily, and until otherwise provided by law, the governor of said territory may define the judicial districts of said territory and assign the judges who may be appointed for said territory to the several districts, and also appoint the times and places for holding courts in the several counties or subdivisions in each of said judicial districts by proclamation to be issued by him; but the legislative assembly, at their first or any subsequent session, may organize, alter, or modify such judicial districts, and assign the judges, and alter the times and places of holding the courts, as to them shall seem proper and convenient.

SEC. 16. *And be it further enacted,* That the constitution and all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within the said Territory of Dakota as elsewhere within the United States.

SEC. 17. *And be it further enacted,* That the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the senate shall be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint a surveyor general for Dakota, who shall locate his office at such place as the Secretary of the Interior shall from time to time direct, and whose duties, powers, obligations, responsibilities, compensation, and allowances for clerk hire, office rent, fuel, and incidental expenses, shall be the same as those of the surveyor general of Nebraska and Kansas, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, and such instructions as he may from time to time deem it advisable to give him.

SEC. 18. *And be it further enacted,* That so much of the public lands of the United States in the Territory of Dakota, west of its eastern boundary, and east and north of the Niobrara, or Running Water River, be formed into a land district, to be called the Yancton District, at such time as the president may direct, the land office for which shall be located at such point as the president may direct, and shall be removed from time to time to other points within said district whenever, in his opinion, it may be expedient.

SEC. 19. *And be it further enacted,* That the president be, and he is hereby authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, a register and receiver for said district, who shall respectively be required to reside at the site of said office, and who shall have the same powers, perform the same duties, and be entitled to the same compensation, as are or may be prescribed by law in relation to other land offices of the United States.

SEC. 20. *And be it further enacted,* That the river in said Territory heretofore known as the River aux Jacques, or James River, shall hereafter be called the Dakota River.

SEC. 21. *And be it further enacted,* That until congress shall otherwise direct, that portion of the territories of Utah and Washington between the 41st and 43d degrees of north latitude, and east of the 33d meridian of longitude west from Washington, shall be, and is hereby, incorporated into and made a part of the Territory of Nebraska.

Approved, March 2, 1861.

[From Public Affairs, Feb. 15, 1961]

TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT

Two territorial conventions (1858–59) met in Sioux Falls prior to the time that Dakota Territory was created for the purpose of establishing the organization of a territorial government and memorializing Congress to recognize the new Territory. The organic act to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Dakota became effective on March 2, 1861.

Although several communities sought the honor of being the capital city of the new territory, Yankton, a Missouri River community 60 miles west of Sioux City, Iowa, was selected by the first territorial Governor as the capital city. This community remained as the territorial capital from 1861 to 1883. In the latter year, as a result of political maneuvering, the seat of government was moved to Bismarck, the present State capital of North Dakota. The latter community remained the territorial capital until the division of the territory in 1889.

STATEHOOD

Prior to the 1889 convention and constitution, delegates met in two conventions at which the constitutional framework was debated. In 1889 President William Harrison signed the bills which created the twin States of North and South Dakota. The following year the voters designated Pierre as the permanent capital of South Dakota.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SOVIET POLITICAL WARFARE—PRINTING OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR DODD AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on December 1, 1960, there was held in Paris a Conference on Soviet Political Warfare. The junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] was one of the sponors of that Conference. He participated in its sessions as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security. He delivered an address to that Conference entitled "The Confusion of the West." In order that there may be a wider circulation and study of the subject, I submit a resolution and a copy of the Senator's speech to the desk with the request that it be referred to the Committee on Rules for the printing of 1,000 copies as a Senate document.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 99) submitted by Mr. HRUSKA, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the remarks of Senator Thomas J. Dodd at the Conference on Soviet Political Warfare, Paris, France, on December 1, 1960, be printed as a Senate document, to be entitled "The Confusion of the West: An Analysis of Certain Aspects of Communist Political Warfare."

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

Mr. GRUENING. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for asking that a printing resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules. I hope that the precedent established today will be followed at all times from now on, and that there will be no further requests from the floor for printing analyses, resolutions, and so forth, to be considered on a unanimous-consent basis, because such requests should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A PERMANENT STANDBY PROGRAM OF EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on the next printing of S. 5, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] be added as a cosponsor of the bill. It was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from Pennsylvania appear in the RECORD at this point, in connection with the measure.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

I am a cosponsor of S. 5, which Senator PROUTY introduced on January 5, 1961. This is a bill which provides for the establishment of a permanent standby program of extended unemployment compensation benefits to be payable during periods of high unemployment.

The experience of the 1958 recession shows that most of those who exhausted the benefits to which they were entitled under State law were steady workers, the chief breadwinners for their families. In New York State where a comprehensive analysis was made, most of the recipients of extended benefits under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act were found to be steady workers with regular jobs during the preceding 5 years. Aside from their layoff during the 1958 recession, 54 percent had not drawn jobless benefits in any year back to 1953.

A similar situation prevails today. Millions of Americans who want to work cannot find a job and thousands of men with families to support have exhausted their benefit rights under State laws. Both Senator PROUTY and I are deeply concerned about these people. We believe that Congress must act—and act quickly, to alleviate their suffering and hardship.

We are pleased that President Kennedy recognizes that the Federal Government must extend unemployment compensation benefits to those seeking work during this recession. We are disappointed, however, that his proposal is only temporary in character and affords no protection to the unlucky individual who may find himself in serious economic difficulty during future

recessions. I shall have more to say on this point a little later.

The President asked Congress to finance his temporary program by increasing the taxable wage base from $3,000 to $4,800. The Ways and Means Committee of the House rejected this request and amended the administration bill so that it now provides for a temporary increase in the present Federal unemployment tax of 3.1 percent for calendar years 1962 and 1963 to 3.5 percent. The committee action is in line with the method of financing called for by S. 5, but the tax jump the House group put in the administration bill is twice as high as the increase provided for in S. 5. Senator PROUTY and I think the Ways and Means Committee has chosen the proper method of financing an extended unemployment compensation benefit program. However, we question seriously the advisability of adding a 0.4 percent tax on all taxable employers at this time.

All things considered, Mr. President, the basic weakness of the administration bill is that it is temporary in character. What is needed now is a bill to establish a permanent standby program of extended unemployment compensation benefits which will give help to jobless workers in this recession and which will aid the unemployed man or woman during future periods of high-level unemployment.

A permanent standby program well considered in advance would be far better than a temporary system such as the administration proposes. Why do I say this?

By the time the T.U.C. law came into play in 1958 half of the jobless people were without unemployment compensation benefits. Now, that is what happened during the 1958 recession. What about the present problem? Secretary of Labor Goldberg has said that we have one-half a million insured unemployed who have no more rights to unemployment compensation under State laws. He also says that we will have at least another hundred thousand people in the same regrettable predicament by April 1.

The policy of trying to take care of critical situations after they arise is not only inhumane, it is bad economics. Economic recovery should be fostered when the first serious slowdown takes place. This would soften the blow and help to flatten out the economic sag.

Only 2 years have elapsed since the most recent recession. Is it realistic to enact a temporary program carrying a high tax increase on the assumption that there will be no other recession in the next 5 to 10 years? It is not realistic—and it is not fair—for Congress to say in effect to the unemployed breadwinner, "We know you have been out of a job for a long time and we know that you have no unemployment compensation money coming in under State law. We are going to see that you get some help and if, in the future, your cupboard gets bare, and you haven't any food for your family, we will think about your problem then. We hope after a few weeks or months we will figure out some solution for it." Mr. President, by perpetuating the practice of handling each recession on a patchwork basis we deny to poor families the barest necessities while the gears of Government get unstuck.

The junior Senator from Vermont, Mr. PROUTY, has long favored the enactment of a permanent program to provide standby benefits to supplement the regular unemployment insurance program. In March of 1958 he introduced H.R. 11634 which called for such a program. The bill was not acted upon by the Ways and Means Committee, but it did influence many States to take action. Shortly after its introduction six States enacted special unemployment benefit programs which come into operation during the recession period. They were California, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, North Carolina and Vermont.

The Republican members of the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems of the previous Congress rejected the notion that new unemployment compensation legislation should be enacted to fight each recession. They endorsed wholeheartedly a permanent standby program that will pay jobless workers benefits when they have exhausted compensation rights under State laws during periods of recession. Senator PROUTY and I were two of the Republican members on that committee. In the final report of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems the minority had this to say on page 170:

"The minority believes that, in the light of this recent past experience, it is a matter of elementary prudence to deliberately design and permanently incorporate in the laws of the country a program to supplement the regular unemployment insurance program at any time in the future when unemployment nationally increases beyond the level for which the regular program should be responsible."

The principal advantage of such a program is clear. During times of high prosperity when comparatively few people are without jobs, the program would be inactive, but as soon as the Secretary of Labor finds that unemployment rates have passed a certain level for a reasonable period of time, then the standby program comes into operation and gives both the economy and the jobless worker a boost. The person who is out of work and has a family to support could immediately receive a check to help tide him over each week that he is seeking employment. He would not have to wait 3 months for Congress to convene and then about another 3 months for Congress, after committee deliberations and floor debate, to produce a law. Already 2 months of this session have gone by and there is as yet no action.

By citing the examples which took place in the 1958 recession and which are taking place now, I think I have demonstrated why a permanent program of standby benefits is needed. I should now like to call your attention to the carefully drawn provisions of S. 5, which deal with the length of time that extended benefits would be paid during a period of recession.

Extended benefits would be paid under the Prouty-Scott bill up to a maximum for each claimant of an amount equal to 50 percent of the total amount of regular benefits which were payable to him pursuant to the State Unemployment Compensation Law under which he last exhausted his rights, or 13 times the claimant's weekly benefit amount, whichever is greater. Let me illustrate by example how the bill would work.

If a State law entitled a claimant to $40 a week for 28 weeks and the claimant exhausted his benefits, our bill would extend to him 14 additional weeks protection at the same rate of pay. If, however, a State law had a regular benefit period of less than 26 weeks and a worker exhausted his benefits, he would (under our Republican-sponsored high-level unemployment compensation bill) be entitled to 13 additional weeks at the normal compensation rate. This is true because S. 5 guarantees the individual (in case of recessions) 50 percent of what he was getting under State law or 13 weeks' protection whichever is greater.

This proposal gives much more help to unemployed men and women than the administration proposal. The administration bill calls for a maximum of 13 weeks and has a formula which makes it possible for the family in the worst economic fix to get the least amount of money. Let me show you what I mean.

The Kennedy bill, H.R. 4806, says that the duration of payments would be 50 percent of the duration of the benefits which were exhausted and in no event may exceed 13 weeks. What is a maximum in the Kennedy bill (13 weeks) is a minimum in the Prouty-Scott bill, S. 5.

Take the case of an individual who lives in one of the depressed areas. Jobs in his locale are hard to come by and he has been without work for many, many months. When he has been able to get employment it has usually been for a day or two at a time. This unlucky person wouldn't get much in the way of benefits under many State laws and when he exhausted his State benefits he would have to look to the Federal Government. What would the Kennedy bill do for him? Well, because of his sporadic work record in at least 15 to 20 States, he would be entitled to only the minimum period of benefits. This minimum could be as low as 10 weeks or perhaps lower. The individual exhausts his 10 weeks of State benefits and the Kennedy bill comes along and states that he is entitled to half of what he got under State law, or, in other words, 5 weeks more protection. Since 13 weeks is a minimum period in the Prouty-Scott bill, this same fellow who has been down on his luck would get the full 13 weeks of extended Federal benefits.

I think it would be a good idea now to see how the administration program would work in a progressive Commonwealth such as Pennsylvania, which provides 30 weeks of benefits to an individual who is unemployed. A recent release of the Ways and Means Committee indicates how little help the Kennedy bill provides for the unemployed worker in a progressive Commonwealth such as Pennsylvania. The committee release has this to say:

"In a case where a State has a duration of longer than 26 weeks, for example 30 weeks, the State is to be reimbursed for the number of weeks beyond 26 weeks (in this case, 4 weeks), and the unemployed worker would receive the remaining number of weeks up to 13 weeks, or 9 weeks in this case."

If a man in our Commonwealth is without work and exhausts his State benefits under the administration bill he would receive 9 weeks of Federal help. Under the Prouty-Scott bill, however, the same individual would be entitled to 15 weeks of supplementary benefits. Since the normal State benefit period is 30 weeks in Pennsylvania, a jobless breadwinner having exhausted his rights would be entitled to protection for half as long as the duration to which he was entitled under our statute. In other words, 15 weeks of benefits, 6 weeks longer than under the Kennedy administration bill.

Our proposal would encourage States to lengthen their periods of coverage. The better a State statute is, the more help the individual would get when his State benefits run out. I am afraid the same cannot be said of the administration proposal.

I was very pleased to learn that the Senate Finance Committee will hold hearings soon on unemployment compensation. If the committee reports the best bill possible, it will help materially in maintaining purchasing power within the local business community at the present time and in every future recession.

Of course, an unemployment compensation bill by and of itself will not end our present economic difficulties, but coupled with other measures it will lessen its duration and accelerate economic recovery. I urge my colleagues to examine S. 5 carefully. I think they will find it is one of the soundest and most humane items of legislation put forward at this session of Congress.

EDUCATION OF THE BLIND—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the

Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 361) to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instruction materials for the blind, and to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and to otherwise improve such act, which I introduced (for myself and Mr. COOPER) on January 11, 1961.

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

CARE OF IWO JIMA MEMORIAL BY AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] may be added, as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 872) vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Surabachi, Iwo Jima volcanic islands, Pacific Ocean area, which I introduced on February 9, 1961.

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

PROVISION FOR NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY AS A BUREAU OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION—ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL ARMED FORCES MUSEUM ADVISORY BOARD OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], be added as a cosponsor to Senate bill 1057, "to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution," and also to Senate bill 1058, "to establish a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution, to authorize expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes," at the next printing of these bills.

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

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1034), relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein and for other purposes, and that this bill be referred to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON FOREIGN POLICY STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold public hearings on two of its foreign policy studies on March 3 and 9, 1961, at 10:30 a.m., in room 4221, New Senate Office Building. The hearing on March 3 will deal with a study entitled "U.S. Foreign Policy—Western Europe," and a study on "Economic, Social, and Political Change in the Underdeveloped Countries and Its Implications for U.S. Foreign Policy" will be the subject of the hearing on March 9.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release which I have issued on this matter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, announced today that the committee has scheduled public hearings on March 3 and 9, 1961, at 10:30 a.m., in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, to receive testimony on two studies which were prepared for the committee in connection with its examination of U.S. foreign policy.

The hearing on March 3 will deal with a study entitled "U.S. Foreign Policy—Western Europe." This study was submitted by the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania. It explores the trends which may affect the economic, political, and security interests of the United States in Western Europe. It is also concerned with the effects of alternative courses of action by the United States upon these trends as well as the possible effects of Western European developments upon U.S. foreign policy.

The principal witness will be Mr. Robert Strausz-Hupé, director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute.

On March 9 the committee will hear testimony on "Economic, Social, and Political Change in the Underdeveloped Countries and Its Implications for U.S. Policy," a study prepared by the Center for International Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It examines the extent to which economic relations affect foreign policies and foreign policies affect economic relations. The study stresses the importance of utilizing the economic instruments which we have available for the purpose of bringing about orderly transitions in the underdeveloped societies.

The principal witness will be Mr. Max F. Millikan, director of the Center for International Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

From time to time the committee will announce additional hearings on studies prepared in connection with its examination of U.S. foreign policy. Senator FULBRIGHT said, "The purpose of holding public hearings on these studies is to receive testimony from interested parties prior to the preparation of a final report. In that way, it will be possible for the committee to test the soundness of the findings and recommendations in these studies before reaching its own conclusions and submitting its final report to the Senate."

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, several nominations have been received today which have been referred to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

These include our former colleague, Senator J. Allen Frear, Jr., of Delaware, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, for a term ending June 6, 1965; Mr. William Lucius Cary, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1961, and a second nomination to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a 5-year term ending June 5, 1966; Mr. Joseph P. McMurray, of New York, former staff director of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1961, and a second nomination to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for a 4-year term expiring June 30, 1965; and Mr. Charles M. Meriwether, of Alabama, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

This is to give notice that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on these nominations at 10 a.m., Thursday, March 2, 1961, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building. All persons wishing to testify on these nominations should notify Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 5304 New Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.—telephone Capital 4-3121, extension 3921—at the earliest possible date.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that, pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 115, 78th Congress, and House Resolution 194, 87th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and Mr. KYL, of Iowa, as members of the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, on the part of the House.

FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENGLE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For text of President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

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

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

By Mr. JACKSON:

Address entitled, "Lincoln: Lesson in Leadership," delivered by Senator CANNON

before the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Illinois legislative dinner, at Springfield, Ill., on February 14, 1961.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Address entitled "New Vitality for Rural America," delivered by Senator YOUNG of North Dakota to the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at Dallas, Tex., on February 13, 1961.

By Mr. MOSS:

Address entitled "Water Problems in the Eastern United States," delivered by Senator HART on February 10, 1961, before the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

Address entitled "Russia's New War Against Free Nations," delivered by Senator BYRD of West Virginia before the Ravenswood Junior Chamber of Commerce, Ravenswood, W. Va., on January 26, 1961.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

Editorial entitled "P.O. Crackdown on Filth in Mails," published in the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post of February 18.

NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT ON KASKASKIA RIVER WATERWAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was delighted to learn that at an enthusiastic meeting at Belleville, Ill., on Thursday, February 23, the substance of the bill which I introduced, bearing the number S. 520, had the endorsement of the Governor of Illinois. The Governor expressed himself in accord with this measure, and uttered the hope for early action on the authorization of the navigation improvement on the Kaskaskia River Waterway.

In my telegram to the meeting I stated:

FEBRUARY 23, 1961.

Mr. EMIL BURAGARD,
Care of Augustine's Restaurant,
Belleville, Ill.:

There is nothing better that I would like to do than to get away from Washington and visit with my friends in Belleville, but I find it impossible at this time, because of pressing matters on pending legislation. It is hard to say "No" to good friends, but my duties as minority leader of the Senate compel me to do so.

I esteem the Kaskaskia River navigation project one of the finest, most promising, with one of the greatest potentials of any with which it has been my privilege to work. This has been in the mill in my office for at least 5 years. The spadework has been done. The Army Engineers' report was excellent. Therefore, I thought it advisable to cut right through any doubts, delays, and redtape, and put the authorization for its construction squarely before the Congress. I can assure you that I shall work intensively to cover every base in order to secure favorable action.

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that with the backing of our distinguished new Governor, this matter can be pushed to an early consummation; and I shall be more than happy to cooperate in every possible way.

NEED FOR WIRETAP EVIDENCE LEGISLATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday, in the case of Pugach against Dollinger, the Supreme Court again affirmed that wiretap evidence obtained by State police officers under State law is admissible in State criminal proceedings. The Court originally so ruled in 1952; and in this latest case the Court has simply added, with a one-sentence opinion that the Federal courts may not enjoin State officials from introducing in State criminal proceedings, State-obtained wiretap evidence. But while the Pugach case deals only with one isolated problem in the law of wiretap evidence, it prompts one to reflect on the general state of this law. To say the least, it is chaotic. Thus, wiretap evidence obtained by State officials is admissible in State criminal proceedings. It is not admissible in Federal proceedings, however, whether it is obtained by Federal or by State law-enforcement officials. And while State officials may introduce in State criminal proceedings wiretap evidence obtained under State law, they do so at the risk of prosecution for violation of section 605 of the Federal Communications Act. If convicted, the penalty could be a fine of $10,000 and imprisonment for 1 year. But here, too, the law is unsettled, for there is considerable debate as to whether both wire interception and divulgence of the fruits of that interception are necessary before one is in violation of section 605 of the Federal Communication Act, or whether interception alone constitutes a violation.

The need for wiretapping by both Federal and State and local law-enforcement officers, to assist in the investigation and prosecution of serious and heinous crimes and sustained criminal activity, has been amply testified to over the years. This need can be met only by comprehensive legislation. The courts cannot be relied upon to meet this need, for the courts must perforce deal only with isolated problems as they arise in isolated cases, and cannot deal with the matter comprehensively.

As matters stand now, the law in this area is simply a crazy patchwork quilt. It is, therefore, my intention to introduce, for the consideration of the Congress, a bill that will legalize wiretapping by Federal officials and wiretapping by State officials acting under State law.

But while we must recognize the need of society to protect itself against serious crime, we must at the same time acknowledge the right of the individual to be protected against unwarranted search and invasion of his privacy. A comprehensive statute would enable Congress to do this. While granting law-enforcement officials the right to intercept and divulge wire communications, the bill would also control wiretapping, to prevent abuse and to protect the rights of individuals.

First, the sort of bill I have in mind would permit wiretapping by Federal officials only upon the issuance of a court order, and would establish the minimum standards under which a court would be empowered to issue a wiretapping order. And the bill would require State laws authorizing wiretapping by State officials to meet the same standards. Second, it would limit the right of wiretapping to serious crimes only—to prevent any possibility of indiscriminate indulgence in wiretapping. Third, it would make wiretapping evidence obtained in violation of the statute inadmissible in any court. Finally, it would establish the requirement that law-enforcement officials report periodically their resort to wiretapping. The mere existence of such a requirement will assist in deterring any abuse of the right of wiretapping, and will permit the Congress to determine what changes, if any, are required on the basis of experience with the law.

It is my firm conviction that only new, comprehensive legislation that meets the legitimate needs of Federal and State law-enforcement officials, and at the same time establishes the necessary controls to prevent abuse, can bring the sort of sense to the law of wiretapping that American society requires today.

LET US TEACH OUR STUDENTS ABOUT COMMUNISM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it has long been my feeling that courses about the nature and tactics of international communism should be taught in our schools and colleges. In this way our young people could be informed about this great threat to our way of life, and would be better prepared to combat it.

The New York Daily News has been a stanch supporter of this idea for many years, and in a recent editorial reiterated its strong stand. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TEACH 'EM ABOUT COMMUNISM

The American Bar Association's board of governors endorses, and hopes the ABA's house of delegates next week will adopt, a resolution urging courses on communism in U.S. schools and colleges.

The aim is to alert young Americans, from their early years, to the nature of the Communist enemy—an enemy which they may quite conceivably be forced to combat throughout their adult lives.

We can think of no more desirable addition to the usual courses of school and college instruction, and hope to see the idea put into nationwide practice before long.

NATURAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, my colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE] has addressed himself to the theories underlying the President's brilliant message to the Congress in regard to education. I should like to invite the attention of this body to another of the President's messages. The first message was on human resources, and the one to which I make reference was on natural resources. Both are important in our system.

In this regard, Mr. President, I refer to a very outstanding column which was published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, written by America's distinguished political pundit, Mr. Walter Lippmann. The essential point of Mr. Lippmann's comments is one which I think needs to be weighed very carefully and meticulously by the Members of this body and the people at large.

The article states not that we ought to conserve our resources, since everybody agrees we should, but rather that we should readjust our thinking about how to pay for the conservation of these resources. Mr. Lippmann correctly points out the confusion which exists in the public mind.

If we do something with regard to the natural resources of this country, it is popularly described as "spending," but if we do something with regard to the private resources in our country, it is regarded as "investment."

Unless and until we can apply the same standards on all fronts we shall continue to suffer from this contradiction of terms.

As Mr. Lippmann suggests, the prejudice in the public mind is borne out in the simple reference to "spending."

For example, the money which we spend privately to make automobiles is regarded as a prudent investment, but the money which we spend publicly to build highways, so that the people may drive their cars around the country, is regarded as reckless spending.

The money which we spend to build public hospitals is regarded as reckless spending and socialistic, although the money we spend to build plants which are used to produce drugs, for administering to patients in hospitals, is regarded as a private investment of a most worthwhile sort in the interest of humanity.

If money is appropriated for a public park, from funds of the Government, its use is regarded as "reckless spending," but if a new movie house is built, that is regarded as a wise private investment.

I could perhaps carry this a step further by suggesting that when the Congress appropriates money to develop the timber resources of the land for recreational and business interests, it is chalked up as mere spending, even though a substantial portion of the income to our Government comes from the businesses which derive their profits from pursuit of the same timber industry.

Perhaps we could consider the question of reclamation development in the West. A case in point is the Seedskadee project in Wyoming. In regard to the project, we shall have to appropriate, and have agreed to authorize, $35 million, or $36 million, for the development of some stream dams which will provide electric power and reclamation, as well as recreational values. Thirty-four million dollars of the total will be repaid from actual charges, yet in the public mind this is a $36 million spending item without any return being accorded.

This brings into focus how important it is for the Congress to consider once again the wisdom of using a capital budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column written by Mr. Lippmann be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 28, 1961]

TODAY AND TOMORROW: A MATTER OF SEMANTICS

(By Walter Lippmann)

After the message on education, which is concerned with people, we had a message last week on the conservation and development of our natural resources. It is concerned with the lands and the forests of America, with the minerals and fuels beneath them, with the air and with the water, the river valleys and the oceans.

The message itself does not contain a legislative program. It is rather a kind of ordered summary and panorama of what in the years ahead needs doing about our natural environment.

There is almost no one, I imagine, who would care to argue that the objectives laid down are false ones, and that the actions indicated should not be taken. No serious person, for example, would say that there is no water problem, particularly in the West. Or say that a planned, rather than a haphazard and helter-skelter, development of the great river valleys is a wrong thing to do. Or say that the pollution of the streams and of the air is not worth worrying about. Or that the erosion of the soil and the destruction of the forests do not concern us. And so on and so on from research in the desalting of the sea water to the setting aside of recreation areas.

Nor will there be many to deny, I think, that the conservation of our natural resources is a primary interest of the Nation as a whole, an acknowledged national interest since the founding of the Republic. The States have a great and essential role to play. But the leadership, the planning, and the coordination can come only from the Federal Government. The boundaries of the States do not coincide with the boundaries of nature.

This is in no sense an innovation by President Kennedy on the New Frontier. It has been established American policy since the States on the Atlantic Ocean began to break through the old frontiers.

The real problem posed by the message is not about the national interest, or about the constitutional principle of Federal leadership. It is how such large and varied measures are to be financed. Over the years the conservation of our natural resources will cost a great deal of money.

The President's message refers to this problem and says that "wise investment in a resource program today will return vast dividends tomorrow, and failures to act now may be opportunities lost forever." But since the message is a map of the country that is to be traveled over and is not an inventory of specific measures to be taken, it does not discuss the financial support of the programs which are still to come.

By the time these programs come into effect, the administration expects, so I understand, not only to have overcome the present recession. It expects also, say in about 2 years, to be achieving a higher rate of growth—to achieve it by reducing unemployment from over 6 percent of the labor force to about 4 percent—which would be noninflationary full employment. At this higher rate of economic activity, the wealth produced this year would be some $40 billion greater than it is. The revenues from this increase at present tax rates would be an additional $10 billion. This would be ample to finance the strengthening of the national defense, aid to education, the resources program, and the welfare measures.

We cannot, of course, be sure that these expectations will be fulfilled. If they are not, the essential needs, defense, education, and the like, will have to be financed by higher taxes. But with good luck, particularly in preventing a much greater international crisis than we now have today, it is quite within the capacity of the American economy to support a rising standard of public and of private consumption. We have the labor, the industrial skill, the management, the know-how, and the research to do it.

But along with all that, there will have to go a certain reeducation of American public opinion. More exactly, the reeducation will mean the clearing away of the confusion which clusters about the highly charged words "spending" and "investment."

There is, for example, the notion that the public authorities at any government level never invest. They only spend. On the other hand, private corporations and private individuals not only spend but also invest. This leads to the blind prejudice that since governments can only spend, whatever money they use tends to be wasted. On the other hand, whenever private corporations or individuals invest, that is a good thing and a public benefit.

This prejudicial use of words confuses public opinion: (1) The money spent privately to make automobiles is prudent investment; but the money spent publicly to build the roads for the automobiles is spending; (2) the money to build a public hospital is spending; but the money to build plants to make the drugs that are dispensed is investment; (3) if a public park is made, that is spending. If a new movie house is built, that is investment.

This semantic muddle inhibits clear thinking about public questions. The truth is that there is private spending and private investment and some of it is good and some is not so good and some of it is bad. There is also public spending and public investment, and some of it is good and some of it is not so good and some of it is bad.

It takes good judgment to spend and invest wisely, be it publicly or privately. But that kind of judgment cannot be made at all if we react, like Pavlov's dogs, to the prejudiced sound of words.

WHITHER CIVIL DEFENSE?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Americans should not tolerate waste, inefficiency, and ineptness in matters upon which their very survival depends. They are entitled to know the truth about our muddled civil defense as it has been handled by highly paid officials of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. Taxpayers should receive their money's worth.

To do otherwise would be to lull the taxpayers of this Nation into a maginotline feeling of security regarding civil defense at a time when millions of their tax dollars are being spent to perpetuate a boondoggling, superannuated Civil Defense Agency.

Our people whose homes and lives are threatened should know the truth—the cold, hard facts of survival in a nuclear war. We, as their elected representatives, are duty bound to provide the Nation with a sane, sound, realistic civil defense program.

After 10 years of civil defense planning, the Government's ability to protect Americans is even more ineffective than when it began. It is time that we face the issue of survival in the thermonuclear age squarely and take realistic steps toward doing something about it.

In one of his first actions as President of the United States, President Kennedy

indicated his doubts as to the present effectiveness of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. In appointing the new Director of this Agency, he asked for a thorough review of plans and functions of this agency.

Mr. President, to supplement the President's action, I introduced Senate Resolution 79 calling for the establishment of a select committee of the Senate to investigate completely our present civil defense program and to recommend remedial legislation.

Civil defense today is a myth. An excellent editorial, "Whither Civil Defense?" was published in the Toledo Blade, one of the Nation's great newspapers, on February 16, 1961. Paul Block, Jr., publisher of this outstanding newspaper, has again shown his keen awareness of the civil defense fiasco. At one point the editorial states:

Perhaps the best civilian defense approach that could be adopted these days would be a broadside of full information and facts on modern war techniques—not with the idea of frightening the country into a complete state of resignation or apathy, but to draw forth intelligent discussions from which could emerge a sane and sensible defense program.

Mr. President, civil defense is a part of our total defense. As such, it should be under the direction of those who know most about the defense—the leaders of our Military Establishment. Coupled with this, we should inaugurate a vigorous and continuing campaign of education on self-protection in a nuclear war using all media of communication at our command—television, radio, newspapers, magazines, and our schools.

This editorial convincingly points out the absurdity of present programs and the need for thorough public investigation and discussion of this vital problem. I commend this to my colleagues in the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

WHITHER CIVIL DEFENSE?

In seeking a thorough inquiry into the state of civil defense efforts, such as they are, Senator STEVE YOUNG is touching on an area in which he has become something of an expert. Not an expert advocate of civil defense as we know it today, but rather an astute critic who has taken a dim view of sirens, signs, and shelter programs that have been promulgated over the past 10 years in the name of civil defense.

The Senator, who wants a congressional investigation of what has been accomplished in this field, summed up an impression held by a considerable number of observers when he said, "Civil defense plans suffer from a bad case of schizophrenia." He's so right, and it is going to take a massive dose of commonsense and informed leadership to straighten it out.

At one time or another, the populace has been advised to evacuate our cities upon attack, remain in cities but head for shelters, head for open spaces but stay off principal highways being used by civil defense officials, and so forth. Confronted by all the confusing and contradictory mishmash over how to behave when a nuclear warhead explodes—assuming we have time—the average citizen hardly knows what to do.

One basic difficulty lies in the fact that there has been no explicit determination by the Government of what is the best way to have civilian population in an all-out attack. Or even, possibly, that we should be so much more concerned about nuclear attacks than about other types known to exist—notably biological or chemical.

There has been precious little public discussion of what this country is doing, what others are doing, or what the population ought to do to meet the threats posed by nonnuclear but equally insidious forms of attack. There are only vague references to nerve gas, poisoning water supplies, or infecting all crops and livestock.

The public, in fact, has been inadequately prepared even to think of or discuss such eventualities.

Perhaps the best civilian defense approach that could be adopted these days would be a broadside of full information and facts to modern war techniques—not with the idea of frightening the country into a complete state of resignation or apathy, but to draw forth intelligent discussions from which could emerge a sane and sensible defense program.

If the Senate Armed Services Committee agrees to push an investigation of civil defense, we can think of no better man to head it than Senator YOUNG. And should he get the assignment, the country can be assured that civil defense will get the intensive airing it needs.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the President's message to the Congress on natural resources was a realistic appraisal of the problems facing the Nation in developing our rivers, streams, forests, and parks to meet the needs of both today and the future. We have been marking time for the last 8 years in many areas of natural resource development and the implementation of the President's program will be more difficult and costly for that reason. Simple problems have become complex problems after 8 years of delay and inaction. The President's program properly takes the long-range approach to conservation problems with the recognition that we owe an obligation to future generations to manage the Nation's resources as a prudent trustee would manage a trust fund. In the future we shall be called to account for our trusteeship, and I hope that our efforts will not be found to be wanting.

I wish to discuss briefly one phase of our conservation activities which has been long neglected. The small watershed program, authorized by the Congress in 1954, is an integral part of our soil and water conservation program. Although the watershed program has been in operation only a few years, its value to the overall conservation program is well established. This is a program which should be expedited, and I hope that additional funds will be provided for it both in the current and in the next fiscal year. A speedup in this program would provide immediate and permanent benefits to our economy.

Water has become the limiting factor of industrial growth in communities throughout the Nation. It is common knowledge that industry will not locate in any area which does not offer an adequate supply of pure water, safety from floods, and recreational facilities for employees. Grants of land, tax benefits, financial aid, availability of labor—none of these will bring an industry to a community that cannot supply water in abundance. Management and full utilization of natural resources is essential to the prosperity and growth of any community.

The Congress recognized that truth when it authorized the small watershed program. It recognized, too, that the Federal Government's proper role is to help the people help themselves. The concept of the small watershed program is that development and management of community natural resources is the responsibility of the community, and that the Federal obligation is to provide technical and financial assistance in helping the local people develop and carry out their own programs of watershed development. Small watershed projects are local projects, not Federal projects. Local people initiate, help pay for, manage, and maintain these projects.

The small watershed program is effective. In the few years the program has been in operation many communities have demonstrated that they can stop periodic destructive floods, supply water for growing municipal needs, and attract new industries. Watershed projects also halt unchecked soil erosion and excessive water runoff on agricultural lands, and enables reforestration of unproductive slopes for future managed timber harvesting. I am personally familiar with one of the most outstanding examples of the small watershed programs, the Six-Mile Creek watershed project in Franklin and Logan Counties in my own State. This project was chosen as watershed project of the year in 1960 by the National Watershed Congress.

In this project, local citizens assisted by the Soil Conservation Service have built 24 floodwater retarding dams, improved 28 miles of channel, and largely completed all planned land treatment measures.

As a direct result of this work, three new industrial plants, manufacturing combs, hosiery, and bowling equipment, have located in the watershed. These industries represent an investment of more than $3 million and employ about 650 people. The towns of Charleston and Booneville have a new water supply for municipal and industrial use. Farmers in the watershed now have greater opportunities to improve their income through better land use, stabilized soil, and water conservation.

The popularity of this program is indicated by the fact that more than 1,400 local communities have applied for assistance in developing small watershed projects. These applications have been screened and approved by the various State governments.

To date only a few more than 600, or less than half the applicants, have been authorized to receive planning help. Only 293 of the communities which have applied have been authorized to begin operations and to receive Federal help in the installation of land treatment measures and the construction of floodwater retarding dams.

Fifty-one applications for assistance have been received from Arkansas, of which only 17 have been approved for planning assistance. Thirty-four communities which have applied have not received any help at all. Of the 17 for which planning assistance was provided, only 9 have been approved for construction aid.

Congress has been friendly to this program. The Committees on Agriculture and Forestry and Public Works have been diligent about approving projects. The members of these committees and the Appropriations Committee are well aware of the importance of watershed development. But budget requests for this program have not been realistic. What has been done is good, but not nearly enough has been done. I quote from a report by the Kennedy-Johnson Natural Resources Advisory Committee:

Few resource programs can directly benefit as many States at so small a relative cost as the small watershed program. Beneficiaries of this program are not only farmers, but millions of people in towns and cities. The recreational potential, largely unmeasured, will be invaluable to many more millions in the large urban areas. It could be one of the prime forces in bringing lasting help to economically depressed areas.

Already local organizations have applied for help in some 1,400 watersheds containing about 100 million acres of land. Applications are falling off, however, because of the timelag before projects can be reached with the present limited planning funds.

Administration policy should include the following objectives:

(1) A goal of 2,000 watersheds completed or under construction by 1968.

(2) Completion by 1968 of the original pilot watersheds.

(3) Provision of adequate loan funds for local organizations.

(4) Organization of future years' budgets so that resource conservation programs will be separated from unrelated activities. The small watershed program has been handicapped by competing for funds with the many other activities of the Department of Agriculture. It should be considered in relation to related programs of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and other public works activities.

I concur in the recommendations of the Committee, and I hope that they will be accepted as administration policy.

President Kennedy, in a statement issued during the campaign last fall, indicated a knowledge and understanding of the small watershed program, as well as a desire to expedite this important work.

These developments indicate that the climate with respect to moving ahead in the development of our small watersheds is improving.

The small watershed program is a going program. It has a backlog of work which can be implemented with a minimum of delay. Communities all over the Nation that have been waiting for the Federal Government to live up to its part of the bargain are ready and anxious to get started. Watershed work plans have been developed and need only Federal funds to be translated into contracts and construction jobs. A speedup of this program would be an ideal vehicle for stimulating the economy.

I hope that the administration will request supplemental appropriations from the Congress to move forward with this program in connection with the plan to expedite public works projects.

There should be an increase in funds for planning in the coming fiscal year so that we can maintain an accelerated timetable for this work. More planning money means that more projects can get started the following year, if construction funds are available.

In order to proceed at an optimum rate there should also be a substantial increase in construction funds in fiscal 1962.

I also suggest that revisions be made in the present method of benefit-cost analysis for resource development projects, as recommended by the Natural Resources Advisory Committee.

Under existing policy, only those benefits which can be expressed in dollars are given any significant weight in project formulation. Social needs and intangible values are not taken into consideration in feasibility studies. The result of this approach tends to concentrate benefits in the most economically favorable places rather than to disperse them widely throughout the river basins. Current procedures in fact tend to favor the economically affluent areas of the country to the disadvantage of the economically depressed or underdeveloped areas. If this policy is continued it will result in maintenance of the status quo rather than development and enhancement of resource potentials required to meet the needs of 1980 and 2000.

In the last Congress I cosponsored the bill introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] which would have established a badly needed congressional policy on water resources development. I was pleased to note in the President's natural resources message that he has ordered a reevaluation of current feasibility standards. I hope that this will lead to a substantial revision of the existing criteria.

We need to promote growth of smaller communities and greater dispersal of industries to areas where water resources are still undeveloped. Great potential for economic progress exists in the rural areas and upstream watersheds of our country. An aggressive water resource development program to establish opportunities for part-time employment in conjunction with part-time farming would materially aid in building up the economy of underdeveloped rural areas.

An expansion of the small watershed program will have an immediate favorable impact on our faltering economy, and will also provide immeasurable permanent benefits to our citizens and future generations. It is a readymade program that requires no tooling up, no longtime working out of procedures, no exhaustive surveys. It can be expanded rapidly. I hope that both the Congress and the administration will be generous in their treatment of the program this session.

THE 1940–41 MONTANA STATE COLLEGE ALL-ALL-AMERICAN FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, all of us recall, in our reading of the exploits of the Vikings, that every now and then occurred what was known as a saga. A saga was an extraordinary exploit, sometimes involving one man and sometimes a group of men.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a modern saga which occurred during the Second World War, at which time 13 members of the 1940–41 Montana State College football team gave their lives. They have since been honored by having their names engraved on a bronze plaque. We think this is one of the finest gestures of the century on the part of the Montana Sports Hall of Fame.

It is most unfortunate that many of the American boys who have given their lives for their country have been fine athletes, such as these men were, and we think that it is fitting and proper to have named the Montana State College football team of 1940–41 the "All-All-American Team." Most of these boys were personal friends of mine. All but one came from the State of Montana. They were all members of the first string. I believe this is the only instance in the history of our Nation in which an entire athletic team laid down their lives on behalf of their country.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Montana Standard of Butte, Mont., dated October 6, 1960, entitled, "All-All-American—The Men Who Gave Their Lives in War," and including the names of this All-All-American Football Team of 1940–41 and the towns from which they came.

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

ALL-ALL-AMERICAN—THE MEN WHO GAVE THEIR LIVES IN WAR

The 13 members of the 1940–41 Montana State football team who gave their lives in World War II have been honored by having their names engraved on a bronze plaque. We think this was one of the finest gestures of the century on the part of the Montana Sports Hall of Fame.

It is most unfortunate that many of the American boys who have given their lives for their country have been fine athletes such as these men were. And we think that it is fitting and proper to have named the Montana State College team of 1940–41 the All-All American team.

We note that at almost all of our sports contests the national anthem is accompanied by the raising of the flag. This is a most appropriate gesture in honor of the Nation's athletes who have served their country patriotically in peace and war. But it is most unfortunate that many people do not seem to know the significance of this gesture.

In recent years the word "patriotism" has fallen in esteem. We think it has been the victim of a smear. It seems that it is perfectly right for other peoples to be patriotic to their country. But it is not right for Americans to be patriotic. We think this is wrong. Patriotism is a fine thing. It is something we should be proud of. Most surely, if we lose our patriotism, we will lose our country.

So each time we hear our national anthem or see Old Glory being raised toward the skies, we should think of these men whose names have been engraved on a bronze plaque and we should remember that many another name of a war victim has been engraved on someone's heart.

Here are the men—the All-All American football team of 1940–41: Dana Bradford, Townsend; W. D. Coey, Deer Lodge; John C. Hall, Bozeman; John F. Burke Jr., Anaconda; Joseph T. McGeever, Anaconda; Alton Zemple, Fairfield; Newell T. Berg, Cosolt, Idaho; Bernard Cluzen, Lone Pine; Carl R. Fye, Butte; John Phelan, Butte; Richard Roman Jr., Bozeman; Wendell Scabad, Glendive; and Oran Beller, Victor.

LIBERAL'S VIEW OF SIT-IN DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, when the so-called sit-in demonstrations began about a year ago, I undertook to point out that the participants were acting in violation of the law of the land as established by an unbroken line of judicial decisions reaching to the Supreme Court as well as of numerous valid State statutes. In my remarks to the Senate on this matter, I stated:

> It is interesting to see our sanctimonious brethren who denounced the white South for violating the law of the land for opposing the decision in the Brown case vigorously applauding and urging on the thousands of Negro college students in their organized campaign to violate property rights as clearly defined and established by decisions of the same courts.

During the past year, many so-called liberals who were quick to condemn and denounce the slightest criticism of the school integration decision have sung a different tune with respect to outright law violations in the so-called sit-ins. To them, the question of supporting or violating the law of the land appears to be a matter of whose ox is being gored.

This amazing double standard which some so-called liberals apply to the law was the subject of an incisive editorial column written by W. D. Workman, a noted South Carolina reporter and author who covers the Southern scene for a number of papers. Mr. Workman's column sweeps away the sham and exposes the hypocrisy of those bleeding hearts who prate about the law of the land on the one hand, but advocate its violation on the other.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Workman's column which appeared in the February 25 edition of the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

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

LIBERALS TWIST LOGIC IN REVERSAL OF THEIR SENTIMENT ABOUT BOYCOTTS

(By William D. Workman)

Boycott a Negro, and be a heel. Boycott a white man, and wear a halo. This is the twisted logic of today's professional liberals.

'Tis a ludicrous spectacle, this business of trying to apply reverse English to the pious preachments against economic pressures. It was not long ago that the integrationists and fellow travelers were raising the roof about the "unfair, un-American, and un-Christian" treatment of Negroes who were being subjected to boycotts.

But now the Negroes are themselves applying the boycotts through sit-in demonstrations, pickets, and pressure—and a new set of lyrics is being fashioned to the race-mixing melody.

Nowhere is this lyrical about-face more apparent than in the psalm book of the southern "moderates," a little monthly publication bearing the misleading title, "New South."

Copious tears were shed in this crying towel of the Southern Regional Council when white persons began retaliating against those Negroes who sought to force their way into white educational religious and civic circles. The laments continued when white farmers in Tennessee decided they could forgo the services of the Negro tenants.

But all this weeping and wailing has made it difficult to justify the same kind of pressure now being applied against white merchants, who now are being victimized by organized Negro boycotts. The changed situation called for a reversal of propaganda, and it must be admitted that the liberals have proved equal to the task.

Let us take, for example, one of the chief psalmists of race mixing in the South, Marion A. Wright, of North Carolina, vice president of the Southern Regional Council.

In November of 1957, after the citizens of Little Rock had shown defiance of Federal court orders to integrate Central High School, Mr. Wright was aghast at this "disrespect for law."

Southern political leaders in general were charged by Mr. Wright with "evasion and subterfuge" in failing to carry out Federal school integration decrees. He observed:

"Suffice it to say that the objectives of all of them is to abet and encourage the citizen to fail in his first duty—observe the law. * * * Now, our political leaders without exception deplore violence. * * * They have no truck with the Ku Klux Klan. But my contention is that they set in motion forces which bred the Klan and the very violence they now condemn. What they advocate, in essence, is disrespect for law. They choose to limit such advocacy to one law—that relating to the public schools. But when you enter the area of disrespect there is no such thing as a limited infection. It spreads."

Then, with heavy sarcasm, Mr. Wright asked:

"What right have they to tell me what laws I shall observe? They choose to flout school law. I may, with as much right, choose to flout the law which protects life and property of the men who disagree with me."

Mr. Wright was more prophetic than he intended to be. Today, he is seriously, and without sarcasm, urging the flouting of laws which protect those who disagree with him.

Let's see what he says in the latest issue of New South about breach of the peace laws by sit-in demonstrators:

"The doctrine of nonviolent civil disobedience is an honored one in this country. It, of course, does not mean that a man has a right to disobey any law he does not like. But he has the right peaceably to protest against laws which offend his religion or conscience, or which place upon him burdens from which his fellow citizens are exempt."

This line of reasoning, if it can be so described, was never invoked by Mr. Wright in behalf of the myriad white southerners who find compulsory race mixing offensive to their religion and conscience.

But listen further to Mr. Wright in 1961:

"To refuse to submit (to offensive laws) is the direct and practical means of testing the law or custom by which one is penalized. So long as he (the Negro) submits there can be no test."

Very well, Mr. Wright. You favor pressuring the owners of stores who prefer a white clientele. You take your stand for sit-in demonstrations, and you call it injustice for store owners to be selective in the class of persons he serves. In your view, all justice rests with the agitator, and none with the proprietor.

The store owner who faces loss of white patronage, and incurs economic ruin thereby, merits none of your sympathy. "Serves him right," you would say.

But do you remember saying this in 1957: "Everyone deserves protection in the exercise of his rights. We should inform our police officials that they have our full support in guarding the persons and property of Negro children and parents involved, and that they will be held accountable for failure to do so."

Would you, Mr. Wright, in the interest of fairplay and impartial justice, substitute the words "white proprietors" for "Negro children and parents" in your earlier pronouncement?

AIR SERVICE IN WEST VIRGINIA; AMERICAN AIRLINES COMMENDED; LAKE CENTRAL BEGINS FLIGHTS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on this date an airline which has served West Virginia well for many years will cease its flights in and out of certain airports in our State. I refer to American Airlines. At two community service points, American is being replaced by a local service carrier, Lake Central Airlines, new to West Virginia. American Airlines will continue, however, to serve our people through the Kanawha Airport at Charleston.

With American Airlines service ceasing in my home community of Elkins, and also in the Parkersburg trading area, I rise today to express gratefulness for the service which that airline has performed for those two sections for a period of approximately a quarter of a century.

To those who live in the metropolitan areas of the country, the figure I state will not be impressive. I live in a public-spirited city in the mountains of West Virginia with a population of some 10,000 persons.

When American Airlines began its flights east and west in West Virginia, it was a development which was significant and heartening to us.

In the interim more than 180,000 commercial passengers have either arrived at or departed from the Elkins-Randolph County Airport.

It is appropriate, too, that I indicate the important part American Airlines has had in the industrial development of West Virginia through the extension of air transportation. Its service likewise has helped to strengthen the economy of our State and the well-being of our citizenry.

American personnel, both in the offices and among the flight crews, have been courteous and efficient. There has been reliability and safety of aircraft operation. And, too, there has been cooperation between the carrier and the communities served.

I personally called C. R. Smith, president of American Airlines, and thanked him for the valuable contributions his company has made in service to Elkins and Parkersburg. I recall the visit Mr. Smith, a veteran in air transport leadership, made to our community in the 1930's. In an address to the Rotary

Club, he explained informatively the challenge of the air age. I trust this note of nostalgia is not inappropriate. Sometimes we forget the debt we owe to those who pioneer and bring needed progress to our Nation and its communities.

Now, although we lose part of the air transportation service of an old and trusted corporate friend of flight, the pattern of both intrastate and interstate service in West Virginia will be extended. Lake Central Airlines will replace American Airlines at Elkins and Parkersburg, and also serve other communities. Eastern Airlines, a trunk carrier, will continue to serve Charleston and Huntington.

Allegheny Airlines and Piedmont Airlines, two other fine local service firms, will likewise continue to provide the transportation of passengers, contribute to the shipment of express and freight, and the carrying of mail by air in West Virginia.

New services north and south, as well as east and west, will weld our interests closer together. Greater frequency of flights will be most beneficial.

Daily scheduled flight service now is available generally linking Elkins, Clarksburg - Fairmont, Morgantown, Wheeling, Parkersburg, Huntington, Charleston, Beckley, Bluefield, and contiguous areas.

We are hopeful that the eastern area of our State, through the Martinsburg Airport, will likewise be provided with daily air transportation service.

The communities and the air carriers have a mutual responsibility on our new and productive frontiers of flight.

YUL BRYNNER DESCRIBES WORLD REFUGEE YEAR ON CBS PROGRAM "RESCUE"

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, television's ability to arouse our concern for a serious human problem of truly worldwide proportions was magnificently shown by the CBS reports program "Rescue"—a study of the World Refugee Year. The stage and screen actor, Mr. Yul Brynner, served as principal narrator for this program, assisted by the distinguished newscaster, Edward R. Murrow, recently appointed to head our U.S. Information Agency.

The theme of the program is summed up in Mr. Brynner's comments:

> You cannot turn your back on people who are rotting away and who have been rotting away in camps for 10, 15 years, through no fault of theirs.

The program also demonstrates that refugees make great contributions to their foster homelands. The roster of men of genius, of our greatest Americans, who stem from refugee origins is long and honorable.

There remain today scattered around the world more than 15 million refugees who have been displaced or evicted from their homelands by the ravages of war or other disaster. They live in camps, in tents, in rude shacks, in primitive conditions at cruelly low standards of life. They are a symbol of man's inhumanity to man, and they should deeply concern all of us. The CBS program "Rescue" linked to the World Refugee Year, reminds us of this concern, even as it jogs our conscience. The program was sponsored by Phillip Morris, Inc., and the producers were Gene De Poris and Fred W. Friendly.

I ask unanimous consent that the script of this program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CBS REPORTS—RESCUE WITH YUL BRYNNER

(As broadcast over the CBS television network, Saturday, December 10, 1960)

Mr. BRYNNER. This is the story of a rescue, of two rescues—one involving an orchestra, a symphony without a country, and a family without a country—both of them caught up in the whirlwind of man's inhumanity to man. This is the story of an airplane—a kind of *Mayflower* of the air age—and of another girl, an Anne Frank of the cold war. It is the story of a band of brothers whose music served the cause of freedom by serving the cause of art. All the characters in this drama are real except for one actor, who would hope that tonight he might be accepted as something else than a poor player, who in the words of Shakespeare, "struts and frets his hour upon the stage and then is heard no more."

ANNOUNCER. And now to introduce "CBS Reports," here is Edward R. Murrow.

Mr. MURROW. Good evening. I'm Ed Murrow. The United Nations asked Yul Brynner to use his fame, his talents, and his five languages to spotlight World Refugee Year as proclaimed by the United Nations. Brynner asked us to help him. This is a result.

Mr. BRYNNER. This pattern of chairs, a tradition from Beethoven to Bernstein, is the seating arrangement for a symphony orchestra. These seats are for musicians who, 5 years ago, played with the Budapest Symphony and other fine orchestras in Hungary. Then, in October 1956, there was an uprising in Hungary—thousands were dead, and there were 200,000 more refugees and displaced persons in the world. This year, the people of the city of Marl, in the rich German Ruhr, asked the Hungarian musicians, who had banded together into a displaced person's symphony, to make Marl their home. Something more than civic significance was expressed by the mayor of Marl, who with one eye on culture, one on German history, welcomed them.

When I, as a German from Germany at this time, talk about this problem, I am aware that our own very special, historical past should make us remember. History also will judge us one day—according to how we carried out our own responsibility with the beginning and solution of the refugee problem.

You have before you a group, which tonight becomes your orchestra. The Philharmonia Hungarica. As you know, for 3 years they wandered all over the world—as refugees; as musicians; as human beings. What united them was their love of freedom and a love of music. Tonight, their wandering ends because you, the people of Marl, have given them a home. I know it will serve as a shining example to communities all over the world of the very spirit of the World Refugee Year as it was proclaimed by the United Nations. And now let me read you the preamble to the United Nations Charter.

"We, the people of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith and fundamental human rights, and the dignity and worth of the human person, and the equal rights of men and women, and nations, large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life and larger freedom, and for these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods that armed force shall not be used save in the common interest, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all people, have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims."

That preamble to the United Nations Charter is as eloquent as anything that man has ever put down on paper, but the echo of the words "to promote social progress and better standards and larger freedom," spoken against the orchestra, makes one suddenly conscious that all the problems "created by the scourge of two wars in one lifetime" have not been solved as quickly or dramatically as those of that orchestra. When the United Nations was formed in 1945, there were 30 million displaced persons—refugees. There are still 15 million. What are 15 million people? They are a statistic as big as London and New York together—bigger than the Congo, or Norway, Denmark, and Sweden combined. What, then, is a single, displaced person? Journey with us to a displaced persons' camp near Linz, Austria. If the name "Linz" is familiar, it's because the Mauthausen concentration camp was near here and it was Hitler's and Eichmann's hometown.

This is a typical corridor of one of the barracks in a refugee camp. This camp, like hundreds of other refugee camps all over Europe, was intended as a temporary dwelling for refugees while they wait to be admitted by a country where they hope to emigrate, settle, and start a new life. The tragedy, here, is that many of them have been waiting for 5 and 10 and even 15 years. During this period they were cared for but many of them were not able to get work. After a few years of waiting, their hopes dwindle and the inactivity and the loss of hope create the most devastating moral and physical deterioration in these people. Some of them who entered the camp in perfect health only a few years ago, today, could not qualify for immigration on the grounds of ill health. Look at these barracks—80 people live in this one. On each side of this corridor there are some 15 rooms. At the end of the corridor there is a common washroom and toilet. In the summer, this place in infernally hot; in winter, the only livable rooms are the kitchens—the rest have no heat. Any sound made in one of these rooms can be heard by everyone in the whole barrack, and here, in dismal hopelessness they have been waiting for years.

In room 3 there is a family that has been waiting 15 years. These are the Naumovs—six in all. Five members of the family sleep in this room. The father, who is tubercular, sleeps near the stove in the kitchen. This has been their home for 10 years. Before that, they were in other camps, some better, some worse. Most of their children were born here. In 1944, Mr. and Mrs. Naumov were in a German slave labor camp, shipped there after the Nazis invaded the Ukraine. Before that, the Naumovs were farmers near Rostov—were married in 1937. Now, in 1960, they are moving again. If you're a displaced person, moving is a psychological as well as a physical wrench—particularly if your children have known no other way of life. They have never seen a plane, except in the sky—a railroad station is something they

read about—a trunk is something they see for the first time when their father nails toegther four pieces of wood. There were times over the years when the Naumov family had hoped to get out—the United States, Canada, Australia, England—but tuberculosis had ended all this and they lived in a constant defeat and depression. Someone once wrote that a displaced person with a spot on his lung was a man without a passport. But this is World Refugee Year and although most nations, including the United States, would not accept them, the Naumov family is going to a country called Canada which this year established two unique criteria for the first hundred families to qualify—you must have tuberculosis, and have no sponsor to vouch for you.

In the YMCA barracks where they had said goodbye to others, the Naumovs have the first real party of their lives. A visitor, lucky enough to be present, does whatever he knows how to do. This woman is Anna Zaikin, a Russian refugee. She urged her husband and son to go to the United States 12 years ago when they had the chance. She remained behind, disqualified with tuberculosis. Now, as a result of a revised, American immigration law, she, too was leaving, to rejoin her family in Ohio. Peter Naumov, the guest of honor, doesn't know how to dance. He doesn't know how to smile, either.

In the jet and atomic age, the prospect of a trip across the Atlantic is little more than a commuter's jump, but if all your travel has been in sealed boxcars and all your days in camps, a 5,000 mile voyage can be frightening and traumatic. The next stop in the Naumov's Odyssey, Salzburg. First, a briefing from an immigration official from the great, free land across the world.

Very soon you'll be traveling to my country, to Canada, by plane, and there you will start a new life—from the beginning. You will be awaited at the airport in Winnipeg. Winnipeg is the capital of Manitoba. We will find work for you and we'll find lodging for you. You must think that every one feels strange in a new country. The first months are difficult. This is something unavoidable. The atmosphere is a bit foreign. The habits are different. The people dress differently perhaps. That's understandable. No one will notice. We're quite used to this, and with time, we have seen with many immigrants that after a couple of months these feelings have disappeared. We're a young country and we hope that you will be able to build a new life there. The possibilities are there and we will help as much as we can in order to make it possible for you to get over these first difficult steps so that you can, perhaps, grow with the country and together we will have a successful future.

Mrs. NAUMOV. I want to ask you what awaits me when I arrive in Canada and my husband is put into a hospital?

MARY DUNLOP. We will see to it that your husband is placed in a hospital or a sanatorium not too far from where you live, and then it will be explained on what days and how you will be able to travel to see him—and your family—have no worries about your family. You will be completely supported. We will find some one to take care of your children. We will do everything possible to help you.

BOY. Excuse me. When we get to Canada will we be living in a camp or in a house?

MARY DUNLOP. There is no question about a camp. There are no camps there.

Mr. BRYNNER. From Salzburg to Vienna the Naumovs traveled on the famed Orient Express, then by bus to the airport. It is 14 steps from the boarding ramp to the door of a DC-6 and Mrs. Naumov told us she counted every one of them. It is 5,300 miles from Vienna to Winnipeg, and she says she counted every mile. In all, the plane carried 65 people. The families were quietly told that the rear half of the plane was quarantined and that all tuberculosis victims had to ride in the segregated section. People, haunted by the eternity of past separations, ride furtively even when the separation is only the length of the fuselage. Later, long after this voyage was ended, Nina, aged 13, told her class in Winnipeg about the flight.

NINA. The first time I had a big fear because my brother said to me that an airplane can fall from the sky. I was very sick but the others were not.

Mr. BRYNNER. Nineteen hours out of Vienna via Bonn and Montreal, this four-engine Mayflower lands at Winnipeg—24 hours ago—which for the Naumovs was a lifetime ago, Winnipeg was hardly even a name on a map. Now, this metropolis of almost half a million is their final port of entry. In the immigration room, the forms and redtape have been streamlined some, but as the Naumovs face the questions and the forms, one is reminded of Gian Carlo Menotti's opera, "The Consul." Papers. Papers. Papers. Father's name, mother's name, place of birth, color of eyes. Color of eyes: tears. Occupation: waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting.

For the Naumovs, the waiting is almost over—but not quite. Again, there is what displaced persons the world over fear most—separation—even on a temporary basis. The husband must go to a tubercular sanatorium for rehabilitation for a chance to live a normal life again, and eventually become a useful Canadian citizen.

The rest of the family is on its way to 452 Mountain Avenue, Winnipeg, where the Canadian immigration authorities have paid the rent until the family can take over for itself. It is a two-family house and the chief attraction is the Naumov's first electric refrigerator, a small, modern stove, and for the first time ever their own bathroom. And for the first time in her life, for Nina, a room of her own. The same day they see their first supermarket. The Canadians will also stake them to $110 a month for their food and other basic needs. Then a visit to St. Boniface Sanatorium and the realization that the separation, with the help of antibiotics and rest, will only be temporary. The next day the children are enrolled in public school. This is the first time they have ever gone to a school outside of a DP camp. In Nina's and Alexander's special class—19 children—each, a new arrival, has traveled anywhere from 5,000 to 20,000 miles to be here.

BARBARA SCOTT. Through immigration we have welcomed many people to live with us in freedom and have added greatly to our cultural heritage. Whether you were born in this splendid country or abroad, we welcome you. And who are you?

BOY. I am Alexander Naumov from Austria.

GIRL. I am Nina Naumov from Austria.

BOY. I am Wee Kwan Moy from Hong Kong.

BOY. I am Werner Lehmann from Black Forest, Germany.

BOY. I am Adrian Storimans from Holland.

BOY. I am Philip Gerson from Israel.

BOY. I am Gabriel Profeta from Italy.

GIRL. I am Mary Nakauchi from Tokyo, Japan.

BOY. I am Edward Zurawski from Poland.

BOY. I am Manuel Correia from Portugal.

GIRL. I am Marina Saulig from Yugoslavia.

Mr. BRYNNER. When you're 9 and 13, a new language comes easy. When you're 48, it's another story—you start with Bunny Rabbit.

Mrs. NAUMOV. Little rabbit went hop, hop.

REHABILITATION INSTRUCTRESS. Hop.

Mrs. NAUMOV. Hop awow.

REHABILITATION INSTRUCTRESS. Away.

Mrs. NAUMOV. Away.

REHABILITATION INSTRUCTRESS. Okay.

Mr. BRYNNER. The diary of one young girl who lived in camps will not have to be published posthumously—and Nina Naumov could hardly wait.

NINA. It was a happy wonder for us—a stranger man comes into our room and talked with my parents about going to Canada. We were very glad because in Canada we have many to eat, but in Austria we were every day hungry.

Mr. BRYNNER. By June, Nina's English was good enough to qualify her for her regular class in the fall and her father's lung showed sufficient improvement to allow that first visit home with the promise that the separation would soon be ended. This was June 29, an historic day on Mountain Avenue.

At the immigration center in Austria, the boy had asked: "When we get to Canada, will we have to live in a camp?" "No," said the lady, "you will live in a house."

There is a considerable gulf between Nina Naumov playing "Home on the Range," the only song she knows, to the Hungarian refugee orchestra in Marl playing the Beethoven Egmont Overture, but the two events are riveted together by the tragedies that produced their wanderings. So the Naumov family and the musicians from Budapest are home at last. But what of the millions of others? What of the 11,000 DP's still left in Austria and the 1,200 persons at that same camp our family left? They still wait. They wait in Greece where one out of eight can be called a refugee. They wait in Italy—some 10,000—mostly from the Communist countries to the north. They wait in Germany, where more than 30,000 refugees are still stateless, a third of them still in camps. There are also 300,000 Germans—mostly from East Germany and the Baltic States in camps here. They wait in Tunisia and Morocco with more than 200,000 from Algeria, barely surviving in tents and mud huts against the bitter north African winters.

They wait in northern India and Nepal where the daily stream of refugees from Communist-ruled Tibet have brought their total close to 40,000—and in Calcutta, which is so swollen with the poverty stricken masses that an accurate count is impossible; estimates are from 800,000 to 3 million. In west Pakistan, 2½ million are still rootless. They wait in South Korea where a million are still unsettled and in South Vietnam, where many thousands more must still be integrated. They wait in Hong Kong, the refugee capital of the world, where authorities admit they don't know how many refugees there are. They do know that the population, little more than a million and a half in 1948, is now over 3 million. They continue to pour into the tiny colony from Red China at the rate of 80,000 a year, and in the area of 12 square miles, tens of thousands try to exist in tin and jute and hemp huts, on roof tops and in back alleys. And they wait—about a million of them in the Middle East. If the refugees' problem in Europe and Asia is one of humanity and common decency, the crisis in the Middle East is riddled with politics and is a common danger to every nation. It has been said for years, now, that the situation in the Middle East could trigger war and that is no overstatement. Immediately after a brief message from our sponsor, this report will continue from the Mandelbaum Gate—No Man's Land—Jerusalem.

ANNOUNCER. Here again is CBS Reports and Yul Brynner.

Mr. BRYNNER. When one watches the happy journey of the Naumov family, or the joyous climax of the Hungarian Symphony, which you will see again later, one is persuaded that the plight of the refugees can be solved, that each of the millions can be rescued if only, but the onlys to the hard core of DP's, are caught up in the winds of hate in the cross currents of controversy. Andre Malraux, the great French author, once wrote: "Like a muted orchestra, the

surge and thunder of ancient tragedy accompanies, but does not drown out the immortal cry, I was born not to share in hatred, but to share in love." This is the Dead Sea in Jordan and these youngsters are the harvest of the hatred and stalemate which the statesmen of the world refer to as the Middle East problem.

[Brynner singing]

"On only two little fishes and on five loaves of bread.
The Lord's disciples began to get worried
And each of them had to scratch his head
But what could they do—for each one knew
There was a big crowd that had to be fed
On only two little fishes and five loaves of bread."

Mr. BRYNNER. Tell me, are there any fish in the Dead Sea?

BOY. No.

Mr. BRYNNER. Why not?

BOY. Because the water is too salty.

Mr. BRYNNER. Oh, it is?

BOY. Yes.

Mr. BRYNNER. Well, we'll sing about it, anyway.

[Brynner sings]

"He broke the bread up and also the fishes
And then his disciples went ahead
But the more passed around, the more they found
With lots left over, when all had been fed
On only two little fishes and on five loaves of bread.
Here's what I've said—if we all love one another,
Then the world could be fed
On only two little fishes and five loaves of bread."

Mr. BRYNNER. Camp dwellers, DP's, the refugee stream—call them what you will—the crisis is cruelest and hardest to solve when it is interlaced with politics. The No Man's Land of the Middle East is the Mandelbaum Gate, which divides Arab Jerusalem from Israeli Jerusalem. An American reporter who could come here but could not cross over—and an American actor who could not cross over—meet on the scarred island of cement.

Mr. MURROW. Yul, how are you?

Mr. BRYNNER. How are you, Ed?

Mr. MURROW. It's a curious place to meet—here at the Mandelbaum Gate in Jerusalem in No Man's Land; in fact, between Israel and Jordan. When I received a cable from New York that you were going to do a program on refugees, it seemed to me rather curious that a well-established, well-known actor, should devote his time to refugees. How come?

Mr. BRYNNER. You cannot turn your back on people who are rotting away and who have been rotting away in camps for 10, 15 years, through no fault of theirs. And you cannot turn your back on the fact that there are kids who are born in these camps. You cannot turn your back on a new race of people that we're allowing to be created—a race of camp dwellers.

Mr. MURROW. Do you find, Yul, in these camps, that that very perishable commodity called hope is largely missing?

Mr. BRYNNER. Well, of course, that is the worst death of all—and the camps are crawling with that form of death. It is exactly for that reason that I want to work, is to give these people some hope of settling somewhere to be useful citizens, to exist and live like decent men, with dignity. It is purely a humanitarian job. When the High Commissioner for the refugees of the United Nations gave me the job, he gave me a completely free hand except for one thing—to remain nonpolitical at all times.

Mr. MURROW. If you were to go up and put questions to the Israelis, what sort of questions would they be?

Mr. BRYNNER. Oh, I think that there are many questions in the minds of everybody on this side—the same as in mine—of what, if anything, the Israelis would offer as a possible solution or a contribution to the refugee problem.

Mr. MURROW. Well, Yul, since you can't go up to Jerusalem in the Israeli sector and I can't go down to Jordan, I suggest that we do this—I will act as your leg man and I will go up and put the question you just raised to the Israeli officials, and we'll see what answer we get.

Mr. BRYNNER. That's a deal, Ed.

Mr. MURROW. Good luck, Yul.

Mr. BRYNNER. So long.

Mr. MURROW. See you.

Mr. BRYNNER. Here, on this narrow rim of earth, between the Mediterranean and the Euphrates, there is an entire generation of refugees washed up by all the tides that divide this planet politically. The Arab-Israeli stalemate; the East-West Cold War; the Suez crisis; the arms race; and even the population explosion. In 1948, there were about 750,000 refugees in Gaza, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria. Now, with virtually no new adult victims entering, the number is more than 1 million and still increasing. This nation of DP's was born out of the Palestine struggle of 1948. Let Ed Murrow remind you of the historical events.

Mr. MURROW. In 1948, Israel, another nation of refugees, was trying to achieve independence. A United Nations resolution ordered the partition of what had been Palestine into two nations—one Arab—one Jewish. The Israelis agreed—the Arabs protested and promised to fight till death to prevent it. The war that followed ended with the Ralph Bunche truce agreement, and Israel was recognized by the United Nations by a vote of 37 to 12, with 9 nations abstaining. Most of the Arabs who fled the war never returned. Thousands still live in Israeli villages, but three-quarters of a million of them stayed in the neighboring Arab lands. But these countries either unable, or some say, unwilling, to absorb them into their population kept them in refugee camps, near the border. Our cameras visited these camps in Jordan and Gaza in 1953. Cities of canvas in a jungle of perpetual poverty and moral decay. In 1960, our cameras went back with Yul Brynner. All of the canvas was gone and the U.N. Relief Agency had done a remarkable job in roofing the camps and providing at least enough food for a minimum daily ration—but the moral decay, hopelessness, was still the order of the day.

Mr. BRYNNER. This used to be the Jewish quarter in the old city of Jerusalem. Since 1948, it has been used as a camp where over 5,000 refugees live. This filthy dungeon used to be used as a storage space. Now, it is a dwelling for some 150 people. Over here, in 1 room, live 3 families—15 people. Directly behind me, there's a common toilet that all these people use. Down below, there is 1 room where 2 families live—12 people. In another room, no bigger than a closet, where a family of 10 lives. Each family gets a 5-gallon can of water a day. This is supplied by UNRWA. Out of that can, they have to drink; do their personal washing and their laundry. If they need additional water they can get it but they have to buy it. UNRWA has been desperately trying to move these people to some place where they could live in healthier conditions. But because of other even more urgent cases, and because of lack of funds, they have not been able to do it.

Mr. MURROW. There is considerable difference between the way in which Jordan, a tiny country with a population of only 1 million with United Nations' assistance, has absorbed a refugee community of over 600,000, training them and attempting to make them part of the country, and Egypt, a nation of 26 million, which has contained all of its refugees in U.N. camps in the Gaza strip—a kind of buffer area between Egypt and Israel. This is a U.N. school in Gaza and the education is worth listening to.

TEACHER. I am looking for a sentence on "foreign."

FIRST GIRL. We have to unite against foreign domination.

TEACHER. Good. What's the meaning of "provide with"?

SECOND GIRL. The rations which UNRWA provides us are not enough.

TEACHER. Good. Sit down. Who can give me a sentence on "restore"?

THIRD GIRL. It is our right, as Palestinians, to restore our homeland.

Mr. MURROW. Both Gaza and Jordan have U.N. vocational schools for boys, and it is the hope of United Nations Relief Agency that by expanding the number of training centers, it would prepare thousands of refugee boys for skilled employment and rehabilitation. Now, we are back in Jordan and this is a trade school where an attempt is being made to prepare young Arabs for gainful employment in Jordan, and hopefully, in other nearby nations.

Mr. BRYNNER. Well, Mr. Knesevitch, you've been running this school, now, for 6 years.

Mr. KNESEVITCH. Yes.

Mr. BRYNNER. What, in your opinion, has the school achieved?

Mr. KNESEVITCH. The way boys speak, for instance, of wanting to go back to Israel in the camps in one way, and there's another, here, after having been trained. They feel that through education and training, they become stronger, and they speak wisely about their return to Palestine. Their hatred, to a certain extent, is still there but it is a disciplined hatred. It's a more refined hatred.

Mr. MURROW. Some observers say that the Arab leaders refuse to absorb the refugees into their towns and cities, because they wish to keep the issue alive, politically, and keep the pressure on Israel. One of the most hopeful signs, however, is the position of Jordan's harassed and able young ruler, King Hussein.

Mr. BRYNNER. Your Majesty, how would you compare the refugee situation in your kingdom with, let us say, Gaza?

King HUSSEIN. Well, I would say that as far as the refugee situation is concerned in Jordan—in this country we have shared the blow. We are all one people. We are all one family; whereas, we feel in Gaza that there is a rash number of refugees that feel that they are refugees, and are living behind barbed wire. That is the basic difference. I think it is quite great.

Mr. BRYNNER. What do you see as the solution to the refugee problem?

King HUSSEIN. This problem is unfortunately part of the Palestine problem that is still hanging about and awaiting solution. And I feel that the United Nations and the whole world, as well as the Arab countries, themselves, have a great responsibility of solving this problem in a just manner, I hope, not in the very distant future. The most important aspect of it is to keep the refugees or the people—keep their spirits high and restore to them their dignity whether they choose to remain outside their country or return to it.

Mr. MURROW. Jordan's approach is not that of the United Arab Republic and the other Middle East countries and President Nasser considers Hussein an enemy and a puppet of Israel. There is a body of world opinion, parts of the Afro-Asian bloc, that puts most of the blame on Israel—first, for creating the problem—now, for not giving Palestine back to the Arabs or for not making financial reparations to the Arabs. The position of President Nasser and of the other Arab countries, including Jordan, has remained constant and firm throughout the years.

Mr. NASSER. Well, you know, the United Nations Resolution of 1948 was about refugees, and the United Nations decided that

the refugees must have the right to return to their country, or must have the right to have compensation if they like. This is our point of view which was declared and it is clear.

Mr. MURROW. In Jerusalem, we talked with Golda Meir. Mrs. Meir, what, if anything, is Israel prepared to contribute to the solution of the problem of the Arab refugees?

Mrs. MEIR. We are prepared, as we have said right along, to pay a compensation to the Arabs for those that have left houses behind or land or anything of that kind—anything short of risking the very existence of Israel itself. We are convinced that the Arabs can be and should be resettled in the Arab countries. They are among their own people. There is no question of language or religion or background or culture.

Mr. MURROW. I think I know the answer to this—but why do you decline to permit any Arabs to return to Israel except those who return to rejoin their families?

Mrs. MEIR. Let me give you one answer: 1948—when we were attacked then by seven Arab countries, these Arabs fled from this country and are now among the refugees. Among them were children who at that time were 5 years old, 6 years old, 10 years old—younger people—14, 15 years old. If, at that time, there had been a peace agreement signed between us and the Arabs, we, at that time, were prepared to take quite a number back. Why can't we do it now? They have for the last over 11, almost 12 years, had poison poured into their souls daily; in their textbooks; in their schools; in their places of prayer—they have heard it on the radio from their leaders. They've read it in the papers—that they have one ideal for which to live, and that is to destroy Israel and to throw these people into the sea. To have that group of people come back into this tiny country, with the problems that we have, I always say to friends that suggest that—that when Israel will decide to commit suicide, this is one good way of doing it. These Arab leaders hate Israel—that one has to accept. What I don't understand—why don't they love their own people. Because in their hatred for Israel they are prepared to have these people—men, women and children, go on in these conditions year after year only to prove their hatred to Israel and keep this hatred alive in the hearts and souls of their people.

Mr. BRYNNER. Wiser men than we have stated that there will be no peace in the world until there is a settlement in the Middle East. There will be no settlement in the Middle East until there is a solution to the refugee plight. The United Nations can help to house and feed them. The U.N. army has for 4 years patrolled Gaza and the other border areas and kept the armed truce. But the chief business of the Middle East remains hatred and mistrust. The United Nations faces no more severe test—including the Congo and Algeria. Part of the problem is that 15 million D.P.'s have no political representation—no army—no flag—no symbol of emerging nationalism. They are part of no power bloc. They have no official voice but perhaps they do have a different kind of voice in the Philharmonia Hungarica, an orchestra of refugees whose very flight from Hungary was a symbol whose every performance is a protest—a voice for the millions who have lost their voice but not their right to be heard. We shall return to that freedom orchestra in a moment.

* * * * *

Mr. BRYNNER. This program ends as it began with the Hungarian Symphony in their home in Marl. When this young orchestra, then a displaced orchestra, played at Carnegie Hall in New York, Howard Taubman, critic for the New York Times, applauded them as a symphony and said: "This orchestra in exile serves the cause of freedom while serving the cause of art." Tonight, they're playing the Dances Galanta by the Hungarian composer Kodaly. This is their favorite composition—for the town of Galanta is on the load road from Budapest to Vienna, and this is the road that most of these musicians know very well.

"If a stranger sojourns with thee in your land, ye shall not do him wrong. The stranger that sojourns with you shall be unto you as the home-born among you—and thou shalt love him as thyself."

For the refugee—a rubberstamp on a piece of paper is more important than money in the bank—for it means that he can move and hope. His children may learn. He may acquire a new nationality and regain dignity. This cannot be done with the gift of old clothes and old slogans. It requires legislation—the authority to put the stamp upon the paper which is the passport to hope.

Our history sings with the names of men and women who sought asylum in this country. They believed in the American dream and they are part of our heritage. There are those waiting, now, to come in, who might well help to determine our destiny.

As we traveled amongst the displaced, we kept hearing this refrain of an American poet: "Who gave me the sweet and gave my brother dust to eat—and when will his ship come in?" If you should care to help to bring in the ship of a refugee whose hope is wearing thin, we shall be glad to forward your donation to the appropriate authorities.

Mr. MURROW. That's Yul Brynner—United Nations, New York 17, N.Y. Now, on behalf of "CBS Reports," our thanks to Yul Brynner, who has spent the better part of a year working on this program, as his contribution to those millions of refugees who have no voice. On their behalf and on his—good night and good luck.

[Brynner sings]

"About those two little fishes and
Those five loaves of bread
Broke the bread up and also the fishes
And then His disciples went ahead
But the more passed around, the more they found
With lots left over, when all had been fed—
On only two little fishes and on five loaves of bread.
Here's what I've said—if we all love one another,
Then the world could be fed
On only two little fishes and five loaves of bread."

KALEWALA DAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Kalewala is the name given to the Finnish national epic, their great national poem. Its beginnings go back to the days of primeval life in Finland, when the Finns customarily recited and sang parts of this epic in various local versions and in innumerable cantos. The words and music were passed on by word of mouth from generation to generation, probably each generation adding something of its own, thus enriching this oldest and best known of their national epics.

Until the 19th century the people had known this epic from memory, and it was preserved only on their lips. Then, scholars traveled through the countryside, listened to the peasants recite and sing the cantos, and wrote them down. The first collection of these poems and songs was published by Zacharius Topelius in 1822, but it was not until 1835 that a fairly complete collection of some 12,000 lines was published by Elias Lonnrot. This collection appeared on February 28 of that year. It was an event of great significance to the Finns, for it insured the preservation and perpetuation of their national epic, embodying their spiritual and intellectual values. That is why the Finns celebrate the occasion of its first publication as a national holiday, and I gladly join them in the observance of that anniversary, the 126th year of the publication of the Finnish epic poem, "Kalewala."

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Estonians have lived in their historic homeland on the northeastern shores of the Baltic for more than 2,000 years. For generations these brave and rugged people have struggled for individual freedom and national independence. That struggle did not cease even when they were brought under the powerful autocracy of Russian czars early in the 18th century. For more than 200 years they endured the oppressive yoke of the czarist regime, and at the same time they worked for their freedom. Their only chance came toward the end of the First World War. When the czarist government in Russia was overthrown by the Bolshevik revolution in 1917, the Estonians regained their freedom and proclaimed their independence on February 24, 1918. That historic event marked a turning point in Estonia's modern history and began a new era for the Estonian people.

Under the democratic form of government established in free Estonia the people lived and worked happily for two decades. During that relatively short time they succeeded in making Estonia a model democracy; in every walk of life they made significant progress, and the country enjoyed prosperity. Then came the Second World War, bringing with it misery and misfortune. In 1940 the country was invaded and occupied by the Red army, then a Communist-dominated government was set up, and in August of that year the country was made part of the Soviet Union.

Since then the people of Estonia have been deprived of their freedom, suffering instead under Communist totalitarianism. They still yearn for their freedom, and while they are not free to voice their feelings, we here in the United States can voice their patriotic sentiments on the 43d anniversary of their independence day and hope for their deliverance from Communist tyranny.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, February 24 marked the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Estonia. I ask unanimous consent that the following statement which I have prepared for the free Estonia press and for broadcast behind the Iron Curtain be printed in the RECORD.

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

A GREETING

We join with all freedom-loving people in commemorating the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Estonia.

The history of the Estonian people began in the uncharted past when they migrated from the traditional home of their race in

the plains behind the Urals and the Volga. By the beginning of the Christian era, they were settled in the land which is now Estonia.

Left to their own devices, the Estonians settled down as fishermen, beekeepers, and tillers of the soil. Through the centuries, they were invaded by the Vikings, the czarist Russians, and by the German crusaders. Later the Swedes and Poles fought for this Baltic seaboard and Estonia became a Baltic province of Sweden. However, the Great Northern War of 1703–14, devastated Estonia and its citizens were subjugated by the Russians.

It was not until February 24, 1918, that the Republic of Estonia achieved independence. What Beneš did for Czechoslovakia, Poska, Pusta, and Piip did for Estonia. Sharing of common suffering had built up a nationalist unity of purpose.

Communist Russia shattered the productive dream of the Republic. In July 1940, the Red army overran and then annexed this small nation. Today Red oppression and regimentation has kept these brave people in virtual slavery.

We still hope and believe that Estonia will regain her independence. In the folklore of Estonia, the epic poem, "Kalevipoeg," written by Widri R. Ristmets are these prophetic words:

"But the day will soon be breaking
When all torches will be burning,
Flinging flames in widening circles
Which will free the arm embedded
In the mighty chains of rock,
Kalev then will be returning
Bringing happiness to people
Of a new Estonia."

Today, we pray with all freedom-loving peoples for the new Estonia which will emerge from the Communist shadows.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was away from Washington on February 16, the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence, and, therefore, was unable to make remarks commemorating the occasion. This belated tribute is not, however, indicative of a lack of interest or lack of sincerity of hope that the Lithuanian nation will one day regain its independence.

It is indeed tragic that between czarist Russia and Communist Russia, Lithuania has enjoyed only two decades of independence. During those two decades, however, the Lithuanians established a flourishing democracy along the Baltic Sea. They initiated sweeping land reforms and made great strides in industry, education, and social welfare. On June 15, 1940, the Soviet Army invaded and occupied Lithuania and since that time the proud and freedom-loving people of that country have been captives of the Kremlin. The voice of freedom and liberty and equality has been stilled—but the Lithuanians who were fortunate enough to escape the iron yoke of communism are still vocal and will continue to raise their voices to express the hopes and dreams of those remaining in their homeland, and which I share, that once again Lithuania will know the priceless gifts of human liberty and national independence.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a resolution dated February 19, 1961, adopted by the Lithuanian-American Organization of Metropolitan Detroit relating to the observance of the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence by the Republic of Lithuania.

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

In observance of the 43d anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania's declaration of independence, the Lithuanian-American Organization of Metropolitan Detroit unanimously resolve:

1. To respectfully urge the U.S. Government to develop an overall dynamic program against the international Communist conspiracy;

2. That special attention be given by the United States of America to the necessity of hastening the liberation of captive Lithuania and that all acts or omissions which tend to confirm the enslavement of Lithuanian subjects be rejected;

3. That the U.S. Government sponsor a resolution in the United Nations based upon findings and conclusions which establish the Soviet Union as a colonial power and as an aggressor against all of the nations now colonialized and enslaved by communism.

Resolved, That this meeting voice its heartfelt appreciation and gratitude to the administration and Congress of the United States for the many past considerations of, and sympathy with, the cause of Lithuania's fight for independence.

Dr. K. KARVELIS,
President.
J. GRUZDAS,
Executive Secretary.

STUDY OF RED DOCTRINE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a recent forward-looking action taken by the American Bar Association.

At a meeting February 20 in Chicago, the ABA's house of delegates, policymaking body of the organization, approved a resolution calling on the Nation's schools to instruct their students in the history, strategies, and objectives of communism.

I submit, Mr. President, that such action has long been overdue. How can our young people successfully oppose the unholy forces of world communism if they are not schooled in its diabolical purpose, techniques, and machinations?

Before we can defeat this enemy, we must know him for what he is. We must understand his thinking, comprehend the scope of his ambitions, and have full appreciation for his artfulness and ingenuity.

It is especially heartening to read that no negative votes were cast on this important issue. And who can disagree with the sentiment expressed by one member of the ABA's house of delegates that our schools should also teach "more Americanism than they do now."

In fact, the ABA resolution mentions that a primary purpose of acquainting our young people with communism should be to "instill a greater appreciation of democracy and freedom under law and the will to preserve that freedom."

As a matter of information to all who are concerned with perpetuating freedom in our country and the world, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a story from the Baltimore Sun of February 21, reporting the ABA action I have just discussed.

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

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Feb. 21, 1961]

RED DOCTRINE STUDY URGED—BAR ASSOCIATION CALLS FOR CLASSES ON COMMUNISM

CHICAGO, February 20.—The American Bar Association today called for adequate instruction in the history, doctrines, objectives, and techniques of communism in high schools and colleges.

A resolution to that effect was approved by the house of delegates, the policymaking body of the organization of 99,000 lawyers. The resolution proposed:

"Through our members and the cooperation of State and local bar associations, we encourage and support our schools and colleges in the presentation of adequate instruction in the history, doctrines, objectives, and techniques of communism, thereby helping to instill a greater appreciation of democracy and freedom under law and the will to preserve that freedom."

MORE AMERICANISM

There were no negative votes, but Edward L. Cannon, of Raleigh, N.C., said schools should be told of a need for teaching more Americanism than they do now.

Henry J. Te Paske, of Orange City, Iowa, chairman of the bar's committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives, said: "We need adequate knowledge of our opposition."

Earlier the delegates refused to back a move to give immunity to Federal income-tax cheaters who make voluntary confessions before they are caught.

The house of delegates also:

1. Adopted a resolution urging prompt passage of legislation to establish 59 additional Federal judgeships.

2. Opposed legislation that would force merchants and moneylenders to spell out the details of financing charges on installment purchases and mortgages.

The bar's taxation section (committee) offered a resolution to amend the laws to "provide that a voluntary disclosure to fraud will provide an immunity from criminal prosecution."

Under the proposal, the taxpayer would have to inform Internal Revenue Service officials of his fraud before they notify him that he is being investigated. The taxpayer also would have to give investigators full information and would have to pay his tax and penalty.

AGAINST DOUGLAS BILL

But Dean Erwin Griswold of the Harvard Law School objected on grounds that such a change would open the door to cynical activity.

On Griswold's motion, the resolution was sent back to a committee for further consideration by a 104–81 vote.

Proponents theorized the change might have brought more revenue into the U.S. Treasury.

The delegates took a unanimous stand against legislation proposed by Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, to compel full disclosure of finance charges on small loans, mortgages, and retail sales made on the time-payment plan.

They approved a statement saying such laws are in State jurisdiction rather than in the Federal field.

The House, in urging quick congressional approval of legislation to establish 59 additional Federal judgeships, said there is a critical need for them and that President Kennedy has agreed with the association

that the paramount consideration in the appointment of a judge will not be his political party, but his qualification for the office.

Byron White, Deputy Attorney General, expressed hope that more exceptionally qualified lawyers will interest themselves in becoming judges.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S HEALTH PLAN FOR THE AGED

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one of the oldest tricks of the legislative trade is to maneuver an opponent of a particular measure into the position of appearing to be against the goals of the measure. Thus, a Senator who seriously and studiously questions the idea of adding medical care for the aged to our social security system might be made to look as though he opposes health care for the aged; or, that he opposes the aged; or even that he is opposed to health.

The administration's proposal for putting health care for the aged under social security is a controversial issue—not because any Senator is opposed to health, or the aged, or health care for the aged—but because there are some very good reasons why it may be considered just plain bad legislation.

Some of these reasons are outlined and illustrated in an article which I clipped from the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader of February 15. I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the RECORD at this point.

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

INEQUITIES IN J.F.K. HEALTH PLAN ARE REVEALED IN FICTIONAL CASE

WASHINGTON.—This is the fictional case of John and Mary Jones, both aged 65. It illustrates one of the controversial issues raised by President Kennedy's health plan for the aged.

There are couples like the Joneses in almost every community. They are among the 14 million elderly persons who would get all the benefits of the new program without having to pay any of the costs.

Kennedy wants Congress to add the payment of hospitalization and nursing home costs to cash benefits available under the social security program. This added cost would be financed by a $1.5 billion yearly boost in social security taxes on workers and their employers.

PREPAYMENT PLAN

The President calls this a program of prepayment of health costs.

Although some would insist on adding the word "compulsory," many would accept Kennedy's terms as accurately describing the program insofar as it would affect young persons now going into the work force.

These younger workers will be paying social security taxes for the next 45 years or so, including the extra health tax which would be set at a maximum of $31 a year for employees, with their employers contributing a like amount.

But Kennedy's description is only partially accurate for middle-aged workers nearing retirement. They will escape the full brunt of the higher taxes needed to pay for existing cash and proposed health benefits, since they won't be felt until January 1, 1969.

And it's not prepayment at all for those like the Joneses who could draw medical benefits without paying any of the new taxes.

Jones represents the retired workers who have paid the maximum in social security taxes. He was 40 when the payroll tax was first applied in 1937. Over the years his earnings required him and his employer to pay the maximum payroll tax, with contributions for each ranging from $30 in 1937 to $144 last year.

The contributions from both added up to $2,600 when Jones retired last month, and he and his wife began drawing $180 in monthly benefits. If they both live 10 more years, they will draw $21,600 cash benefits.

Enactment of the controversial health program Kennedy proposed to Congress last Thursday would result in a big increase in the potential cost to the social security fund of the Joneses' benefits.

Some retired workers on the benefit rolls paid less than $50 into the social security fund. They get much smaller cash benefits but would qualify for the same medical benefits as John and Mary Jones.

If either or both the Joneses needed hospitalization, they would be entitled to up to 90 days of hospitalization and 180 days of nursing home care. The patient would have to foot the bill for only a small part of the hospitalization cost—$10 a day for the first 9 days.

ASKING QUESTIONS

Some influential lawmakers are asking these questions:

Is it fair to impose on the social security fund the cost of medical benefits for persons who will pay no part of the new taxes?

If a new program is started, shouldn't benefits be restricted to those who have paid at least a year or more of the heavier taxes?

They point out the Congress cautiously followed this pattern when it first set up the social security system. The law was passed in 1935. The taxes were first applied in 1937. The benefits didn't start until 1940.

Some influential Democratic lawmakers are talking privately of being just as cautious in moving the program into the controversial new field advocated by Kennedy.

Such an approach, they pointed out, would reduce the amount of new tax revenue needed to operate the program, particularly if the benefits were set at levels well below those proposed by Kennedy.

THE NATIONAL GUARD IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in January 1960, the mission of the New Hampshire Air National Guard was changed from the employment of fighter-interceptor aircraft to multiengine heavy transport. I am much pleased to say that New Hampshire was among the first States to receive this heavy equipment, to train its crews and to qualify for global transport missions.

Under the direction of New Hampshire's able adjutant general, Maj. Gen. Francis B. McSwiney, and the immediate command of Col. Paul Smith, the 131st Heavy Transport Group has established an enviable record of efficient performance over a relatively short period of time, and it is one in which I, for one, take considerable pride.

The February 1961 issue of the National Guardsman, official publication of the National Guard Association, carries an extremely interesting article entitled "From Keene to Korea," which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

This article portrays the splendid cooperation which can and does exist between our civilian community and various components of our Armed Forces. It is the story of a substantial quantity of foodstuff, clothing, and other articles of necessity donated by the public-spirited citizens of Keene, N.H., for the use of an orphanage at Seoul, Korea.

This shipment was airlifted with skill and proficiency by an aircraft of the New Hampshire Air National Guard, with the cooperation of the Military Air Transport Service, in what I believe to be the longest mission of its kind ever performed by an Air National Guard unit. In my judgment, this flight demonstrated the high quality of service the National Guard is prepared to give this Nation in time of conflict, should the necessity arise.

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

FROM KEENE TO KOREA

(By Maj. W. D. McGlasson)

There was no fuss, no photographers, no farewells. All the formalities had been taken care of the day before. The air guardsmen simply climbed into the big plane, ran up its four powerful engines, waved to the two ground crewmen standing by with fire extinguishers, and took off.

Thus, as casually as for a half-hour hop down to Boston, a New Hampshire flight crew commenced the longest peacetime training flight ever credited to the Air National Guard, from New Hampshire all the way across the continent and the Pacific Ocean to Korea, some 8,500 air miles from their starting point. Before they returned to Grenier AFB 12 days later, plane and crew had traveled more than a third of the way around the world and back—nearly 17,000 miles. Even though the entire trip took less than 2 weeks, they twice ran through the whole climatic scale, freezing in New England, shivering in fog-damp central California, donning trunks and gay shirts in Hawaii, swimming in Wake Island's lagoon at a comfortable 77°, and back to shivering again in a nippy Japan and Korea breeze.

Taken separately, there was nothing unusual about plane, crew, route, cargo, or the flight itself. With the exception of the red-cheeked Santa Claus painted on its nose, the plane was an ordinary C97 Stratofreighter, big bellied, slow, reliable, and unglamorous. The crew was standard for the C97—two pilots, navigator, two flight engineers and a loadmaster—backed up this time for training purposes, however, by one MATS regular for each of the crew positions. The route, too, was standard—a long-traveled leg in MATS' system, and the cargo an odd-lot conglomeration of clothing, food, toys, and such, destined for an orphanage in Korea's capital city.

It was in the combination of all these factors that the flight attained a significance far greater than the sum of its separate parts. When the plane touched down at Seoul's Kimpo Air Field, the Santa Claus design and the big New Hampshire Air National Guard inscription along its fuselage told the group of waiting Korean children and their 1 Cav Div sponsors that this was the payoff to Operation Sleighlift. Six tons of badly needed supplies donated by the citizens of Keene, N.H., to help a group of Korean orphans through the bitter winter months, had been delivered—in a New Hampshire Air Guard plane by a New Hampshire crew.

To the men responsible for American defense, the flight represented far more than an exercise in human goodness. To them, it meant this: if the Air Guard's new heavy transport squadrons could carry food and clothing all the way from Keene to Korea

as the by-product of a training flight, they just as readily could haul troops and vital supplies to any airfield on the face of the globe to support an emergency military need. With squadrons already formed, or aforming, the Air Guard's long-haul elements were just about ready to join MATS' first team.

It was a crisp, clear New England morning and the sun had just shown itself above the low hills bordering the New Hampshire airbase, when Maj. James E. Cuddihee steered the big stratofreighter onto the runway and called for "max" power. There were 13 persons on board but no one even mentioned the ill-omened head count.

TSgt. Richard C. Nault shoved the four throttles far forward, the heavily loaded plane lumbered down the runway with increasing speed until finally it lifted itself into the air, and Operation Sleighlift was on its way.

Slowly, MATS No. 80402 climbed to cruise altitude. Nothing is done suddenly with a fully loaded C97. The four huge engines each generate 3,500 horsepower, but they have their work cut out for them when the plane is loaded for a long hop. That morning, they were lifting some 76 tons up through the atmosphere—23 tons of it in fuel alone. That's 7,088 gallons, A1c. Robert Hicks, the loadmaster, quickly calculated—enough for the 3,000-mile flight to Travis AFB, Calif., plus 10 percent safety factor. It takes 900 to 1,200 pounds of fuel just to warm-up the engines and get the plane off the ground, explained TSgt. Robert Ross, one of the NHANG flight engineers, and an average 3,000 pounds an hour to keep it in flight. Rounding out the 76 tons was the plane itself, at 86,557 pounds net; the crew of 13 and their luggage; emergency equipment, such as two fully outfitted 20-man life rafts for the Pacific crossing and finally, the payload.

THE LONG-RANGE PATTERN

While the plane droned westward across Michigan, the snow-covered Dakotas and the northern Rockies, I asked a lot of questions of the kind only a ground-bound Army type would think of, and emerged with a better understanding of the flight, and of how it came about.

First, I wanted to know, how did this flight fit into the general pattern of retraining for ANG jet fighter units converted last year to heavy transports? Second, what was Operation Sleighlift? Third, how did the two become intermingled? Finally, a question I reserved for the top brass in both MATS and the Air Guard: what was the timetable for future conversions?

From his memory and from clippings and notes in the bulging pockets of his flying suit, Major Cuddihee, aircraft commander and fulltime operations officer for N.H.'s 157 Air Transport Group provided answers to the first three questions. This was the second in what was to become a series of overseas training and checkout flights to qualify the New Hampshire crews in their global mission. Six ANG squadrons had made their conversion from jets in January 1960 and now, all were entering the final phase of their retraining. Each man on each of the 16 crews in the six squadrons was required to make two overwater checkout flights before he could be rated as operationally ready.

Early this year, we learned later from top Air guardsmen at the Pentagon, five more squadrons will be converted and their full-time technicians entered in the initial phase of retraining in a speedup of the original program. By the time the conversion program is completed sometime in fiscal year 1962, 17 ANG squadrons will have been assigned a MATS big-plane mission and their 240 flight crews each will be making at least two flights per year to keep current in the techniques of overwater flight. That, according to Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, head of the Air Guard, adds up to well over a flight a day—and not just to Tokyo but later, probably, to Manila, Rome, Madrid, and other bases in MATS' globe-circling network.

Operation Sleighlift got its start several weeks before when Lt. Horace D. Verry, an Army officer (and former Army guardsman) from Keene, now stationed in Korea, wrote a letter to Keene Publisher Justin Gallagher describing the poverty of the 78 children at Pubwon Orphanage. Mr. Gallagher published the letter; Mayor Charles A. Coolidge and MSgt. Irving Clark, the local Army recruiter, organized a drive, and 12,000 pounds of warm clothing, nonperishable foods, toys, medical supplies—even two pianos and six phonographs—soon piled up in a warehouse, all of it donated by generous Keene citizens. The only problem was how to get it to Korea. Dr. James Murray, local physician and an Air Guard medical officer, told them about the training flight from Grenier Air Force Base to Tokyo in early December and said it just might be possible to wangle Air Force permission to haul the good-will cargo to the Far East and right on to Seoul. It took some convincing, but the Air Force finally granted permission. Previous flights had gone to Tokyo but none had made the additional 600-mile hop to Seoul. Thus it became the longest training flight on the Air Guard records.

FROM JET JOCKEY TO "TRUCK DRIVER"

Was it difficult, I next asked Major Cuddihee, for the jet pilots to adjust to the bigger, slower, prop-driven transports? Is there a tendency among the former jet jockeys to downgrade their new mission and look back too fondly on the days when they left contrails at 35,000 feet as part of the ANG's all-jet air defense force?

Yes, replied the major, a big, husky New Englander with more than 8,000 hours in his flight book, most of it in jets, it was difficult to adjust because habits of long standing had to be broken, new mental attitudes adopted.

"The fighter pilot is a lone wolf, the heavy transport pilot a team player," he explained. "There's a basic difference in their mentalities and it takes time to shed one set of concepts, take on another."

"When you ask the flight engineer to give you 'maximum power,'" he went on, "you're depending on someone else to do what you've always had to do for yourself—and you find your own hand inching toward the throttles."

Yes, he said, they miss the excitement and the individual challenge posed by jet fighters, but now they have a new sweetheart. She's not such a hot, fast-stepping little number, but she's just as lovable in her own sedate way! Now, the crews are fully aware of the critical importance of their new mission and they're just as enthusiastic about it as they were about the old.

Why, I asked Maj. John Hardwick, senior AF adviser to the New Hampshire unit, along on the trip to check out the Guard pilots, are all six of the Air Guard's present transport squadrons assigned to WESTAF (Western Transport Air Force)? This requires the crews in two of the squadrons, at Greiner and Schenectady, to make the long cross-country hop to California before they even can start their over-water training flights. Wouldn't it be more practical to assign them to EASTAF (Eastern Transport Air Force) so their flights could originate at McGuire AFB, N.J., and terminate on the other side of the Atlantic?

The assignment of all six squadrons to WESTAF, replied Major Hardwick, was to centralize—and thus simplify—their initial training and supervision. Later, he conjectured, when other guard squadrons swap their fighters for transports, they may be split between the two MATS headquarters, with the Mississippi as the boundary.

Now we were approaching Travis AFB, west coast terminal for MATS' Pacific operations and home, at one time or another in their careers, to almost every flier in the MATS system. Here, friend met friend, often after a lapse of several months, to exchange gossip, shop talk—and laundry.

Travis, though, was only the first of many such stops. MATS men are a nomadic breed, by the very nature of their job, and Hickam AFB (Hawaii); Wake Island, a tiny circlet of coral surrounding a pale green, storybook lagoon; and Tachikawa (Japan) all are homes away from home, each as familiar to the roving transport crews as their own hometowns, each a place for swapping jokes—and favors.

"Say, Bill, next time you get to Hickam will you pick up the watch I left at the PX for repairs? Just leave it with Casey at Travis and I'll pick it up next time out." That's the kind of deals that go on as a matter of course.

MATS AND ANG IN A HAPPY MARRIAGE

On the long, overwater legs of our flight (Travis to Hickam, 2,145 miles; Hickam to Wake, 2,011 miles; and Wake to Tachikawa, 1,743 miles), and among the MATS officers we met at each stop, I resumed my questioning, and the answers gave a clearer picture of this new MATS-ANG alliance.

Everyone I queried, guardsman and Regular alike, agreed that the mating was a happy one.

"The MATS people have taken us into the family," said one of plane 80402's crewmen. "They treat us like one of their own."

A high-placed MATS officer at Travis outlined a philosophy which he credited to Maj. Gen. Russell L. Waldron, WESTAF commander: "We're happy as hell to have the guard with us. They work hard, have lots of spirit, give us a badly needed boost in our wartime airlift capability. We treat 'em like our own. They're part of MATS."

"Listen to some of our ground crews," he went on, "and you'll see what I'm getting at. When an Air Guard C97 comes in, you don't hear them say 'Here comes an Air Guard plane;' they say 'Here comes one of our planes.'"

"One reason—and a big one—that our retraining has gone so well is that MATS gave us some of its best men as advisers," said Major Cuddihee and Capt. John Enright, the guard copilot, at a later bull session.

The MATS advisers are all tops in their trade, said the two ANG pilots, with thousands of hours in the air and much of it in the C97.

Not that the guardsmen themselves are amateurs—not by a long way. Major Cuddihee has been flying since World War II, Captain Enright almost as long; Capt. Henry R. Simonds, Jr., the navigator, learned his trade as a World War II cadet; Technical Sergeants Nault and Ross each has years of experience in the maintenance field. Ross, for example, spent 6 years as a full-time MATS flight engineer before taking a similar full-time job as an ANG technician. Airman Hicks, the loadmaster, had less service but had been graduated from the loadmaster's school at Shepherd Air Force Base. And they're representative of the flying personnel in all six MATS-mated squadrons.

Next, as we made the hop from Wake to Tachikawa, I had a question for the navigators, Captain Simonds of the guard crew, and his MATS adviser counterpart, Maj. Albert V. Freeman. Why did we follow the longer southern route via Hawaii and Wake? Couldn't our C-97 make it nonstop from Hawaii to Japan, cutting off that long swing to the south? Not during the winter months, they explained. The prevailing winds then are from west to east, sometimes at unbelievable velocities up at flying altitude. Flying straight into Japan from

Hawaii, we'd be bucking headwinds that sometimes climb to 100 miles per hour.

On the return trip, though, it's all to the good. Above 15,000 feet one of the aptly named jetstreams usually can be found to propel you on into Hawaii nonstop. Our C-97, which normally cruises at about 210 knots groundspeed, whizzed along at speeds which occasionally reached 350 knots.

But now we were approaching Japan on the outbound leg of the trip and I had one more question for Major Cuddihee before we landed at Tachikawa for the MATS-prescribed 15 hours of crew rest. Are the crews on MATS and ANG transports organized as close-knit "families," as in our wartime bomber forces—every man flying each time with the same group of coworkers? No, answered the major, crew integrity is the law in SAC, where different conditions prevail, but in the transport forces, all procedures are so thoroughly standardized that any navigator, or engineer, or loadmaster, or pilot, can blend efficiently into a team operation, even if they're all perfect strangers to each other (although it became obvious to us that there are few strangers in MATS; MATS itself is a family). This permits closer control of flying hours, for one thing. If a man misses out on some hours this week because he's sick, he can make them up a couple of weeks hence. Nor does it immobilize an entire crew just because one man is out of action.

Now, with the symmetrical cone of Mount Fuji rising through the clouds off to the west, we were letting down for Tachikawa. This meant, to the crewmen, some badly needed rest, a chance to poke into street-corner stalls in a strange country shopping for souvenirs, and some exotic oriental dishes to try out and customs to observe.

We were scheduled to make the quick dash to Korea the next day to turn over our cargo to 1 Cav Div troops for delivery to the orphanage, so Major Cuddihee's final instructions were: "Remember, we want to get into Seoul and out before the weather closes in. We're supposed to be there at noon sharp, so it's 0600 alert, 0700 to show, 0900 to go."

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED, HEAD FOR THE STABLE

Next day, Plane 80402 kept its rendezvous with the Pubwon orphans, and in a typical American gesture, the first thing lifted out of the airplane was a 7-foot Christmas tree bearing a card which read: "Merry Christmas to Horace Verry and His Orphans." It had been stowed on the plane's big clamshell cargo doors, away from the other cargo throughout the long flight, to avoid damage. It immediately was turned over to Brig. Gen. F. H. Britton, the 1 Cav Div CG, who turned and handed it to Miss Lee On Soon, the orphanage director, to mark the happy and successful conclusion of Operation Sleigh-Lift.

Three hours later, the official ceremonies over and the largess of a New England town on its way by Army truck to its final destination, the plane and its crew of guardsmen and advisers headed back toward Tachikawa to start the long flight home. First there'd a 48-hour layover at "Tachi," the prescribed crew rest for so extended a journey, then the last minute hubbub of departure—trying to find the small Japanese woman who'd taken your dirty clothing away for laundering shortly after your first arrival; changing military scrip back into U.S. currency at the yen window in the terminal, concurrently trying to sell your remaining Japanese yen to incoming servicemen (you can swap scrip for Japanese money to spend off base but you can't change it back).

Finally, wheels-up. We were making the first hop direct to Hawaii, thanks to favorable winds, fireballing Midway en route. That means landing only briefly to eat breakfast, refuel, and listen to the Navy men stationed there tell about the latest antics of the ridiculous gooney birds.

The long flight—all afternoon, all night, and well into the next day—provided an opportunity to mull over some of the things we'd seen and learned, both the important and the trivial. The time changes, for instance. On a trip like this, you're eternally setting your watch up or back, gaining or losing 3 or 4 hours a day depending on which direction you're going. And somewhere between Hawaii and Wake, you gain (or lose) a whole day, when you cross the international date line. Thus you leave Japan at noon Monday and, after 22 hours en route, reach Honolulu 2 hours before you started—on paper, that is.

There's a note in my memo book simply labeled "Problems," and thereunder I listed some of the areas in which the ANG and MATS jointly will have to concentrate some of their best thinking. Crew qualification, for instance. MATS truthfully can say, at this point, that only 3 of the 96 air crews in the 6 ANG squadrons are rated as operationally ready by current MATS standards. But men who are close to the problem say everything isn't as simple as black and white. MATS Regulars, piling-up 90 hours of flying on a single trip such as ours, can amass quickly the total needed to achieve and maintain a ready rating. It takes much longer when you're flying guard style, on weekends and in spare time. Perhaps, say guard officers, some of the standards are too severe for guardsmen; perhaps some modifications can be permitted without sacrificing proficiency.

A DICTIONARY OF COMMUNIST LANGUAGE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the present serious situation in the Congo and its repercussions in the United Nations brings out once more what I believe to be the crux of all of our difficulties in trying to deal with Communists. This is due to the inability of many to understand Communist mentality, psychology, and language.

They make the monumental mistake of regarding Communists as merely unreasonable troublemakers or chronic soreheads. We compound this error by the even greater mistake of failing to understand that Communists have created an entirely new language of their own. George Orwell in his remarkable book "1984" called such perversion and distortion of ordinary language for brainwashing and population control methods—"Newspeak."

While there is now a substantial library of sound and informative books on communism, unfortunately very little has been written on Communist "Newspeak." Counterattack, a weekly anti-Communist newsletter published for the past 14 years in New York, has helped close this serious gap in our understanding of the whole complex problem of communism. The February 3 issue is devoted to "Communist Language—A Dictionary of Its Own." The author is Edward Hunter the well-known correspondent and author who first brought back from Red China the Communist term "brainwashing" and introduced it into our language. Mr. Hunter also wrote "Brainwashing From Pavlov to Powers" recently published by the Bookmailer, New York.

I regard this article so important to a more correct understanding of Communist mentality and what makes Communists tick that I strongly urge every Member of this body to read this issue of Counterattack. Most of our bungling in trying to deal with Communists would be eliminated if our policymakers only understood the lesson which Mr. Hunter's article conveys.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that "Communist Language" be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks today.

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

THE WAR FOR YOUR MIND—COMMUNIST LANGUAGE—A DICTIONARY OF ITS OWN

(By Edward Hunter)

This is the first of a series of three or more articles on what is probably the most effective Red bait—Communist language. This article deals with the existence of Communist language as such. The next will describe the Communist dictionary in an effort to make dialectical materialism comprehensible to the ordinary citizen. A third article will provide a glossary of Red words, and cliches, a basic dictionary with which we can translate Communist statements.

One of the most successful traps Communists use is in our methods of communication. They have infiltrated our speech and literature, and operate a parallel language inside our own. Communist language has its own vocabulary. The meaning of words differs from similar ones in other tongues, no matter how identical the spelling, pronunciation, and grammatical use.

During the early years of communism there was reason for people not realizing this. The Communists were comparatively few in numbers even in the Soviet Union, where the party seized power from an already victorious revolution that had overthrown the czardom and operated a parliament. The fatal blunder of this regime was in according, while emergency conditions still prevailed, equal privileges to those dedicated to its destruction. The free world cannot be too critical of this naivete, for it has yet to learn the lesson itself.

The Communist hierarchy did not conceal its conspiratorial nature. This was done for it by fuzzy-minded, hard-headed, self-styled idealists who transferred to communism all their own aspirations for a perfect society, and closed their eyes and ears to whatever conflicted with their restless dreams, which they call Leninism, with a bible entitled "dialectical materialism."

The Reds thereby obtained an aggressive, even hysterical, certainly ruthless, corps of defenders of the new faith, who fought fiercely against any who would arouse them from their dreams. This environment enabled the Reds to perpetrate unprecedented crimes, including man-made famines taking millions of lives; the institution of slave labor camps holding tens of millions; the development of a clinical, Pavlovian system of changing political attitudes based upon an atheism that equates a man with a dog; the massacre of broad sections of the educated classes of entire nations, as in Poland and Korea, in a program of calculated genocide. All this was concealed by the pro-Red dreamers, once addicted to the opiate of communism. Any compromise with truth was preferable in their eyes to the loss of their Marxist narcotic.

Nearly a half-century has passed since a coterie of near-sighted Junkers, thinking themselves supremely clever at psychological warfare, transported Lenin across Germany, so he could overthrow Russia's democratic revolution and create enough havoc to prevent Russia's reentry into World War I. How the world has paid for this trickery. What a ghastly price it has cost all Germans.

We are all still paying for it. The reason for bringing this up is twofold. One, to explain how we failed to detect the Communist language. Two, to remind those on the free world side, who can think clearly, of history's terrible warning.

But there is no longer any excuse for blindness to Communist tactics, baits, and traps. Government officials are prone to pass the buck to the public, while leaders in private life insist it is the Government's job. The average man takes refuge in the theory that a single individual can do nothing as if everything that has ever happened was not first conceived in some one man's mind. Actually, it is up to all of us. The penalty falls upon all. Those with the most to lose are the elite, the executives in industry and labor, and in journalism. If they don't make it their personal responsibility, they will be liquidated and evaporated, to use Red terminology. Department store heads, editorial writers, trade union delegates and college professors are part of the public that constitutes the majority. So what if government is shirking its duty? This is no excuse to indulge in any apathy that is tantamount to suicide. Once leaders in private enterprise bestir themselves, they find the Government following their lead.

The start people can make to save their own lives and that of their loved ones and their institutions against Khrushchev's promised burial of us, is to learn what the Communists mean by their talk and the bait they have set in the form of a specific Communist language.

COMMUNISM MUST BE TRANSLATED

There was a time when there would have been no questions about the meaning of some such sentence as, communism has its own language. The reader might agree, or doubt it, but the idea would be clear to him. Not any more. More and more people nowadays react to sentences. They don't really read them. This is Pavlov's signal system. People say, "Oh yes, I know; the Reds use semantics in order to fool you." Or, "Sure enough; you're referring to Red doubletalk."

But this is not what the sentence says. A language is not mere semantics, nor just doubletalk. The Reds use these, too, but in addition, they have a specific language. This is extremely difficult for people to grasp, because the language is cleverly concealed inside our own and is adapted to the language of the country where Reds operate. Without this language as a cover for their own machinations, and a deceit upon non-Communists, the Red hierarchy could not condition us for the kill. Communist language is employed as a softening-up media, and is the means of indoctrination; the two processes that go into brainwashing.

Much of the verbiage used by communism is dissembling. Khrushchev makes constant use of Communist language to confuse and entrap us. In a speech before a Rumanian Red Congress on June 22, 1960, he said: "You remember that I was accused in the United States of trying practically physically to bury every capitalist." His audience laughed. He pointed out that the Communists were not so naive. "They understand that capitalism is its own gravedigger." This brought hilarity to his listeners.

When he reported to the Supreme Soviet in Moscow last May 5 on the torpedoing of the summit conference, he said, "Imperialism arouses the wrath of the people and digs its own grave." This is an old line. Let us translate that last statement of his from Communist language into our own. Here is what we get: "The Communists will provoke the populations of the leading non-Communist countries into destroying themselves."

Without translation, there can be no understanding of communism. Our leaders agree now that we must learn the tactics the Reds use against us. Yet almost every attempt to do so, instead of teaching the evils of communism, is lost in verbiage and ends up by becoming an indoctrination course in communism. There are plenty of pro-Reds to push it this way. We can pull the carpet out from under them and see through the plotting of the enemy once we grasp the fact that communism speaks a language of its own, learn its general approach and pick up some of its vocabulary. None of this is very difficult; what is hardest to achieve is a state of mind willing to do it.

Eighty-one Communist parties from around the world, including the United States, held a month-long convention in Moscow recently and on December 6 a manifesto was issued that filled about 25 solid columns of small type in the New York Times. Here is one paragraph from it:

"The formation and consolidation of national democracies enables the countries concerned to make rapid social progress and play an active part in the people's struggle for peace, against the aggressive policies of the imperialist camp, for the complete abolition of the colonial yoke."

If we read those words according to their definitions in an ordinary dictionary, we cannot avoid being taken for a propaganda ride. The words don't mean the same in dialectical materialism, which is the dictionary of Communist terminology and a guide to Communist thought.

If an intelligence officer or diplomat accepts the ordinary English version, he will be passing along misinformation or deceiving himself. This is what we have been doing for years. The newspaper dispatches that quoted it without translation were doing the same. Here is how the paragraph reads, translated:

"The formation and consolidation of states set up as the result of nationalistic movements enables these countries to obtain new privileges rapidly, and to play an active part in the pro-Red policies of the free world, for the complete ouster of the white man from Asia and Africa."

The entire Red manifesto was spotted with this sort of thing. Untranslated, whoever publishes it is abetting Red propaganda. Communist writing has a hypnotic cadence to it, which gives a reader the impression of being privy to some special knowledge. Interminable pages of it, and hours of it in speech, are forced upon the overworked minds of peoples living under communism.

By cloaking their ideas and instructions in this verbose language, the Reds are able to utter the most bare-faced lies and issue their most vicious orders, coming out in the open with details for the commission of outright treason, while seeming to be expressing highly idealistic thoughts in a sentence structure that while unnecessarily involved, is otherwise perfectly proper. The ordinary reader cannot avoid feeding himself Red propaganda and has no idea what the sentences actually mean.

A complete understanding of Communist language, with all its nuances, would be tantamount to taking a lengthy indoctrination course in communism, and is far too involved a process, and unnecessary. One doesn't have to become an expert in communism to see through their jargon, any more than one has to be fluent in German to order a meal in a Munich restaurant.

Those, however, who deal with Communist subjects have the obligation of acquiring an insight into Red language. Newspaper correspondents who send dispatches about communism are doing their country a disservice if they fail to translate it for the average reader. Certainly our intelligence people in the FBI or the CIA who deal with communism have the obligation of learning the language otherwise they become Red stooges no matter how anti-Communist they believe themselves to be. This is the trap. This is how it was laid out. Unfortunately, the bulk of newspapermen, Government agents, and dplomats, certainly most professors in the social sciences, on whom we depend for our information and guidance, have fallen headlong into the Red language trap. This has been particularly true of our policymakers in the State Department.

Those who have the faculty for translating from the Communist have been squeezed out of the picture by the opportunists and fellow travelers who have taken the name "liberal" as a cover. Those whose records for accuracy on communism are the best, as shown by the record, are branded anti-Communist and are called alarmist, and hysterical, because their reports differ so completely from those who accept Red lingo at face value, and have been consistently wrong. A situation has developed in which those who have been correct about communism are forced onto the sidelines, while the clique that left a trail of disastrous blunders receives book-of-the-month contracts, the fat consultation fees, juicy foundation awards, and the highest paying Government jobs. Their consistency in bringing forth learned sounding errors supports the so-called scientifically based prediction by Red theorists that our society can be induced to bury itself. Their role is decisive. They supply the tranquilizers and the sleeping pills to our society, from bottles labeled "peaceful coexistence," diverting attention from what the enemy actually says and does. Yet, this process continues to go on as if there were some regulation in editorial and personnel offices, that only those who have proven themselves wrong on communism are eligible for consideration. They have to be wrong the same way too, giving the impression of accuracy by referendum. They must have fallen into the same traps, making it appear their's had to be the right road after all, because so many people took it.

This is the sinister background to the conformity of today.

What superficially sounds like evidence of a moderate Red attitude, can turn out in translation to be a threat or an insult. Foreign correspondents interviewed Khrushchev in Moscow last May 11, for instance, at an inspection of what was presented as the remnants of the U-2 that had been brought down near Sverdlovsk. This was an especially vitriolic interview, one in which Khrushchev showed how Communists react to forebearance on our part. He had just come from Paris, where he had used gutter language against us while haranguing our President to his face. "You spit in their eye, but they insist it's only dew," was what he said of us in this interview. His parting words for the assembled American and other newsmen seemed to be on a moderate tone, winning him applause. "Stand up for the truth, for the noble cause of peace, and you will earn the respect of your peoples," he said in parting.

What our side applauded, properly translated from the Communist, was: "Stand up for the Communist line, for the noble drive for a world united under communism, and you will earn the respect of ourselves, and our sympathizers."

A CODE LANGUAGE

The Communist language can best be described as a code language. This was the term I applied to it in a chapter on the subject in "The Black Book on Red China," published in 1958. The existence of a specific Red language had not hitherto been pointed out. That prophetic genius, George Orwell, had fictionally described it in his momentous novel, "1984." He employed a totalitarian vocabulary and included a glossary at the end, calling it Newspeak. Communism fits this pattern. Orwell's background in leftist movements, including his participation in the Spanish Civil War, when

he was wounded critically, gave him insight into the jargon. Yet, "1984" was fiction, and people could not bring themselves to believe that it truly portrayed real life. Actually, Orwell was a superlative reporter as his earlier works on his Burmese and other southeast Asian observations showed.

The Communists weren't claiming a new language for obvious reasons. They did, however, come as close as possible to doing so by defining words and giving them special Communist meanings. So long as they could keep the existence of such a language secret, its effectiveness could be maintained at a higher pitch. Only by disclosure can its impact be lost. The Reds consistently keep such things under wraps until no longer possible, as with brainwashing. An example was the Red perpetration of the Katyn massacre which they led the world to believe was a German deed. This secrecy still works to their advantage.

General knowledge has been withheld to this day of the Communists share in the holocaust of Jews mercilessly slain during World War II. Exactly as they have succeeded in blanketing Captive Nations Weeks with programs on Nazi atrocities, so have they been able to have their horrible role in anti-Semitic murders shifted wholly onto the Nazi leaders.

In each instance, these facts were not entirely unknown in the United States and Britain, but were hushed up by "nice people" who couldn't bear the thought or who just couldn't believe it, and by diplomats who shuddered to think of how this would complicate their work. Except for this help, Red agents could have gotten nowhere.

So it has been with Communist language. Recognition of it would gravely complicate international negotiations. Hushing it up though, hands the Moscow-Peiping axis what can be its decisive advantage in our struggle for survival.

Now that Communist language is beginning to be detected, the Reds themselves have started writing about it. The "World Marxist Report," in its December 1960 issue, ran an article entitled, "Party Language is the Language of the People." The slant taken was typical of Red circuitousness and evasion. The impression was given that they were only eliminating false definitions with which the bourgeoisie seeks to cover up reality, and replacing them by "genuinely scientific terms capable of throwing light on this reality."

A word in its Leninist sense, the article declared, "throws light on political reality and helps the people to gain a better understanding of the conditions of their struggle." A denial that there could be "any special language characteristic of the Communists" turned out to be a claim that only it was correct. We read: "Attention should be paid to terminology. When the terms characteristic of our ideology win universal recognition and penetrate into the language of all peoples, this signifies a deepening of the consciousness of the people. Consequently, the last thing we want to do is to relinquish our terminology. * * * In the course of our theoretical work the everyday language is consciously raised to the level of a scientific Marxist language."

The denial of Communist language, while at the same time describing its attributes, is not unusual in Red logic. Similarly, Communist delegates at the United Nations dispose of any accomplishment of the world organization displeasing to themselves by calling it illegal. In the case of language, the pretense is that there is only one correct definition for a word, the Communist version, and hence that ordinary language is technically nonexistent. For those who have difficulty following this logic, they need only refer to the books of dialetical materialism, and if they still feel confused, they can inquire of practically any of the American captives of the Reds in North Korea who were put under brainwashing pressures. They will make this brainwashing plain enough, out of their own agonizing experience.

The international Communist movement in its earliest times was confronted with a dual task in communications. They had to create a safe channel for conspiratorial communications between members often distantly located from each other and they also had to evolve easy propaganda access to masses untouched by Red heresies.

Both problems were solved by a daring extension of the Communist infiltration tactic. The Reds simply infiltrated existing languages as they did into organizations with the intention of using it as a front or of capturing it. They did this by the bold yet simple device of using words already in existence only giving them their own Communist Party meaning. The normal, original language constituted a cover for their real messages. By a quick switch from one to the other, they kept us capitalist hicks in a state of utter bafflement, operating with the ease of a card shark at a county fair. This succeeded beyond what must have been their greatest expectations. We swallowed the verbal bait, hook, line, and sinker.

What evolved was this code language, which is not to be confused with semantics, double-talk, puns and other artifices in speech and literature. The Communists make the utmost use of these, too. But in addition they employ their own Leninist language, as distinct from the language that it infiltrated and absorbed as German is from English, or Japanese from Chinese. The international character of the Communist conspiracy required a communications media that had the advantages of Esperanto without its complications.

Out of necessity, the Reds employ whatever language or dialect already exists in an area. This tactic is in accord with a statement made to me some years ago by Herbert Philbrick, of "I Led Three Lives." We were discussing Communist fronts. "The Reds never lay a track where a railway is already operating," he said. "They simply get on the train." The Communist Party employs words already existing, merely giving them the meanings defined in their books on dialectical materialism. These constitute their dictionary.

The Communists, once this had been achieved, were able to stand on the rooftops and shout their instructions across the alleyways to distant agents, or proclaim their wants over the radio to their Communist colleagues, and be understood only by those for whom their messages were intended while others who heard them were as if deaf to the true intent of the words. This way, the Reds diverted attention from whatever conspiratorial purpose they had in mind disguising it by the ordinary dictionary meaning of the terminology, reaping a propaganda gain while hoodwinking their foes and communicating with their fellow plotters. The code did double duty as Red language and as propaganda. The Reds have constantly managed to couple complexity with simplicity this way. This is one of their procedural techniques.

Adlai Stevenson received a lesson in this from Khrushchev in the Kremlin. Stevenson wrote about it for the North American Newspaper Alliance shortly after the interview and it was promptly reprinted in the September 5, 1958, issue of U.S. News & World Report.

Khrushchev had informed Stevenson, in a taken-for-granted-way, that the world was going Communist, adding: "The process should take place without interference. If this principle (of noninterference) were accepted it would improve the international climate." Stevenson noted that the Red chief was talking only about our interference with Communist expansion into the free world. So he brought up the subject of "disillusioning events" that constituted Communist interference, as "Soviet pressure on Greece and Turkey, the coup in Czechoslovakia, the division of Germany, Soviet subjection of all Eastern Europe from the Baltic to the Black Sea, the war in Korea and arms in Egypt."

Khrushchev thereupon "hotly informed" Stevenson that what went on in the Communist part of the world was none of the United States business. "However," Stevenson wrote, "he evidently considers everything that happens in the non-Communist part (the 'capitalist' world) a legitimate concern of the Soviet Union."

"Thus," our new Ambassador to the U.N. wrote, "the prescription given me by the leader of the Soviet Union appears to be that events inside the Communist world are none of the West's business, but the non-Communist world must stand aside while his 'new system of society' exploits the national awakening and social unrest in the world, and spreads from country to country."

Could it be stated any plainer? Whether Stevenson learned the lesson he recorded, or whether it went into one ear and out the other, will become apparent by his behavior at the U.N. The problem is to make such lessons stick. Khrushchev in this interview was giving Stevenson his version of peaceful coexistence. We must stand by while the Reds subvert and take over. The Reds for their part, have every right to prevent us from expanding our ideas even to call a halt to prodemocratic activities inside our own borders that can be regarded as unfavorable to communism.

We need only go back over past Communist behavior to see that this is exactly the policy they follow. In Communist jargon, our refusal to do as they, in the Leninist manner, constitutes "a hostile attitude" and is "illegal." These are specific words out of the dialectical materialist dictionary. Like the "big lie" that Hitler taught as a safe, beguiling tactic, this arrogant Communist "big hoax" is practiced on so vast a scale that while we see some of the details, we miss the landscape.

Stevenson would not have been surprised by Khrushchev's statement if he translated such words as "interference" and "aggression" from the Communist. Unless he does so at the U.N., he will fall headlong into this language trap, dragging our country along with him.

This makes every indoctrinated Communist bilingual and able to communicate in both Communist language and in the language of his country. The Communists make full use of this bilingualism to befuddle non-Communists, and lead them astray. A Red employs a high-sounding word one moment according to its definition in Webster, and the next moment in accordance with its meaning in dialectical materialism. They don't give a clue which, although the meanings are invariably different, and frequently diametrically opposite. The Reds, using two languages this way, have the tactical advantage of a gambler flipping a coin while calling "heads I win; tails you lose."

If we do not insist on translating Communist language, we are in the situation of a player who doesn't notice the trap he is falling into. The American feeling is that any such darned fool deserves to be taken. If our officials, editors and executives—intelligence agents and reporters—persist in not seeing through this Red verbal sleight-of-hand at this late date, we can only say in American jargon: "We're asking for it." The stakes are our survival.

Each citizen has an obligation to be informed about these matters. There is no law requiring that he read only the anti-anti-Communist press and literature. He

has the responsibility then of making use of the knowledge thus acquired with all the influence that he can wield as an American citizen. What should be obvious by now is that the chips in the game are his own future, that of his loved ones and his career and possessions, if not his soul.

MANAGEMENT OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I received in the mail yesterday from the secretary of state of the State of Wyoming a copy of House Enrolled Joint Resolution No. 4 which was passed by the 36th Legislature of Wyoming and signed by Acting Governor Jack R. Gage on February 21, 1961.

At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of this resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION 4

Joint resolution making application to the Congress of the United States urging the call of a convention on behalf of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States under which expenditures of the Federal Government may not exceed estimated receipts except in emergency and by vote of a substantial majority of the Congress.

Whereas the cumulated net Federal deficit has grown to unmanageable proportions over the past 30 years and in this period there have been 18 deficits in 23 nonwar years; and

Whereas governments should be required to operate within their income: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of the 36th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That, pursuant to the provisions of article V of the Constitution of the United States, application is hereby made to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to such Constitution under which, except for trust fund expenditures and receipts, the expenditures of the Federal Government during any fiscal year may not exceed the estimated receipts of such Government during such fiscal year, unless a substantial majority of the Congress, on recommendation of the President and because of war or other grave national emergency, votes to suspend the limitation on expenditures for a specified period of time; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies thereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator J. J. HICKEY, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, and U.S. Senator HARRY F. BYRD.

Approved February 21, 1961.

JACK R. GAGE,
Acting Governor.
ALBERT C. HARDING,
President of the Senate.
JOSEPH L. BUDD,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I believe the passage of this resolution is most significant. I commend the Wyoming Legislature for taking the lead in apprising Congress of the necessity for a sane approach to the problem of providing appropriations for the functions of Government without resorting to deficit spending.

I call particular attention to the acknowledgment in this resolution of, first, the fact that the national debt has reached "unmanageable proprotions;" and, second, that during the past 30 years "there have been 18 deficits in 23 nonwar years;" and third, that "Government should be required to spend within their income."

I heartily endorse these sentiments of the Wyoming Legislature, and express my sincere hope that the rest of the States will see fit to approve similar legislation.

I should make it clear at this time that the Senate of the United States has had repeated opportunities to pass legislation along this line. I first sponsored a bill requiring a balanced budget in 1954 with the cosponsorship of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

In fact, Senate Joint Resolution 38, which is now pending before the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, would, if passed, accomplish the purpose of keeping Federal expenditures in line with estimated revenues, except in times of national emergency. I introduced this measure on January 26 with the cosponsorship of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], my colleague the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. The resolution which the Wyoming Legislature approved is, in essence, an approval of the objectives of Senate Joint Resolution 38.

I hope that my colleagues from Wyoming, during one of their trips to their home State, would convey to their friends in the State legislature my congratulations on the passage of this significant measure. I am convinced that fiscal responsibility is one of the most neglected needs of Government today, and I am gratified that a State legislature has officially recognized this need. In my estimation, Congress has not adequately demonstrated an awareness of the problem, but repeated expressions from the individual States, such as the resolution from Wyoming, could go a long way toward creating this awareness.

At least, Mr. President, we continue hoping.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as a sponsor of the administration's bill to provide Federal aid to education.

As a member of the Senate and of the Education Subcommittee, such a program has long been a major goal of mine.

The administration bill sent to us by President Kennedy, insofar as it provides assistance to the States for elementary and secondary school education, closely parallels S. 8, which the Senate passed last year.

I introduced S. 8, together with my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HART], again in this session of Congress, and the bill now is pending before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

The President and his Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are to be commended for keeping the principal features of S. 8 intact in the administration bill.

These include the use of State allocations for either school construction or teachers' salaries at the discretion of the State authorities.

The so-called "equalization formula," which takes into account the numbers of schoolchildren as well as the relative State income as the means of distributing the funds, also is fair.

The Senate by its vote last year already has indicated its support of these main features.

We have waited a long time for a genuine education bill, and I am confident that with the President as a partner the 87th Congress will enact this historic legislation.

While I approve generally of the education bill, and thus am happy to cosponsor it, I must in all frankness enter a reservation to titles II and III of the administration bill.

These titles make extensive revisions and reductions in the operation of Public Laws 815 and 874, the so-called Federal impact area laws.

These laws have been extremely valuable in providing necessary Federal assistance in the operation and construction of school facilities in areas affected by an influx of Federal employees.

I will keep an open mind on this, and am willing to be convinced that changes should be made if a proper case is presented, but so far the justification for the administration's proposed reductions is not apparent.

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE ELDERLY—RESOLUTION BY WAYNE COUNTY, MICH., AFL-CIO COUNCIL

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the Wayne County, Mich., AFL-CIO Council, a resolution was adopted urging Congress to establish health insurance for the elderly under the social security system.

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

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

RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY BUILDING SERVICE EMPLOYEES, LOCAL 79

Whereas there are 16 million persons in the United States aged 65 or older, and millions of these are unable to obtain and pay for adequate medical care; and

Whereas the continued expansion of this segment of our population, coupled with the continued increases in the cost of medical care, will intensify this crucial national problem in the future; and

Whereas we in the labor movement firmly believe that the Federal Government should take immediate steps to satisfy this need through a method not involving the means test, which we hold to be repugnant, undemocratic, and an invasion of the rights of the individual: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call upon the Congress of the United States to immediately establish a system of prepaid medical care for

the aged, using the social security mechanism as the means of raising the necessary funds.

THE PLIGHT OF THE UNEMPLOYED

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor has published a moving report on the plight of those of our fellow Americans who have long been without employment as a result of an economy which, in the recession of today, has for too many years failed to meet the needs of our expanding population. The individual stories reported here are repeated in many States and counties in America today. It is for these human reasons that we in Congress have a special obligation to devote our energies to the enactment of the many antirecession measures President Kennedy has called for, and to prepare legislative machinery for quick action on additional measures should the economic outlook for March and April warrant stronger measures.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "Jobless Are People," written by Richard L. Strout, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 25.

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

BEHIND THE STATISTICS—JOBLESS ARE PEOPLE

(By Richard L. Strout)

When Pete Kasardis, an unemployed Indiana steelworker was asked what was hardest about being laid off he replied, "That's easy—selling the dog. We had him 5 years. The kids sobbed for days. But dough is dough.

"I got $15.50 for the dog and we had our first beef since I was laid off."

That is the story told by Perry Stewart, editor-publisher of the New Albany (Ind.) Tribune.

Unemployment statistics go back ultimately to unhappy men, frightened wives, hungry children, delinquency, demoralization, and defeat. Unemployment is people.

JANUARY TOTAL CITED

Official January unemployment statistics total 5,400,000, or 6.6 percent of the total labor force. Unofficial statistics that ignore complicated weighting mechanisms and simply compare jobholders with jobless put the average at 7.7 percent.

After a slow start Congress is moving to pass bipartisan administration emergency unemployment relief, providing $1 billion to jobless workers. The measure has passed the House Ways and Means Committee. It will be financed by higher contributions to unemployment insurance. It will continue temporary Federal unemployment insurance. It will continue temporary Federal unemployment compensation to those who have exhausted benefits.

Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor, told the committee that by April 1, 600,000 will have exhausted benefits.

After April 1 he estimated that 2,400,000 other workers will become eligible for benefits before they get jobs again.

Who are the unemployed?

The Labor Department finds 2,200,000 married men among the jobless. Heads of families are the hardest hit. The percentage of unemployed married men to all married men is 6.1, highest in 6 years of keeping this information.

Worst age period for men is from 25 to 44—the normal peak period of worker productivity. Unemployment concentrates in such masculine blue collar trades as manufacture, mining, railroads, steel, auto, electrical, and machine factories.

The layoff pattern normally follows trade union seniority rules: the young go first, the older last.

At present about 25 percent of the jobless, according to Mr. Goldberg, have been laid off over 15 weeks. Half of these again have been out more than 6 months.

Family men who are laid off for long stretches face difficult adjustment, sociologists say. Some grow desperate; others are apathetic, and lie watching TV all day.

TRAGEDY RELATED

Many State laws forbid relief when there is an employable adult in the family. Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana told the Senate the other day of a jobless coal miner who traveled the Ohio Valley for 2 years looking for work. "He was terribly distressed because his wife and children lacked food," Senator HARTKE, reported. A tragedy followed, the Senator added; the man killed himself.

Similar laws obtain in many States.

Negroes always face job difficulties. They are "last hired, first fired." At present they are twice as likely to be out of a job as whites. The current (January) unemployment rate for white men is 7.2 percent; for nonwhite men, 14.7 percent. For white women 6.4 percent; nonwhite, 12.5 percent.

When teenagers start looking for work today they have trouble: 800,000 are unemployed—or one-sixth of all those in the job market.

When husbands are laid off mothers seek jobs. Statistics show unemployment has taken a much heavier toll of men's jobs than women's, particularly women doing light work. Opportunities for women have expanded in some clerical, white collar, and service fields. Women over 45—evidently regarded as mature and dependable—have done better than younger women.

AUTOMATION FACTOR

Half the country's major industrial areas are now in the "heavy unemployment" classification, with 20 in the chronic distress list. The latter are called areas of substantial and persistence (labor) surplus; over 500,000 workers now seek jobs in these areas.

Some 1,300,000 new U.S. workers seek jobs every year as population expands. On top of this, automation and better tools and processes permit the same work to be done every year with 2,700,000 fewer workers.

Thus there is an annual need each year of 4 million new jobs—just to keep the present maladjusted employment ratio where it is.

Can America achieve this? Some experts think that to revive a chronic distress area will take at least 5 years.

One answer is faster economic growth. In recent years America's annual growth rate, expressed in total national output, has lagged behind most other big industrial countries. This includes the Soviet Union.

COMPETITIVE POSITION OF MICHIGAN IN OBTAINING DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, recently management and labor in Muskegon, Mich., set an example of responsible, cooperative endeavor in working out an agreement that would place one of Michigan's main industries in an even more competitive position in obtaining defense contracts. We who are privileged to represent both the manufacturers and the workers of Michigan can cite this with pride. It is one of many signs of the good relationships which have been developed in our State to improve the economic well-being of all the people of our State.

I ask unanimous consent that copies of the newspaper reports on this situation be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Muskegon (Mich.) Chronicle, Feb. 21, 1961]

WORKERS GIVE UP PAY HIKE

The hands of 2,500 Continental Motors Corp. workers rose as one Monday as Local 113, United Auto Workers, voted unanimously to forego a 2-cent-an-hour cost-of-living raise to keep their company competitive in tight bidding on M-60 tank engine contracts.

Civic leaders hailed the vote, taken in a mass union meeting in the L. C. Walker Sports Arena, as "another shining example of local labor-management cooperation in the emergency effort to stabilize jobs and bolster the Muskegon economy."

Continental President C. J. Reese could not be contacted today, but stated earlier: "We are in a very pressing situation on these contracts, and our union is aware of the problems. We are very hopeful that some good, frank talk, back and forth, will work this out."

There was a lot of frank talk, and leaders of Local 113 laid it on the line in Monday's mass meeting. Speakers from the local's executive and bargaining committees spelled out what was at stake and what was required. The committees recommended deferring action on the pay raise, and when the question was put there were no dissenting votes.

Local President Harold Van Alsburg said: "We felt that when the membership knew all the facts they would come through for the local, the company, and the economy of our community. Our action will help the company to a better competitive position in the tank engine bidding, and should hold this vital work for our plant."

The vote was to defer taking a 2-cent-an-hour cost-of-living wage hike scheduled for effect March 12 for a temporary period of 6 months. The resulting level projection on operating costs is expected to permit Continental to improve its offer in close bidding on engine production contracts for the Army's new M-60 main battle tank, and M-88 tank recovery vehicles.

CMC has received more than $20 million in M-60 tank diesel orders in the last 12 months and the resulting business has stabilized employment at the Getty Street military plant. Loss of contracts under future M-60 and related production schedules could cost many jobs.

Continental received its latest contract award for M-60 engines on December 31—a $3,023,761 order for production of 165 of the 750-hp. diesels. The units are for installation in tanks being produced by Chrysler Corp. at the Army's Detroit Arsenal Tank Plant at Warren.

Bidding on the new contracts is underway before the Tank-Automotive Section, Detroit Ordnance District, which reported Monday that it is expected the new awards will be made by the end of March.

[From the Muskegon (Mich.) Chronicle, Feb. 20, 1961]

JOBS AT STAKE?—CMC UNION MAY VOTE TO PASS WAGE HIKE

Continental Motors Corp. Local 113, UAW, has scheduled a special membership vote today at 2:15 p.m., in the L. C. Walker Sports Arena on a proposal to pass up a cost-of-living pay raise due March 12 to keep the

company competitive in bidding on Army tank engine contracts.

Result of the vote is of extreme importance to Continental, its employees, and to the working economy of Greater Muskegon.

Continental is bidding on engine production contracts for the Army's new M-60 tank and M-38 tank recovery vehicle. Major contracts for these engines are now in negotiation before the Tank-Automotive Section, Detroit Army Ordnance District. Continental's military division has received contracts for more than $20 million in M-60 tank diesels in the last year.

The contracts stabilized employment at the Getty Street facility.

The M-60 is the Army's new main battle tank and loss of the engine contracts under future production schedules could be disastrous.

Company officials and executives have declined comment on the situation or the issues in advance of the membership vote. But both indicated the matter is of grave importance.

Harold VanAlsburg, president of Local 113, said today an hour in advance of the meeting that "our bargaining committee has recommended that we forgo the upcoming cost-of-living pay raise to improve the company's position in tight bidding on the engine.

"We feel the union should do its part by the company and for our community, and that the action is in the best interests of our membership. The cost-of-living escalation comes in a few weeks, and we would defer taking advantage of it for a temporary period to help the company out. We believe the membership will come through."

Continental has bid successfully on all previous M-60 contracts, the latest a $3,023,761 award for production of 165 of the 750-horsepower diesels on December 31. The units are for installation in M-60's being produced by Chrysler Corp. at the Army's Detroit Arsenal Tank Plant at Warren.

Lawrence Braun, of Tank-Automotive Section, acknowledged today that Continental and other engine manufacturers, including Lycoming-Spencer of Avco Manufacturing Co., are involved in current bidding on M-60 and M-85 engines.

[From the Muskegon (Mich.) Chronicle, Feb. 22, 1961]

REALISTIC DECISION

For proof of realistic labor-management relations, we have this week the example of Continental Motors Corp., and its union, Local 113, United Auto Workers.

After a number of meetings to explore all the details, both from the company and union point of view, union members voted overwhelmingly Monday to pass up a 2-cent-an-hour cost-of-living pay increase that otherwise would have become effective March 12.

The action was taken to improve the competitive position of Continental Motors, in regard to retaining Government contracts for the manufacture of tank engines at Continental's ordnance plant here.

It is estimated that as many as 600 jobs could have been involved. Thus both union and management had a distinctly mutual interest in exploring the problem fully and coming up with a solution.

[From the Muskegon (Mich.) Chronicle, Feb. 22, 1961]

REESE LAUDS CMC UNION'S ACTION ON PAY

"It was a wonderful confirmation of the deep-rooted competitive spirit of Continental workers; of their interest in their company's stature and leading position in the industry, and in the economy of this great community."

Commenting on the recent vote of Continental Motors Corp., Local 113, UAW, to defer taking a 2-cent-an-hour cost-of-living wage hike, C. J. Reese, company president, continued:

"We are very grateful to the union leadership and its committees for their recognition of the problems and awareness of what is required in this period of changing times. Their work, and the support of the union membership, has helped us to meet this first very competitive problem for our survival. These tank engine contracts are vital.

"This has always been a fighting community, and it has the heart now, as it has proved before, to battle successfully against big odds and come through on top again and again. Where the odds are real, they can be fought and faced down.

"Continental is fighting and it's going to win. We're proud of our workers. But we don't have any monopoly on this kind of competitive and cooperative spirit. Muskegon has been on the ropes before, but there isn't enough economic muscle in the world to put her down and keep her there.

UNWARRANTED ATTACKS ON THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the distinguished columnist, Mr. Ralph McGill, has written a penetrating analysis of some of the groups who play lightly and dangerously with our constitutional system in their totally unwarranted attacks on the Supreme Court. Mr. McGill has made a significant contribution in reminding us of the rule of law in a vigorous and growing democratic system of government.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

EXTREMISTS AGAINST CONSTITUTION

(By Ralph McGill)

There grows today, among the more thoughtful lawyers of the Nation, an awareness that they have allowed extremists to create a doubt in the minds of an undetermined number of less informed Americans about the validity of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the process of our judicial system.

They now see there are subversive forces at work which, in the several forms of hate literature regularly attack our judicial system and our courts. The most depraved anti-Semitic diatribes increase, picturing the Constitution and our courts as directed by a Jewish, Communist conspiracy. The peddlers of hate travel the country, distorting truth and planting the most reckless lies.

That there are some lawyers who are found in these strange, weird caravans serves to illustrate the failure of the great majority of the bar to speak out against such persons and such procedures. Nothing in all the excesses of Goebbels' lies during the rise of Adolf Hitler is worse than the latest material flooding the mails.

AS SUBVERSIVE AS REDS

It is equally as subversive of American institutions as is the most persistent Communist spy ring and propaganda. It attacks the administration as disloyal. It finds Dwight D. Eisenhower to have been the dupe of Communists and Zionists. Our judges are similarly slandered. It seeks to make Americans doubt their Government and its institutions, including the courts. If we ever forget we are a nation of law, then the American system is doomed. There are those who seek to incite massive defiance of law.

At such a time there appears a timely book. It is a small one of 70 pages. It costs but $1.50. It is a good book for father and mother to read to their children. It is a fine text for civics classes or community discussion groups. It is a Living Bill of Rights, by Justice William O. Douglas, of the U.S. Supreme Court. The book consists of a short essay on the amendments which, with the Constitution itself, are our supreme national treasure.

We began as a nation in 1776 with the Declaration of Independence. This document proclaimed human liberty and the inalienable right to it. It was necessary to establish a stronger unity and we did so with the adoption of our Constitution in 1789. We then became the United States.

Our Declaration and our Constitution were attacked by the crowned heads of Europe as radical and dangerous. The Russian throne refused to recognize us because we were a set of revolutionary radicals. Today, the Communist bloc of nations rejects our idea of individual liberty and freedom. The Communists, like the emperors and czars of another time, regard it as dangerous nonsense.

Our Constitution and its precious content of individual liberty are not well understood in the new countries which come to independence with so many lacks and so little preparation. Food, clothing, housing, medical care, and jobs are their immediate needs.

LIBERTY TAKEN FOR GRANTED

Liberty, at such moments, does not seem of much importance. And, as Justice Douglas says, in a brief introduction, many Americans think of the Constitution as a historic document written for another people in another time. That is because we have always known liberty. Our radical Revolution, which so excited and dismayed kings and czars, was fought a long time ago.

We forget, too, that our Revolution was not entirely directed against a foolish British king. In our Constitution, we protect ourselves first of all against any domestic tyranny. We determined to live without any tyrant—domestic or foreign. And so we have. And so we will, as long as we retain faith in our Constitution and its guarantees of freedom—so long as we believe in human liberty for every citizen of this country.

If we ever forget it, then our Republic will begin to die at the moment of forgetting. And with it will die human liberty.

The basis of our life is law. Our Supreme Court and our judicial system are our most certain protectors—all of us need to stand up and be counted on the side of law—especially our lawyers.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, over the past decade, the Federal Government has undertaken—in the absence of a comprehensive law providing payments in lieu of taxes to local governments—the assistance of school districts saddled with heavy expense burdens attributable to Federal activities around the country. Ever since 1950, when the Congress recognized the injustice of existing problems, we have made important financial contributions to the construction and maintenance of schools in what are termed federally impacted communities.

The last extension of Public Laws 815 and 874, authorizing this assistance, envisioned some reduction of certain types of aid as time went by. I am confident this decision was influenced in part by

the expectation Congress in the meantime would enact some general aid-to-education law. Unfortunately, this has not been done.

For some weeks now, school authorities have been preparing their budgets and analyzing their operational problems with a view to the start of the 1961–62 school year next fall. I have received many warnings that an extremely heavy financial blow will be struck if the so-called category B aid under Public Law 874 is cut off or sharply reduced as scheduled on June 30. This is especially true in California, where Federal activities have been accelerated, the number of federally connected children in school populations has increased, and more than 500 districts are accommodating such pupils.

Consequently, I am introducing a bill to extend for 2 more years this imperative and thoroughly equitable Federal assistance. I believe that it is in the interest of just and amicable Federal-State relations and that we have an inescapable obligation to acknowledge a Federal responsibility in this regard.

The importance of helping federally impacted districts cannot be minimized. One form or another of this aid is vital to some 4,000 school districts of our Nation. One-fourth of our entire school population represents children of federally connected families.

To California, such help, as I already have suggested is of utmost significance. If Congress fails to enact legislation such as I am proposing, in my State 344 districts will be cut off from such assistance and the aid to 162 others will be materially reduced. Even if the school population remained static, the local agencies would be compelled to absorb a suddenly transferred expense of more than $28 million in the next school year. This is patently unfair, in my judgment.

I was disturbed, Mr. President, yesterday to learn that President Kennedy feels this assistance should be drastically curtailed. Some of us in Congress are of a different view. No matter how much merit there may be in arguments that general aid to education might eliminate the need for special benefits, I feel the problem of federally impacted areas requires extensive study and discussion. I do not see how we can expect local education authorities to alter their financing plans on short notice.

My own State of California, which in the past few years has greatly increased its own education expenditures by additional taxation and large-scale borrowing at both State and local levels, is threatened with an 80 percent reduction in Federal funds received by school districts unless the present law is continued.

As a sample of the extent to which California areas are struggling with the problem, in San Diego alone there are over 20,000 category B pupils from 125 tax-exempt Federal properties and 400 Navy ships. This is 25 percent of the total school population of the community. At practically the other end of the State, in the Tulelake area in the high Siskiyou Mountains, 50 percent of the operation funds for education of elementary schoolchildren are contributed by the Federal Government under Public Law 874. The enrollment of section 3 pupils is high in widely scattered sections, amounting in 1957–58 to over 33,789 in Los Angeles County, 20,762 in Alameda County, and 18,282 in Sacramento County.

The percentage of Public Law 874 aid toward the total expenditures is, in many cases, even more striking. In one Solano County district it was 43.87 percent and in a Kern County district 39.87 percent.

Further evidence of the continued Federal obligation is provided by the fact that in California districts eligible for this aid rose from 444 in 1957–58 to 516 in 1959–60. Furthermore, Federal pupils are growing in numbers in my State at faster than the general rate and from 1950–51 through 1957–58 the increase in average daily attendance of these children amounted to 107.1 percent.

Data from the Office of Education further warrants continuance of the present law, if for no other reason than to allow Congress more time to consider the necessity of giving special recognition to the problem of federally connected children and the effect of any general aid-to-education law we may enact. I note that the Commissioner's annual report for 1960 shows the number of tax-exempt Federal properties claimed as a basis for payment rose 220 over 1959, while the number of districts eligible for Public Law 874 aid rose from 3,762 in 1959 to 3,821 last year.

It will be recalled that the initial estimates of appropriations for each of the two prior fiscal years actually turned out to be short of need, so that the Congress was required to make available increased amounts twice last session in order to avert threatened reduction in payment of full entitlements. We already know that greater than expected enrollments for the current school year threaten to result in a 15 percent shortage for fiscal 1961 in payments under Public Law 874 and $30 million more is needed to assure ample money to avoid financial hardship.

There is abundant evidence of the need and ample reason why we should not dismiss this problem lightly. Consequently, I believe it imperative to have at least a temporary extension of the present law and I am hopeful that the bill which I am submitting will receive thorough and early consideration before grave injury is done.

THE NEED FOR STANDARDS ON IMPORTED DATES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, late in the last session of Congress the House of Representatives approved H.R. 12341, whose provisions provided, in part, for the amendment of section 8e of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and would extend its restrictions on imported commodities to include dates with pits, dates with pits removed, and products made principally from dates. Unfortunately, with the rush of the closing days there was not time for consideration of this legislation by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Thus the bill died with adjournment.

The passage of this measure is essential if we are to maintain standards of grade, size, quality, or maturity for all dates consumed in the United States. We now provide such standards for the domestic product. But there is also a need for standards for the imported variety of dates.

In detailing the need for this legislation in the last Congress, the House Committee on Agriculture favorably reported the bill stating that:

> The domestic producers of * * * dates have established marketing orders for their commodities under which those * * * dates which do not come up to standards of quality, grade, size, or maturity stipulated by the order are kept off of the market in their natural form and may be used only for processing.

The report—No. 1734 of the 86th Congress—noted that—

> A substantial portion of the harvest does not meet the standards established and is diverted to secondary uses.

The American date industry has undertaken major programs to acquaint the consumer with the high quality of the domestic product. As a consequence, consumer use and acceptance have increased. Is it not only fair that those who import dates from abroad—and they are obviously produced at a much lower cost—be required to maintain standards for these imported dates just as our domestic producers maintain standards for their product? Under our self-imposed regulations, often one-third of our domestic date crop fail to meet the requirements set up for sale as fresh dates or packaged dates. They are withheld from the whole-date market and diverted to products made from dates.

As the House Committee on Agriculture noted, without related standards for the imported products—

> There is nothing to prevent imported dates which do not come up to the high standards set for these products by American producers being brought into this country for sale in unlimited quantities. This would have a serious effect on American producers and their marketing programs in two respects:
>
> (1) By selling a product of inferior quality on a generally quality-regulated market, a misleading and unfair price advantage may be obtained, and
>
> (2) Consumer disappointment at receiving a product of inferior quality can seriously impair the efforts and expenditures of domestic producers to increase consumer acceptance and total sales of these products.

At the present time, the Food and Drug Administration attempts to spot check the imported dates to assure their purity and wholesomeness. The passage of this bill would not duplicate this function since the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to impose restrictions only as to "grade, size, quality, or maturity." Section 8e of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 is a penal statute, making it unlawful to import into the United States any commodities which do not meet the standards of grade, size, quality, or maturity established by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the authority of the section. Presumedly, once these restric-

tions are known, importers will make every effort to comply with them and detailed inspection by the Department of Agriculture will be unnecessary.

In the hearings on this bill held in the House last year, Mr. Tellis Codekas, a well-known dategrower from Indio, Calif., and the chairman of the Domestic Date Growers' Committee succinctly summed up the dilemma which confronts his industry without this legislation:

> We feel we are not trying to place a burden on any other variety of dates. We feel to increase the consumption of this date market, the consumer must get a quality and uniform product, one which, when she picks it up, she will come back and buy it again. If she picks up dates and puts them in her home, the family does not know and she probably does not know where the dates come from. She does not know if they are imported or domestic. If she gets a bad package, it reflects not only on the importers but on us. We feel we want to try to expand our sales, and it is necessary to have good quality dates to offer to the consumer. We feel this is the only way to do it.

The passage of this bill would be good for both the domestic and imported industries since such standards would improve the overall market and thus increase consumption of dates and date products by our citizens.

TO FORM A MORE PERFECT UNION: ARTICLES FROM NEW YORK TIMES ARE QUOTED ON AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is my privilege to be a cosponsor of the aid-to-education bill introduced earlier by the able and diligent senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. This measure, which is intended to implement the President's modest program with ambitious goals, is, in my opinion, a sound one.

Doubtless, however, it will face rigorous scrutiny and criticism from the opposition both in committee and in this Chamber. In this respect, the noted Washington Bureau chief for the New York Times, Mr. James Reston, pointed out that the atmosphere which sometimes prevails here leads normally sensible and even intelligent men to the habit of accepting as incontrovertible fact ideas that have long since ceased to be true or in some cases never were true. He was speaking with specific reference to acceptance of the fiction that Federal assistance to education is somehow un-American, socialistic, or unconstitutional.

It is not my intent today to argue at length to dispel this fantasy—nor to plead the case for Federal aid from the long history of national action in this field. This issue I may address at another time if the occasion warrants. For the present, I limit myself to suggesting to those who would invoke the hallowed cause of States rights and the 10th amendment the fact that the preamble of the Constitution states as its first purpose the aim to form a more perfect Union.

Mr. President, this Nation no longer lives under the Articles of Confederation—though there are some who seem reluctant to acknowledge the change. We tried the Articles of Confederation for almost 10 years and found them wanting. And it was then that the founders determined to form a more perfect Union.

This has particular reference to the issue of Federal aid to education because it is the union of all the States, Mr. President, which is in need of the specialists to solve the scientific and technical problems of our civilization. And it is the Union which requires citizens of broad-gage learning who are qualified to shape the political decisions of our age.

It is not merely a question of the educational needs of the State of West Virginia, or New Jersey, or Alabama, or of any particular State. Just as the United States are more than the sum of the 50 individual States, so the national interest in education calls for a commitment greater than the sum of the interests of the 50 States. For 50 years we have accepted this logic in the conservation and development of our natural resources. Is it not time now to apply the same logic to the conservation and development of our infinitely more precious human resources?

In keeping with this philosophy, the proposed measure would work toward the long-range goal of establishing a national minimal level of school support by bringing the status of the most needy States into closer approximation with that of the more affluent. Thus, as Mr Fred M. Heckinger, education writer of the New York Times, demonstrated last Sunday—if one typical low bracket State were to spend all of its Federal allotment for increasing teachers' salaries across the board, every teacher in that State would receive a raise of $950 a year. Whereas, if the State of New York used all of its allotment for the same purpose, each of its teachers would receive a raise of $330.

Similarly, using the same low-bracket State and New York State for illustrative purposes, were they to devote all of their respective allotments to school construction, the Federal portion would amount to 11 percent of the unaided expenditures of New York State and 40 percent of the unaided expenditures of the typical less affluent State. The built-in incentive provision of the proposed measure would tend toward a more rapid relative cumulative development of the States which currently have the lower support levels. Yet, I would emphasize that this measure, unlike many Federal assistance programs which require State matching funds, would not penalize the poorer States for their inability to match the Federal grants.

Mr. President, one frequently encounters the argument that the problems of American education are not going to be solved by vast infusions of Federal money—that they are problems stemming from the inferior quality of American education, and that this is in turn the product largely of inadequate or inferior training of our teachers. The proponents of Federal assistance do not argue that it is a panacea for all our ailments, but the fact that the Federal Government cannot do everything should not be used as an argument against its doing anything.

The curriculums for the training and education of teachers are a matter for the determination of the colleges and State certification authorities, not the Federal Government—though I do not believe that Federal research facilities should be barred from studying and advising in this area. However, for those who see this as one of the major problems in the American educational scene—and I count myself in this company—there is some very encouraging information offered, again by Mr. Hechinger, in the New York Times of February 26. Mr. Hechinger reports that on the basis of a national canvass during the last 2 years, most of the 50 States have increased the requirements for the study of academic subjects by prospective teachers. Many of the remaining States are planning similar steps within the next 12 months.

Mr. Hechinger's article reports in considerable detail the steps that have been taken in many of our States to provide more academically sound and meaningful foundations for our prospective teachers. This is not the time for me to discourse on this subject in further detail, Mr. President, so I will say to my colleagues on both sides of the issue in the proposed bill that educational and State authorities are acting on the problem of providing better qualified teachers.

We must help them raise the salaries so that they can retain such teachers, and help them provide the facilities so that the teaching process may improve the minds of the children of America.

I would enjoin my colleagues—as this bill goes to committee and later when it is reported to the floor—that whatever our present persuasion, let us try to put aside doctrinaire attitudes and the cliches of an earlier age and consult the problem in terms of our national needs in a time of worldwide scientific, social, and economic change.

ARTIFICIAL POVERTY HINDERS PROGRESS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Mr. Leon Ward, a citizen of Utah, has written a most refreshing and thought-provoking letter to the editor of the Deseret News. His letter is so different in tone from the usual items which appear on the editorial pages of our press that I would like to have all of my colleagues read it. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE WE-CAN'T-AFFORD-IT CHANT—ARTIFICIAL POVERTY HINDERS PROGRESS

(By Leo Ward)

After reading the newspapers of Utah for the past 3 weeks I must express my amazement and disappointment. Beginning with the editorial of the Deseret News on the theme "Taxes Have Reached the Saturation Point," the tune of "we can't afford it" has been repeated by the Governor and is now

being echoed in the halls of the legislature until any hope of meeting the problems of our society today is lost in the artificial poverty we have created by our own self-destructive brainwashing.

We can afford to have two cars in the double garage; we can afford to buy $20,000, or $30,000, or $50,000 homes; we can afford to have so many clothes that storage becomes a headache; we can afford the food to gorge ourselves until our very fatness becomes a problem; we can afford to squander $5 here, $10 there; we can afford to build fine churches; we can afford to send our sons on missions—these are only a few of the things that we can and do afford.

Yes, all those things we can afford, but we can't afford adequate funds for education; we can't afford public funds to pay fairly for the multitude of services we get from our Government; we can't afford to provide the framework for a stable public service, even when private industry has found that such benefits to its employees pay dividends; we can't afford to cope with the problems of housing for the elderly, medical care, juvenile detention facilities which correct instead of compound an evil. Yes, these are just a few of the things we can't afford because we have been told that we can't afford them.

Nobody likes to pay taxes, and especially so when they are told repeatedly that the taxes they are paying are too high and that they are breaking the back of the taxpayer. In spite of the high taxes, have we ever had a higher standard of living? Have the profits and dividends, and savings of individuals, ever been much higher?

We need an aggressive, healthy society with vigorous public services and public agencies working in our behalf to improve the society in which we live. We have held the line too long while we have listened to organized groups that aren't working for you or for me, but for themselves. If it takes a sales tax increase of 1 percent to get us back on the road, I'm for it. If it takes a property tax increase to meet our social needs, I'm for it. If it takes both to smooth the way for a better society for my family, then I'm for it. We'll scrape by, secure in the belief that perhaps this time we are doing something for our State and our country ahead of what we do for ourselves.

THE SPY NEXT DOOR

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, recently there has been a great deal of discussion concerning the national telecast, by Armstrong Circle Theater, of a program entitled "The Spy Next Door."

Shortly before February 1, the date originally set for the telecast, the broadcasting system over which it was scheduled, canceled the showing.

It will be remembered that the two RB-47 pilots had been released from a Russian prison just a few days before that. They were then scheduled to arrive in the United States. Apparently there was a feeling that public showing of a film like "The Spy Next Door" would be harmful to continuance of the United States-Soviet relations then prevailing.

Frankly, Mr. President, I was greatly concerned that perhaps some agency or officials of the Government had interceded with the Columbia Broadcasting System, with a request that the showing be canceled. Such direct Government action would indeed be highly regrettable. However, upon talking to an official of the CBS, I became satisfied that such was not the case. CBS acted on its own, and in its best judgment felt the film should not then be shown. It changed its action later, so that the program was nationally telecast on February 15.

While credit should be given for later revocation of that decision, it should be clear that a decision to withhold the filming of a program such as the one under discussion would be a grave mistake indeed. It would be virtually an invitation on future occasions to the Russian Communists to engage in additional illegal and unconscionable acts, and to the expectation by them that when they rectified such a situation they would be entitled to some additional deferential treatment. Such a form of appeasement is not only below the position of the United States, but would also lead to heavy loss of self-respect, as well as loss of the respect of other nations of the world, including the Russian people.

The fact is that for 40 years the Communist movement has been engaged in a persistent and relentless conspiracy in America. Every day their efforts are advanced to their utmost. The only way in which we can successfully meet such a conspiracy is to maintain vigorous, persistent, and relentless opposition to it.

One of our best weapons is a popular, widely based awareness by our citizenry of the real nature of communism and the way in which it works. So long as efforts along this line are based on fact and realism, and so long as they are suitably presented, they should be encouraged.

The program entitled "The Spy Next Door," was based upon factual situations. In its preparation, its sponsors checked carefully with official Government sources, in order to lend a tone of authenticity, which is very commendable.

It is gratifying to note that demand has already shown itself for the film for reshowing to programs and groups at various cities in the Nation. All of this is to the good.

The sponsors of the program are to be congratulated for the public service they are rendering in a very vital field.

In order that the substance of this program can become even more widely known, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that its text be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

THE SPY NEXT DOOR

(Writer, Jerome Ross; director, William Corrigan; producer, Robert Costello; editor, Barbara Schultz)

Mr. EDWARDS. Good evening, everybody, coast to coast. This is Douglas Edwards. Tonight—a story about spies. It is based on cold documentary evidence. On cases made public by the FBI. On hearings conducted by Senate and House committees. On data provided by spies who have defected. You will see the entire framework of the Soviet espionage system, one of the most gigantic and widespread espionage systems ever devised.

* * * * *

Mr. EDWARDS. This is Moscow, headquarters of the Razvedka of Soviet espionage system.

All over the world, its agents and subagents are attempting to steal defense secrets from other countries—in an FBI report it is stated that a few years ago, in a single 18-month period, during 1956–7 481 cases of Soviet espionage to the Department of Justice. And the FBI reports that since the end of World War II, at least 35 Soviet and satellite diplomats in this country have been exposed as spies. And that according to Soviet defectors, between 70 and 80 percent of all Russian diplomats stationed in this country are assigned specific intelligence tasks, and working under them are many hundreds of other agents and subagents, both American citizens and foreigners.

* * * * *

Mr. EDWARDS. This factory is located in Buffalo, N.Y. It might also be a factory in Los Angeles. Or Denver. Or Springfield, Mass. Behind this doorway parts of an elaborate new invention are being manufactured. A device whose very existence is known only to a handful of Government officials and officers in the Pentagon. A top secret project, this machine has taken many years to develop. On it may depend the continued safety and well-being of our country.

This man has invented the device. He is Lawrence Grabel, electronics engineer. He is supervising the overall manufacture now going on in various widely separated cities.

Lawrence Grabel is fictitious. But he and every other character in this story are based on documented information, on similar persons and incidents now a matter of public record.

(Dissolve to Grabel's home.)

Mrs. GRABEL (on phone). Oh, Harriet, I don't see how we can come, Larry's out of town so much these days. No. No, he's working on a new book. You know, one of his impossibly theoretical opuses that I never understand. And his publisher's set a deadline.

(Grabel enters with bag.)

But thanks anyhow, dear, bye, bye.

(Hangs up.)

Mr. GRABEL. Hi, darling.

Mrs. GRABEL. You look exhausted, utterly exhausted.

Mr. GRABEL. We had some pretty rugged flying weather.

Mrs. GRABEL. Where were you this trip?

Mr. GRABEL. Now, honey, you know better than to ask me that.

Mrs. GRABEL. Honestly, you'd think I was a Russian spy.

Mr. GRABEL. Kiss me, Mata Hari.

Mrs. GRABEL. Vere were you, Tovarich?

Mr. GRABEL. Madam, G-2, the CIC and the FBI have all impressed on me that nobody—absolutely nobody——

Mrs. GRABEL. OK, OK. You're getting a real kick out of this cloak-and-dagger stuff, aren't you?

Mr. GRABEL. No, they insist it's essential.

Mrs. GRABEL. You should have heard me with Harriet Barton just now, planting your "Cover." You'd have been proud of me.

Mr. GRABEL. Nobody's supposed to know I'm even working for the Government.

(Dissolve to Moscow office.)

Mr. DENIKEN. Lawrence Grabel, age 49. Author of many textbooks and articles on computing machines. And listen to this, Colonel Guriev, "Grabel holds five basic U.S. patents on transistor circuits of the high-speed computer types. Two months ago he was given leave of absence from the university where he teaches theoretical electronics. He is working for the U.S. Government. He travels a great deal."

Colonel GURIEV. From one of your people in Washington?

Mr. DENIKEN. Yes, the one who told us 6 months ago about their new cryptographic machine. We think this information about Grabel means the machine is now in production, Colonel.

Colonel GURIEV. Based on this man Grabel's patents?

Mr. DENIKEN. Yes. At least, that's our evaluation of this data: an inventor of special computer circuits. Obviously, they've got him on a very important job. My guess is, they've subcontracted the component parts——

Colonel GURIEV. Their usual method, yes——

Mr. DENIKEN. And Grabel's visiting the different factories, supervising overall production.

Anyhow, I suggest we send out this directive.

Colonel GURIEV (reads): "Urgent, obtain all possible data on new transistor-type cryptographic machines, patented by Lawrence Grabel. Are they in production? If so, where?"

Mr. EDWARDS. This directive known as a "task" will go to espionage agents inside the U.S. territory.

Igor Deniken, civilian. Under him is a worldwide network of agents and subagents, tens of thousands of them, posing as diplomats, journalists, trade representatives, visiting scientists. Deniken heads the American section of KGB.

Its headquarters is in Dzerzhinsky and Lubyanka Streets in Moscow. A block-long, six-story building in Moscow—headquarters of the KGB—formerly known as the MVD, the NKVD, the Gay-Pay-Oo and, before that, the Cheka, the Russian secret police.

Every type of American publication is constantly perused by the KGB. Every aspect of U.S. technology is studied as well as miscellaneous data covering a wide variety of subjects.

Maps of American cities, freely published by our chambers of commerce or commercial firms, are carefully filed away. They show the locations of powerplants, urban transit systems, railroad facilities.

Colonel VLADIMIR GURIEV. Under him, thousands of other agents—military and naval observers and attachés, ordinary sailors on Russian freighters, pilots on Russian commercial planes, fishermen on Russian trawlers, the military counterpart of Deniken.

Mr. DENIKEN. I have a "sleeper" living in New York. Good man, an engineer. Excellent technical background in electronics.

Our next contact with him is day after tomorrow, 9 p.m., New York time. I'd like to activate him then.

Colonel GURIEV. I'll have our cryptography experts work up a list of questions about the new machine.

Mr. DENIKEN. Very good, we'll send out the signal to our relay point in Havana.

Colonel GURIEV. No, not Havana. Right now we're using one of the trawlers.

Mr. EDWARDS. In the Atlantic Ocean, in American coastal waters, a fishing vessel. Actually, it is a disguised Soviet naval trawler. It serves as a relay point, transmitting messages into the United States. Messages such as the detailed questionnaire about the new U.S. cryptographic machine. It is being received at 6:30 a.m. It will be retransmitted tonight at 9 p.m.

This man born in Riga, Latvia is a naturalized American citizen. For 3 years he has worked in New York City as a photographer's assistant. A bachelor, without family, without friends.

He is using the passport and identity of a dead man, George Kalbfuss. In France he went under the name Sergei Volkow. In Prague, he was Ivan Tolberg. In Guatemala, he was Harry Dubenko. His true identity is Maj. Alexis Rudchenko. In espionage jargon, he is known as a "sleeper"—a key agent planted illicitly, under deep cover or fabricated identity, in order to perform specific assignments.

Like Col. Rudolph Abel, arrested in Brooklyn on June 21, 1957, this man takes his instructions directly from the KGB in Moscow. His engineer's training enables him to seek out and evaluate highly complicated technological data. Often such agents wait months, or even years, before the signal is given for a particular job.

All over the United States—in our great industrial areas, in remote towns where key research may be going on—there are other sleepers, perhaps dozens, perhaps hundreds, listening in at appointed times. Each has his own code number.

Tonight Alexis recognizes that this message is for him.

Now comes the tedious job of transcribing his notes. The questionnaire from Moscow may run pages in length.

With the use of complete darkroom facilities he will transfer the message to microfilm.

The top of a tin can, bent double, will serve to hold the tiny strip of microfilm.

Next, among a score of subagents, the sleeper selects the person best able to obtain information on the cryptographic machine.

The message will be left at a drop or a dubok. In Russian, the word "dubok" means little oak—that is, a drop or hiding place for messages.

This bench, on Riverside Drive in New York, is a dubok.

The folded piece of tin containing the microfilm is held in place by a magnet nailed to the underside of the bench.

* * * * *

The final step takes place in a certain New York restaurant. In order to notify his subagent that a message is waiting at the dubok Alexis marks a specific page in the Manhattan telephone book.

In 1952 the Assistant Soviet Naval Attaché in Washington, Alexander Kovalev, utilized this precise system for alerting his subagents.

All this elaborate procedure is so that agent and subagent under ordinary circumstances need never meet. But this is no ordinary circumstance. In his message the agent has also asked for a treff or rendezvous.

The meeting place is this cafeteria in midtown Manhattan.

Of the sleeper's various subagents, none of whom know each other, this man—Leonard Gregory—is best qualified to go after the particular information wanted. He's the man in the field, so to speak, corresponding to Scientist Klaus Fuchs, arrested in England in 1950. Or David Greenglass, who worked under the Rosenbergs. Or Alfred Dean Slack sentenced to 15 years in 1950.

Mr. GREGORY. Hello, Steve. How are you?

Mr. EDWARDS. "Steve." He knows his boss, Alexis Rudchenko alias George Kalbfuss, only by the code name Steve. Thus, in the event of arrest, he can provide no more than a physical description of the man who directs him.

Leonard Gregary, born in Hartford, Conn. He works for a publishing house specializing in trade and technical publications. He began his spy career as a "nash" or idealistic amateur.

Mr. ALEXIS. How do you feel about the article you've been asked to write, Leonard?

Mr. GREGORY. Quite excited about it.

Mr. ALEXIS. I should think it would pay you, oh say, $500.

Mr. GREGORY. Good.

Mr. EDWARDS. Leonard Gregory is no longer an idealistic amateur. He is used to receiving a regular monthly remuneration.

Mr. GREGORY. A couple of years ago, I had the pleasure of interviewing Prof. Lawrence Grabel for one of my firm's technical publications.

Mr. ALEXIS. So you know him, then?

Mr. GREGORY. One of my college classmates is still doing graduate work with him. He can easily arrange for me to meet the professor about this new article I'm writing.

Mr. ALEXIS. Why don't you start working on it immediately?

Mr. GRABEL. Yes, Tommy, I remember him. He interviewed me once. Very nice chap. Sure, if you like, we can lunch tomorrow. Tell him to meet me at the Faculty Club at 12:30. Fine.

Mrs. GRABEL. Glad to hear you're having lunch these days.

Mr. GRABEL. Chap named Gregory. Friend of Tommy Cartwright. Wants some advice on an article.

Mr. EDWARDS. Results of the KGB directive: bits and pieces of information from many sources.

Mr. DENIKEN. Colonel.

Mr. GURIEV. Lawrence Grabel spent 2 days last week in Buffalo, N.Y.

Mr. DENIKEN. Get me the list of electronics plants in the Buffalo area. He may be interested in any one of them. I think our man in SOUCO can help us on this.

Mr. EDWARDS. Soviet espionage depends not on single agents or groups, but on parallel spy setups, known as apparats. Each apparat exists independently, each functions separately. There is rarely any cross contact between one such vertical spy-chain and another. Not even their chiefs know who heads other apparats. They operate throughout the United States. For instance, Sovco Commercial Trading Corp., 490 Fifth Avenue, New York City. With its head office in Moscow, Sovco does business with countless U.S. firms. Often unknown to its top executives, are the intelligence agents planted by the KGB or the GRU who take separate orders from Moscow.

Mr. SUZHINSKI. Hello, Mr. Herbert MacGruder, please.

Mr. EDWARDS. This purchasing agent for Sovco is an old hand at gathering items for KGB on a business or social level.

Mr. SUZHINSKI. How are you, Mr. MacGruder, Suzhinski here.

Mr. EDWARDS. He is talking to a prominent exporter of American electronics equipment, and here is how his contact pays off. A country club in Westchester. No member is more careful than Exporter Herbert MacGruder. No man is less likely to give aid and comfort to the Soviets.

Mr. MACGRUDER. Almost landed a big order with the Russians. Had to turn them down though. Since one of the plants I deal with in Buffalo has a hush-hush Government contract, I couldn't supply them. Naturally, I didn't tell them which plant.

Mr. DENIKEN. We've found out which plant it is, Colonel.

It seems that full security measures are in force at Empire Electronics in Buffalo. Now we've got to find out what other factories are involved.

Mr. GURIEV. Well, since the cryptographic machine is contracted for by the Pentagon, our GRU men can find out easily enough.

Mr. EDWARDS. The GRU or Chief Military Intelligence Directorate of the Ministry of Armed Forces is even larger, perhaps even more far reaching than the KGB. This organ functions directly under the General Staff of the Soviet Army and plants its own operatives in such places as No. 1119 16th Street NW., Washington 6—the Soviet Embassy—through its high iron fence, a letter was passed by Air Force Captain George Holmes French on April 5, 1957. In it, he offered to sell U.S. secret information. He was arrested and is now serving 10 years.

Soviet diplomatic personnel frequently engage in espionage activity.

AIDE. Mikhail, the Ambassador won't need you today. Take the afternoon off.

Mr. KLABOTKIN. Thank you, sir.

AIDE. Is that for His Excellency?

CHAUFFEUR. No, no. Gifts to mail back to my family.

Mr. EDWARDS. (VO) Gifts to mail back to his family. Corporation reports chamber of commerce statistics photostats from the U.S. Patent Office, local employment figures, such printed material is openly available to anyone who writes for it.

The Embassy chauffeur is Alexander Petrovich Klabotkin, second in charge of an apparatus functioning under the naval attaché. He is a full colonel in the GRU.

He is known as a "legal" agent. Legal, that is, in the sense that his presence is openly known and he enjoys diplomatic immunity. If caught spying, he will merely be asked to leave the United States. He resembles such recent agent-diplomats as Yuri Novkov, declared persona non grata, in January 1953. Igor Amosov, persona non grata, February 1954. Leonid Pivnev, May 1954. Ivan Bubchikov, June 1956. Boris Gladkov, June 1956. Vassili Molev, January 1957. Nikoli Kurochkin, June 1958. Kirill Doronkin, March 1959. Vadim Kirilyuk, January 1960. To name only a few.

Colonel Klabotkin is an expert in piecing together seemingly unrelated items.

Colonel GURIEV. Our Washington contact just informed me that the other factories involved are located in Plainfield, N.J., Gary, Ind., Montgomery, Ala.

Mr. DENIKEN. Alabama. Thank you, colonel.

Mr. EDWARDS. As more and more data is collected, a pattern begins to take shape.

Mr. DENIKEN. As of the above date, two significant items provided by our people in Sovco. One, shipments of freight from three other factories to Building E, Pyra-Pack Electronics Co. Two, several technicians from other companies, and their families, temporarily transferred on loan basis to Buffalo.

Evaluation of above data: that the cryptographic machines are now being assembled, and that the assembly point is Empire. Recommendation: directive to "Steve" urging immediate efforts to establish contact with some employee working in E building, Empire Electronics, Buffalo. Remember two f's in Buffalo, Comrade.

Mr. EDWARDS. In response to latest instructions, Major Rudchenko, alias Steve, has moved to Buffalo.

He studies recent issues of the plant newspaper. It's friendly and chatty. It tells of weddings and births and social activities among plant personnel. For instance, Fred Horvath, just elected captain of the building E bowling team.

Horvath, a Hungarian name. Perhaps it was Ferenc Horvath.

The major will make a few local inquiries. Within 24 hours, via Moscow, another KGB agent will be making more inquiries.

But not in the United States nor in Moscow. In Bucharest.

At the same time at a well-known faculty club the sleeper's young American subagent meets with Professor Grabel.

Mr. GREGORY. What do you think, Professor?

Mr. GRABEL. Darned interesting article. Well written.

Mr. GREGORY. Of course, it's completely theoretical. I doubt if memory cones could be used practically, in the way I've described.

Mr. GRABEL. Why not?

Mr. GREGORY. Well, for for one thing, how would you store and transmit the information? By satellite relay?

Mr. GRABEL. Possibly.

Mr. GREGORY. But then how would you translate it into everyday symbology? Assign combinations of sound waves to represent numerals or letter combinations?

Mr. GRABEL. You could. Or, better yet, one might—maybe you're right. I don't know, really. Maybe there isn't any practical application.

Mr. GREGORY. On the other hand, a few years ago you took out some basic patents——

Mr. GRABEL. Oh, you mean that cryptographic device?

Never got anywhere with it. Blueprints for a machine that just never worked.

Well, if you'll excuse me——

Mr. GREGORY. May I trouble you to look at the piece again when I've rewritten that first part.

Mr. GRABEL. Why not? No trouble at all.

Mr. EDWARDS. This is Special Agent Tom Holley. He heads a counterintelligence unit in a U.S. Government agency in Washington whose function is to combat espionage, to preserve our vital defense secrets.

Mr. HOLLEY. Come in, Mr. Grabel.

Mr. EDWARDS. In the event of any security problems, Lawrence Grabel has been told to contact Mr. Holley.

Mr. GRABEL. How do you do, sir?

Do you happen to remember me?

Mr. HOLLEY. Well, certainly by reputation. Also, we've been asked to keep an eye on you.

Mr. GRABEL. If you fellows hadn't made me so darned security-minded, I doubt if I'd even bother you with this, I mean, it's all so vague.

Mr. HOLLEY. Suppose you let me be the judge?

Mr. GRABEL. I have a funny feeling that I'm being pumped for information.

Mr. HOLLEY. Oh?

Mr. GRABEL. A young chap, friend of a friend, edits and writes technical articles in my general field. Well, yesterday—he showed me a draft of an article.

Mr. HOLLEY. Go on.

Mr. GRABEL. I may be doing him a gross injustice. I mean he's an awfully nice chap. My wife kids me over how cloak and daggerish I'm getting. Well, anyhow, this lad's an associate editor at Hendrix-Hobart Publications in New York. His name is——

Mr. HOLLEY. Leonard Gregory.

Mr. GRABEL. Why, yes.

Mr. HOLLEY. Bring me our 1035 file on Leonard Gregory.

* * * * *

Mr. HOLLEY. "Leonard Gregory, editor of scientific textbooks and technical trade papers, periodicals, et cetera, was a member of a Communist Party cell while a graduate student. He visited Mexico City in the spring of 1955 as a tourist. Was twice observed by Mexican police entering the Soviet Embassy. Believed to be a courier, passing classified U.S. data. However, no direct evidence of this. In 1958, Gregory contacted a civilian employee at Aberdeen Proving Ground, a former college classmate, and offered to buy classified blueprints for a technical article.

"Insufficient evidence for direct interrogation or indictment, but surveillance continues."

Mr. GRABEL. He's a Communist?

Mr. HOLLEY. Well, actually, he severed all connections with the American Communist Party in midsummer of 1954.

Mr. GRABEL. Then I'm wrong about him?

Mr. HOLLEY. No, that doesn't follow. You see, nowadays the Russians won't let their subagents remain in the organizations known to be tied with Russia, such as the American Communist Party. During the war, during our early atomic program, yes. But now it's too risky for them to use well-meaning amateurs.

Mr. GRABEL. So you think he's working for them?

Mr. HOLLEY. I'm going to let you find out for us, Mr. Grabel.

Mr. GRABEL. Me?

Mr. HOLLEY. I'd like for you to start feeding him data on the cryptographic machine.

Mr. GRABEL. But, it's top secret, every detail.

Mr. HOLLEY. Mr. Grabel, this is not an unusual procedure. You will have to feed this fellow Gregory a little bit of information at a time. Give him just enough to make it plausible and yet not enough to give away anything. To the point where Gregory thinks he'll get the assembly blueprints and calls in some of the higher ups.

Mr. GRABEL. You mean the sort of thing where I would show him perhaps a modified version of the three main circuits, or I might include the coil system that we discarded. Something almost true but would be very misleading.

Mr. HOLLEY. Exactly, and remember only a little bit each time.

Mr. GRABEL. How about something like this?

Mr. EDWARDS. In the jargon of counter espionage, Lawrence Grabel becomes what is known as a "controlled source" that is working under the direction of American security.

Mr. GREGORY. It's certainly a remarkably good illustration of the theoretical put to practical use.

If I'd had this before, Professor Grabel, it would have made my article a lot better.

Mr. GRABEL. Right here, there is the area that fascinates me.

Mr. GREGORY. Can I have this drawing, Professor Grabel?

Mr. GRABEL. Oh, I don't see why not if it'll help you in your work.

Mr. GREGORY. Thank you.

Mr. EDWARDS. The drawing is transferred to microfilm placed in a bent piece of tin, and left by Gregory at the dubok.

Major Rudchenko, although temporarily residing in Buffalo, continues to be a traveling man. Several times, over a period of weeks, this pattern is repeated.

And at the same time to avert suspicion, Mr. Grabel is carefully briefed on how to explain his violation of security in terms that Gregory will readily accept.

He's provided with what's called a legend.

Mr. GREGORY. Your wife is a fine cook, Mr. Grabel.

Mr. GRABEL. I think so, too. You'll have to come often.

Mr. GREGORY. Professor, did you mean what you said before?

Mr. GRABEL. That discussion while we were eating—the role of the scientist?

Mr. GREGORY. Yes. Do you really agree with me that we've got to rise above petty nationalism, petty loyalty that, for world peace, we scientists, we technicians, have got to take the future into our own hands?

Mr. GRABEL. Leonard——

Mr. GREGORY. Yes, sir?

Mr. GRABEL. Don't you suppose I've guessed where my help to you has been going? I want it to go there, Leonard.

Mr. EDWARDS. Subagent Gregory can now inform that a new nash has been recruited. And that a source of vital information is now available.

And 3 weeks later at a street corner in Buffalo by careful prearrangement, Lawrence Grabel appears. Under his coat he carries a dummy set of plans for the cryptographic machine. Gregory has arranged to bring the man he knows as "Steve" to spot microfilm it, using infrared.

Also waiting are these gentlemen from U.S. Security.

This one will record the entire proceeding on motion picture film.

Under Mr. Grabel's scarf, a tiny microphone will transmit any spoken conversation to Special Agent Holley.

The treff was to take place at 10 minutes past 9 p.m. However, a half an hour has elapsed, nobody comes to meet him—his instructions are to leave, an alternate meeting place is always arranged for, at a later time.

On the following night, several blocks away from the first prescribed location, Grabel again waits.

And again special agents station themselves nearby.

Once again, after a half-hour wait, Grabel departs. The next step is to make contact with Special Agent Holley.

Mr. HOLLEY. They've obviously decided not to do any more business with you.

Mr. GRABEL. What could've gone wrong?

Mr. HOLLEY. They're on to you, probably.

Mr. GRABEL. But, why? how?

Mr. HOLLEY. Don't underestimate them. Moscow's probably evaluated the stuff you've given them so far.

Mr. GRABEL. Well, what happens now?

Mr. HOLLEY. For the moment, nothing. You're out of the picture, as far as they're concerned. In a few weeks, maybe, they'll try something else or try to reach somebody else. Then we'll try something else. That's how the game is played.

Mr. GRABEL. What about Leonard Gregory?

Mr. HOLLEY. We'll get him when we want him.

Mr. EDWARDS. It took 4 years to crack the Rudolph Abel apparat.

Ten years before the apparat in which Alfred and Martha Stern took part was finally rounded up.

In Moscow, too, more time is needed. They will continue to go after the blueprints. In addition it has been decided to obtain a working model.

Mr. GURIEV. Lightweight aluminum. And we estimate the cases at the same size as those for the discarded T-14 model.

Mr. DENIKEN. Same weight, same size, not unmanageable.

Colonel GURIEV. The cases were made at the Gary plant and shipped on June 10, 1960, to Buffalo.

Mr. DENIKEN. June 10, they should be there by now.

Colonel GURIEV. Yes; any day now all the component parts will be ready for assembly.

Mr. EDWARDS. Six thousand miles from Moscow, 11,000 miles from Buffalo, is the city of Bangkok, capital of romantic Thailand, where, one afternoon, the entire diplomatic colony meets at a friendly lawn party given by the British Embassy.

Betsy Bonner is a typist and receptionist at the American Embassy.

Mrs. Nadya Radek is the wife of a minor employee at the Soviet Embassy.

Before going overseas, Betsy was given a course in security. But it's also her job to maintain friendly social contacts.

BETSY. I'm just exhausted. I spent all afternoon apartment hunting.

Mrs. RADEK. Apartment hunting?

BETSY. We're expecting some new personnel out here. I found a lovely apartment for them—that new building on Chavraniput Street.

Mrs. RADEK. Oh, yes, it's lovely. My husband and I looked there.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mrs. Radek has been assigned to "study" Betsy, among others.

In 1954, when Vladimir Petrov, third secretary, defected in Canberra, Australia, he told of Soviet missions and consulates the world over, riddled with trained espionage agents, among them himself and Mrs. Petrov.

KGB in Moscow will be given the names of the incoming U.S. personnel. In Washington a simple investigation will inform the Russians that they are two experienced code clerks, presently attending a cryptographic school. Obvious conclusion: they are being trained on the new machine and therefore the shipping date of the machine is near at hand.

Meantime, other bits of the jigsaw puzzle have been pieced together. The opportunity to steal the machine now presents itself.

Mr. DENIKEN (on phone). Oh, yes, it's the same Ferenc Horvath, colonel. No question about that. Our information comes straight from Budapest.

* * * * *

Mr. EDWARDS. Washington, D.C., the Rumanian Embassy—The FBI reports that Soviet espionage agents often make use of personnel from satellite legations and embassies.

Mr. KLABOTKIN. Naturally, it must come from you, Mr. Kaldor. We wouldn't dream of interfering.

In Buffalo, Fred Horvath is a foreman engineer at Pyra-Pack Electronics who has lived in this country since the age of six and has been thoroughly cleared by plant security.

Mr. Horvath. Magda. We're in second place. I was terrific, three strikes in a row.

Mr. KALDOR. Mr. Horvath.

Mr. HORVATH. Janor Kaldor, counselor, Rumanian Legation. My brother, is it about my brother?

Mr. KALDOR. In a way.

Mr. HORVATH. You see? What did I tell you? I told you, if we would only be patient. How soon will it be granted, sir?

Mr. KALDOR. How soon will what be granted?

Mr. HORVATH. Why, the exit permit for my brother and his family.

Mr. KALDOR. Tell me, sir. How is it your brother went back?

Mr. HORVATH. Well, it was when our grandfather died. In 1935. Stefen went back to settle the estate and he met a girl and they married.

Mr. KALDOR. And he stayed on?

Mr. HORVATH. First his wife didn't want to leave her parents, then the war came along. But now they're anxious to join us.

Mr. KALDOR. Your brother has five children, I believe——

Mr. HORVATH. Our own nieces and nephews, and we've never seen them. But, you know what my wife's done, sir? She's inquired into the public schools here in Buffalo. And we even know where there's a house they can rent. And I've talked to a man, a watchmaker like my brother, and he wants to take Stefan on as a helper.

Mr. KALDOR. Well, now, there are one or two things——

Mr. HORVATH. It's like I told the immigration people when they got the American Consulate to issue them a visa number, I'm an American citizen with a good job. No question of the family becoming a public charge.

Mr. KALDOR. Perhaps Mrs. Horvath won't mind leaving us alone for a few minutes?

Mr. HORVATH. Yes, please, Magda.

Mr. KALDOR. What do you do at Pyra Park Electronics?

Mr. HORVATH. What?

Mr. KALDOR. You're an assembly supervisor, are you not? Tell me, Mr. Horvath, are you cleared for all of E building?

Mr. HORVATH. I, I, don't know what you're talking about.

Mr. KALDOR. I think you know very well.

Mr. HORVATH. Listen, what is this? I thought you came to talk about my brother and his family.

Mr. KALDOR. I did. They could be here—like that. In 2 or 3 weeks, say. But, naturally, it would depend on you. Some friends of ours would like one of the code machines, Mr. Horvath.

Mr. HORVATH. Y-you're joking.

Mr. KALDOR. It is suggested that you bring out parts and assemble it here in your home. However, how you do it, we leave entirely up to you.

Mr. HORVATH. Oh, no, no.

No, no, no. Get out of here. Get out before I call the police.

Mr. KALDOR. Now, Mr. Horvath, really——

Mr. HORVATH. Forget about the permit. Better, much better, Stefan should stay where he is.

Mr. KALDOR. Oh, I don't think so, I really don't think so.

By the way, have you seen a recent picture of them, of Stefan and Ilona and the children?

Taken 2 days ago. As you see, in excellent health, all of them. I call your attention to the stamp. Official AVH photo.

Mr. EDWARDS. AVH—the official stamp of the Siguranza, the Rumanian police.

* * * * *

Mr. EDWARDS. And now, in building E at Pyra-Pack Electronics in Buffalo, Horvath begins his espionage activities.

One at a time top secret assembly blueprints are carefully studied, carefully memorized, and then replaced. And, over a period of several weeks, component parts are taken from storage bins.

A record is kept of each part that is removed.

But these key parts are not put back. Instead, on the inventory log, various single units are listed as defective and falsely certified as having been destroyed.

At home, at his workbench, supervising engineer Fred Horvath pieces together the new cryptographic machine.

Simple parts that he cannot steal, he rebuilds from memory.

Fear for his brother has involved this man in what is known as "a hostage situation."

Colonel GURIEV. I had the insides removed. We've been making measurements. The cryptographic machine could be placed inside. That's how it will reach us, via Sovco.

Mr. DENIKEN. Good. And we have just completed the operational plan paragraph 1, item "A." The manager of the TV factory in Kharkov has ordered 20 of these color sets to be shipped from New York, for dismantling and study.

Mr. EDWARDS. The operational plan for the theft of the cryptographic machine has been worked out in Moscow and is divided among several U.S. apparats. It is dangerous to overburden any single apparat.

In testimony given in Washington, in March 1959, Peter Sergeyeviv Deriabin, former KGB officer, explained this decentralized strategy; a directive has also been given to the Sovco apparat.

SHIPPING OFFICIAL. Yes, Mr. Suzhinski?

Mr. SUZHINSKI. Oh, Vlasnik—when are we shipping those TV sets for the factory in Kharkov?

SHIPPING OFFICIAL. On the 11th. They go out from Brooklyn, the freighter *Volny*.

Mr. SUZHINSKI. I have a friend up in Buffalo, he sells television sets. I'd like to throw a little business his way. Say, three or four of the sets?

SHIPPING OFFICIAL. Can he have them at our Brooklyn warehouse by the 10th, sir?

Mr. SUZHINSKI. I'm sure he can.

Mr. EDWARDS. At the same time, Rudchenko begins his part of the mission.

Mr. ALEXIS. How do you do. Is Mr. Horvath at home?

Please tell him, I'm from the Rasko Souvenir Co. It's about those loving cups he wants to order for the factory bowling tournament.

Mr. HORVATH. Good evening.

Mr. ALEXIS. How do you do, sir.

Mr. HORVATH. Did you bring the catalog for the silver-plated cups?

Mr. ALEXIS. Yes, but I hope to interest you in the gold-plated ones, they're far more handsome.

Mr. EDWARDS. They have given each other what is called the parol, or password.

Mr. HORVATH. What about my brother?

Mr. ALEXIS. Believe me, I don't know the first thing about your brother. I'm here to see how you're coming along.

Mr. ALEXIS. Will it be ready by January 6?

Mr. HORVATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALEXIS. I'm having a TV color set delivered to you on the 5th. Remove the insides. Keep it for yourself and your wife, if you wish. Substitute what you've built inside the cabinet.

When you get the machine installed call this number. They'll come and pick up the TV set. They know what to do with it.

Mr. HORVATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. EDWARDS. In the Buffalo, N.Y., station freight handler Charlie Agostino has knocked off work to eat his lunch. He notices the stencilling on two crates. On

orders from Moscow, Major Rudchenko, alias Leon Kremmens, has purchased and had shipped out from Buffalo two other TV sets. This, in order that the third set, to be shipped on the 7th, will arouse no undue suspicion. Charlies Agostino wonders why the Russians are sending TV sets from Buffalo.

In a day or so from now, he'll mention it to a neighbor, a patrolman on the Buffalo police force.

In the same way, in 1953, when Jimmy Bozart, 14-year-old Brooklyn newsboy, accidentally discovered a hollow 5-cent piece. He showed it to Patrolman Frank R. Milley and the boy's curiosity led ultimately to Col. Rudolph Abel.

After the machine has been assembled and wrapped in a blanket for insulation, it is carefully strapped inside the empty cabinet of the television set. It will then be ready for shipment.

Mr. DENIKEN. Yes, read it to me. New York.

Colonel GURIEV. Is everything on schedule?

Mr. DENIKEN. No slip-ups.

Send a telegram, "Z" code, Breshler, Bucharest. Suggest release of Stefan Horvath and family as soon as convenient.

Mr. SUZHINSKI. Hello, warehouse? Have all the crates been received on that order for Kharkov?

Good. How many from Buffalo? All three? Splendid.

Mr. EDWARDS. January 10. The freighter *Volney* is being loaded with cargo. Tomorrow she will sail with the tide. On that same day, acting on a phone call, U.S. security agents, Buffalo branch office, pay a visit to this television repair shop on Delaware Avenue.

TV SHOP OWNER. He said his name was Kremmens. I never saw him before. He walked in here cold one day and paid spot cash for three color sets. Had two of them sent down to New York City and the third to a man named Horvath here in town. I get a 40-percent markup, so who was I to ask questions?

BUFFALO AGENT. Go on.

TV SHOP OWNER. The friend sent his set back here and then I reshipped it out again to the New York people. That was part of the arrangement.

BUFFALO AGENT. Did you open the crate? Did you look inside the set?

TV SHOP OWNER. What for? I knew what's inside a television set. I was getting paid plenty for shipping it. Why should I ask questions?

BUFFALO AGENT. Have you got the address of this Kremmens man?

TV SHOP OWNER. He never gave me an address. But he had me call him once about delivery dates and, I wrote it down. He was at the Bijou Hotel.

BUFFALO AGENT. He's pulled out. What did he look like? Can you give us some kind of a description?

TV SHOP OWNER. Well, it's hard to say.

BUFFALO AGENT. Did he smoke a pipe?

TV SHOP OWNER. Why, yes, sir. Real strong tobacco.

Mr. HORVATH. I only saw him once. That time he came here. He gave the right password, but no name. He's about 50, tired looking. I nearly forgot. He smokes some kind of a Turkish or maybe it's Bulgarian tobacco. After he left, my wife had to open the window. What'll happen to me?

BUFFALO AGENT. You'll be put on trial.

Mr. HORVATH. What about my brother?

AGENT. You were his sponsor. You should know the immigration laws as well as I do. If a sponsor gets in trouble with the Government, the party he is sponsoring will not be allowed to enter the country under any circumstances. Horvath, why in God's name didn't you come to us and tell us? We'd have figured some way for you to seem to work with them and help your brother.

Mr. EDWARDS. The "characteristics' file." Under the heading "Smokers" is a notation about one George Kalbfuss, photographer's assistant, living in New York City. Eight years ago he was questioned in some inconclusive investigation; he'd established his complete innocence. Fortunately, U.S. agents had noted that Mr. Kalbfuss used a highly scented Turkish or Bulgarian pipe tobacco.

In 1950 the fact that an unknown courier spy was interested in chemistry led to the arrest of Harry Gold, now serving 30 years at Lewisburg Penitentiary.

Now, the New York branch office has been alerted. Armed with a search warrant, signed by a Federal judge, agents pay Mr. Kalbfuss a visit.

A shortwave radio, photographic equipment, movie film, coded memo books, a microdot device for condensing documents to pinhead size.

These shoes, as passports are called, fabricated by a cobbler or specialist in false identity papers. Hollowed out nails, pencils, coins, earrings, and cufflinks for carrying messages.

NEW YORK AGENT No. 1. Professor Grabel, are these your sketches?

Mr. GRABEL. That's right. I supplied them to Leonard Gregory.

NEW YORK AGENT No. 1. George Kalbfuss?

Mr. ALEXIS. Yes.

I am Maj. Alexis Nikolaevich Rudchenko, Soviet army, retired; citizen of U.S.S.R. I request to have an attorney appointed by the New York Bar Association.

NEW YORK AGENT No. 1. We know you've been given a course in U.S. legal procedure, but where was the cryptographic machine delivered, major?

SECOND AGENT. Here we are, Sovco Warehouse in Brooklyn.

Mr. EDWARDS. But, at the warehouse in Brooklyn, it is learned that all consignments have been trucked over to the pier where the freighter *Volny* has been loading cargo..

Mr. GRABEL. Can't you stop them? Can't you get a police launch and——

NEW YORK AGENT No. 1. Take it easy, Mr. Grabel. No; we can't—that 'ud create an incident.

Mr. GRABEL. But you don't know. You don't realize what they're getting away with.

Mr. HOLLEY. They got away with absolutely nothing, Mr. Grabel. Remember what I told you: it gets to be a kind of game? The model they stole has the wrong components in it. Circuits that were doctored, obsolete parts that we camouflaged. It may take them months to find out. At least, it'll give us a breathing spell.

We knew it was Horvath who they'd subverted in building E, so we fed him what we wanted them to have. It's something like you with Gregory only this time Horvath never suspected we were using him.

Mr. GRABEL. And this time it worked.

Mr. HOLLEY. Yes, it's not a bad haul. Gregory Horvath, Rudchenko and if Rudchenko talks, maybe there'll be others.

Mr. GRABEL. Will he talk?

Mr. HOLLEY. I doubt it, not an old timer like him. This is merely journalistic exaggeration, wishful thinking. A case like this one is far from closed. We've knocked one apparat out of action, but how many others are working on the same assignment? It may be months—or years—before they're smoked out. They'll keep right on digging away at us.

Mr. DENIKEN. Next time, colonel. We'll get it next time.

Colonel GURIEV. Of course.

Mr. DENIKEN. By the way, Tass wants to send out a statement on this arrest. Let me read you what I've prepared.

The Soviet Government has no knowledge of this man. Furthermore it categorically denies the charges. This is one more instance of U.S. propaganda, designed to imperil world peace.

* * * * *

Mr. EDWARDS. And now I would like you to meet the Honorable ROMAN L. HRUSKA.

Senator HRUSKA. Thank you, Mr. Edwards.

The program you have just seen is based on official records. It tells us forcefully that America is under constant threat from enemy forces—more penetrating, persistent, and powerful than most people realize.

Communist espionage is not an amateur activity. Those engaged in it are professionals, highly skilled and well trained. They work grimly and for keeps to get information which is needed to weaken and eventually to destroy us.

Our $43 billion budget for defense and security shows that the cold war is real. Authentic programs like this one show how some of it is fought. At all times, even at this very hour, actions of spys continue throughout our land in every endeavor related to our national security. Your law enforcement agencies are doing a courageous, effective job in combating such activities.

But, they cannot do it alone. They need the cooperation, understanding, and support of an alert, responsible citizenry. A citizenry which focuses on the present danger and yet retains its balance.

With such an aroused and informed people, our country's secrets and safety will be more secure—as will our individual liberty and national heritage.

Thank you and goodnight.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT REQUIRING BALANCED FEDERAL BUDGETS—WYOMING RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am pleased to be associated with Senator BRIDGES, Senator CURTIS, and Senator COTTON in the effort for a constitutional amendment requiring balanced Federal budgets. We have introduced Senate Joint Resolution 38 for this purpose.

Acting under article V of the Constitution, the Legislature of the State of Wyoming has passed a resolution, and the Governor has signed it, urging Congress to call a constitutional convention to propose such an amendment.

I congratulate Wyoming as a leader in this move. Increasing interest by the States in the serious fiscal matters confronting the Nation is gratifying. I am advised that State taxpayer groups in many States, acting in concert with the National Taxpayers' Conference, are deeply concerned over conditions as they exist.

The situation is that the Federal Government, through the current fiscal year, will have balanced its budget only 5 times in the 24 peacetime years.

The Federal debt now exceeds $290 billion, and interest on the Federal debt is costing more than 10 cents out of every revenue dollar.

Secretary of the Treasury Dillon on January 11 testified that total debt in the United States now exceeds a trillion dollars—individual debt more than $286 billion; corporate debt nearly $360 billion; State and local debt nearly $70 billion, and the Federal debt more than $290 billion.

There is certain to be another Federal deficit in the current fiscal year ending

June 30, and I predict still another deficit in the year beginning July 1. The deficit next year could be large, in view of a possible decline in tax revenue and prospects for increased expenditures.

Another huge budget deficit at this time, combined with the continuing deficit in our foreign payments balance, could be dangerous. Budget deficits contribute to inflation. Inflation involves confidence in the dollar. Declining confidence in the dollar will result in further loss of gold.

The deficit in our foreign payments balance has already resulted in the loss of $5 billion of our gold reserves to foreigners in 3 years.

Our gold reserves are now at their lowest level in 20 years; we have less than $18 billion. Some $12 billion in gold is needed to back our currency and deposits, and foreign governments and banks still have large claims on our supply if they choose to demand payment in gold.

There is an urgent need for balanced general fund budgets, with surplus for debt reduction, if we are to preserve confidence in the dollar. The Wyoming resolution is a move in the right direction. I sincerely hope other States will follow, and that Congress will comply.

As one Member of the U.S. Senate, I deeply appreciate the action by the State of Wyoming, and the activity of the National Taxpayers' Conference, and its organizations which are interested in this amendment.

PRESS CONFERENCE BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR UDALL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on the 9th of February I read, on the floor of the Senate, a letter which I had addressed to the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart Udall, inviting him to clarify the impression created by certain press reports on the news conference which he had held.

I stated at that time, and in the letter to Mr. Udall, that I would be glad to read on the floor of the Senate any letter he might wish to issue clarifying his statement. I have received a reply letter, which was dated February 13, 1961, which I desire now to read.

I may say, in that connection, that I was absent from the city over the Lincoln birthday weekend, and did not return until Friday; so this is the first opportunity I have had personally to read the letter into the RECORD. The letter by the Secretary of the Interior reads as follows:

DEAR FRANCIS: This is a reply to your letter of February 9, 1961. I first learned of this letter about 2 p.m., on the 9th when my press secretary exhibited to me a news story based on your comments on the Senate floor earlier in the day. As your remarks and letter (which bore a 5:30 p.m., February 9, postmark—and which I received the following day) were in the nature of a personal attack on me, in self-defense I had no choice but to take the discourteous course and reply to it through the press media prior to the time that it arrived.

My reply, I confess, was motivated in part by anger, but, as someone said recently, that is "part of the game of politics," too. In any event, I made the following statements to the AP and UP reporters (which you have undoubtedly already read) and I must report them here as in part they constitute my reply to your letter:

"Senator CASE should be ashamed of himself for unloosing a mishmash of innuendoes which represent a sideswiping attack on my character.

"If he had taken the time to read the transcript of my news conference he would have realized that all of his 'impressions' are false.

"If he would have bothered to talk with his South Dakota colleague—BEN REIFEL—or the other three Republican Congressmen I talked to—he could have quickly ascertained that projects were not discussed, and that nothing improper passed between us.

"I receive a daily average of 15 or 20 calls from Senators and Representatives. Surely, Senator CASE does not contend that members of the Cabinet should not initiate conversations with Members of Congress."

As a Congressman and public official I have always gone out of my way to try to understand the other fellow and his point of view, and it does seem to me that perhaps both of us can learn something from this encounter if we put our minds to it.

I am enclosing for your scrutiny a copy of the press conference to which you referred in your letter, and I think you will find on perusing it that my remarks were quite similar to those that you or any other former Congressman might have made under the circumstances.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

P.S.—I appreciate your offer to read my reply on the floor of the Senate, as I believe that many of your colleagues will be interested in my explanation and rejoinder.

S.L.U.

To make the record complete, I should place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the portion of the transcript of the press conference when the Secretary was asked about the matter and which formed the basis of the press story. I note in reading this material, and I did not have access to the transcript until the Secretary sent it to me, that there was considerable reference to the possibility of changing the location of the saline water plants. That was a matter which particularly disturbed me because I wondered if the Secretary was going to institute a review of the location of all five of the saline water plants. The one that was particularly mentioned by the press was the one in North Carolina, although the transcript reveals that the Secretary also referred to the factors which were used in the location of the plant in California and disclaimed any intention to review the decisions on any other than the one proposed to be placed in North Carolina.

He noted:

We were fascinated to find in looking back that when the west coast plant was located, there were two locations in California, one had 895 points and one had 875 points, but the Secretary chose the one in San Diego, where a particular political situation existed, which had 825 points.

The comments of the Secretary are of interest and public importance, and I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the Secretary's press conference may be printed in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, insofar as it pertains to this matter.

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

The PRESS. Mr. Secretary, during the fight on the House Rules Committee, some Western Republican Congressmen said you telephoned them and told them to "shape up and vote right," if they wanted a sympathetic ear in the Interior Department on their reclamation projects. Do you have any comment on that?

Secretary UDALL. I could never quite tell from the press just exactly what they said I said. I hope these Congressmen that I talked to do not object to my calling them, and if they do, I think that they should say so. It never was quite plain to me from what Mr. HALLECK said that I had said anything improper or that I had done anything other than perhaps pass the time of day.

I do not think that I did anything improper. In fact, several of them—I talked to Democrats and Republicans—lots of them are my friends and I worked with them and I know them. I believe in reasoning with people, and if I did anything that previous Secretaries or Cabinet officers have not done under similar circumstances, no one to my mind at the moment has said that I did such things. So I really would await the bill of particulars.

The PRESS. Did the people you talked to vote right?

Secretary UDALL. I got a result or two.

The PRESS. What is your batting average?

The PRESS. What did you tell them, Mr. Secretary? Mr. CHENOWETH in particular, he is one of those who voted "no," or voted "not present."

Secretary UDALL. I do not think that I would care to discuss what I said other than to say that I think all of us in the House understand the rules of the game. I discussed the rules of the game, and discussed other matters of mutual interest.

The PRESS. What are the rules of the game?

Secretary UDALL. Well, if anyone who has been around as long as you have, Helen, does not know the rules of the game, I am afraid that you will never learn.

The PRESS. Mr. Secretary, I thought you were talking about this new administration. Isn't that what you mean when you talk about the rules of the game?

Secretary UDALL. When I say the rules of the game, I am talking about the rules of national politics. I do not think that this administration, other than perhaps in terms of followthrough and field generalship and vigor, perhaps—maybe we are doing things that other administrations have done a little more effectively in some instances, but I think that the rules have always been the same, no matter which party is in power.

I do not think that we are doing anything new or different than has been done. This Department has always been a sensitive area in these matters.

The PRESS. Do Frying Pan and Burns Creek still have the priority that you reportedly gave them earlier?

Secretary UDALL. I never did give Frying Pan a priority.

The PRESS. Well, there was something, I think in that REA News, that you had given a priority to Frying Pan and Burns Creek.

Secretary UDALL. Maybe the REA people gave it priority. In my last press conference, or sometime, I think that I gave priority, or as examples of things we would give priority to, Burns Creek and San Juan Chama, Navajo, and those are two. I am interested in Frying Pan, but I did not say this was top priority.

The PRESS. Mr. Secretary, back to that congressional thing for a moment, your discussions with the Congressmen, were they taken with the direction or knowledge or acquiescence of the President?

Secretary UDALL. I think it was generally known, and it was widely reported in the press that some of the people at the White House were participating in discussions. I think this is proper and as it should be.

I received no directions from the President and I did talk with some of his people.

The PRESS. When you were a Congressman, were you called by members of the Cabinet and asked to vote on certain things?

Secretary UDALL. Well, you see, I served for six years where the party, not my party, was in power, and I had contacts with people in the Interior Department very frequently, very frequent contacts. I do not know that I ever had a call from the Secretary himself, but I had conversations with people in the Department of a similar tenor.

The PRESS. Mr. Secretary——

Secretary UDALL. Let me be very candid about it. I do not think that this administration and the various Cabinet people and others did anything different than has been done under other circumstances.

Charlie Halleck, for example, styles himself as a "gut fighter" and a guy who plays the game to the hilt. I am afraid he does not like it when other people play the game to the hilt, too. That is really about what it got down to, it seemed to me.

The PRESS. Mr. Secretary, under the rules of the game, since Mr. Chenoweth did not vote as you hoped he would, what happens to Frying Pan?

Secretary UDALL. I was not terribly unhappy with what he did, and we do not in this Department—we handle nearly a fourth of the bills that pass in Congress. It has never been the tradition of the committees on the Hill, because of the volume of business and the fact that we have to cooperate, nor of this Department, to engage in little partisan forays.

You get down to the question of priorities, which is a different matter. Certainly someone who has voted, let us say, to deny consideration to the basic administration program, if he shows up with hat in hand the next week and says, "Here is my program; give me some help, naturally if there are other Congressmen who have programs you might give them a little attention before you do the other fellow.

The PRESS. Does that mean he is in pretty bad shape on Frying Pan?

Secretary UDALL. No, I would not say so.

The PRESS. Did his vote affect Frying Pan in any way?

Secretary UDALL. Well, it is not a matter simply of it affecting his relationships here. I think that his vote and the vote of other Republican Congressmen had a very tremendous impact on some of the people in the House who voted on the other side.

They have memories, after all, and I am perhaps talking more as a House Member, a former House Member, than a Cabinet member, but one of the things that I was concerned about was not necessarily the effect down here, but what is the effect on your colleagues who have a vote on programs that affect many areas of this country?

The PRESS. Mr. Secretary, did you have an exchange with Representative LENNON on this matter?

Secretary UDALL. No, I had no contact with him.

The PRESS. Mr. Secretary, have you talked——

Secretary UDALL. I take that back. He sent me a wire, and I sent him a letter yesterday.

The PRESS. Have you talked with Senator MANSFIELD about his copper cartel program?

Secretary UDALL. No, I have not.

The PRESS. Do you have any comment to make on that?

Secretary UDALL. No.

The PRESS. You do not want to say anything further on the LENNON thing, just that there was an exchange?

Secretary UDALL. I answered your question, and I had an exchange.

The PRESS. There was no exchange prior to the vote of Congressman LENNON?

Secretary UDALL. Not with me; no.

The PRESS. Concerning the desalinization plant in North Carolina?

Secretary UDALL. This was a plant where I think the decision on this was announced on the 17th of January. This was one which came under the general rule that I announced, of reviewing last-minute decisions, and naturally there was interest in this on the Hill, and this came into the picture. But I had no personal contact with the Congressman on it.

The PRESS. Has the review of that situation been completed?

Secretary UDALL. The review is underway now.

The PRESS. It is still underway?

Secretary UDALL. That is right. I might comment, and this will give you an idea, to talk about the rules of the game, as to this particular saline water plant, there were five of them, you know. They had an advisory board which determines where it would be located and a selection board, I think it is called, and using 1,000-point-rating scale, this Wrightsville Beach, N.C., location which got it had 885 points, and Port Orange had 880, and it seems to me that in itself is almost reason for some review.

I am not saying that there were politics in this, but I am saying that maybe a little bit of the rules of the game are in it. We were fascinated to find in looking back that when the west coast plant was located, there were two locations in California, one had 895 points and one had 875 points, but the Secretary chose the one in San Diego, where a particular political situation existed, which had 825 points.

The PRESS. Would you name the two higher ones, there, sir?

Secretary UDALL. One was Camp Pendleton, Calif. This was announced in October of 1959.

What I am doing, I think there is ample precedent for.

The PRESS. There were political considerations in the selection of the San Diego plant?

Secretary UDALL. I am not saying that. I am saying that these were the facts. You can draw conclusions if you want to.

The PRESS. Well, is there any thought of changing that West Coast plant or any other of the saline water plants?

Secretary UDALL. No, these are all decisions which are final. The only reason the other one has come under review is that it was done in the last week.

The PRESS. What do these points relate to, Mr. Secretary? What did the 1,000 points relate to?

Secretary UDALL. It is just a rating scale of 1,000 points which consists of several different factors, such as the cooperation extended and the nature of the site, and it is a rating scale that the selection committee rigged up, a rather involved one.

The PRESS. Mr. Secretary, what was the figure on Wrightsville Beach?

Secretary UDALL. Wrightsville Beach scored 885 out of a possible 1,000, and Port Orange, Fla., had 880, and Greenport, Long Island, 815, and Virginia Beach, Va., 810.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release from the office of ALTON LENNON, a former Member of this body, now a Representative in Congress, dated January 28, 1961.

The release states that Mr. LENNON, in a telegram sent to Secretary Udall, said in part:

Your aid, Orren Beaty, is quoted in the Star-News newspaper, Wilmington, N.C., Friday, January 27, 1961, as follows: "Udall's aid said the Wrightsville Beach plant 'is one of the 11th hour decisions subject to review' and added that the decision is tied up with the current fight over liberalizing the Rules Committee. He said 'Democratic members on Capitol Hill' are putting pressure on the Interior Department to use the plant as a lever over Representative ALTON LENNON, in an effort to swing him over to Speaker SAM RAYBURN's side."

Mr. LENNON goes on to say:

I have a right to know who these individuals are in the Congress, or otherwise, that your office says are putting the pressure on you to use the review of the selection of Wrightsville Beach, N.C., as the site for the East Coast Saline Water Demonstration Plant as a lever over me in an effort to persuade me to change my position with respect to the membership of the House Rules Committee.

Mr. President, along with general reports on the press conference, it was my learning of this incident which aroused my special interest, because I had been active in legislation to locate the saline water plants, as had the distinguished present occupant of the chair, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE].

One of the plants had been located in South Dakota. I was interested in knowing whether the call to my congressional colleague, Representative REIFEL, had anything to do with suggesting a possible relocation for that plant. I learned, upon inquiry, that no mention of that particular plant was made in the conversation which was held with Mr. REIFEL.

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

TELEGRAM TO HON. STEWART L. UDALL, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I attempted to reach you by telephone today but was unable to do so.

Your aid, Orren Beaty, is quoted in the Star-News newspaper, Wilmington, N.C., Friday, January 27, 1961, as follows: "Udall's aid said the Wrightsville Beach plant 'is one of the 11th hour decisions subject to review' and added that the decision is tied up with the current fight over liberalizing the Rules Committee. He said 'Democratic Members on Capitol Hill' are putting pressure on the Interior Department to use the plant as a lever over Representative ALTON LENNON, Democrat, of North Carolina, in an effort to swing him over to Speaker SAM RAYBURN's side."

I am shocked and amazed that such a statement should come from your Department and be given to the press, without at least doing me the courtesy of communicating with me or my office before such a statement was released to the press by your office.

I have a right to know who these individuals are in the Congress, or otherwise, that your office says are putting the pressure on you to use the review of the selection of Wrightsville Beach, N.C., as the site for the east coast saline water demonstration plant as a lever over me in an effort to persuade me to change my position with respect to the membership of the House Rules Committee.

This suggested threat or blackmail of a Member of Congress is inconceivable and I

believe will be rightfully resented by the fair-thinking people of North Carolina and America. North Carolina gave to Mr. Kennedy and to the new Democratic administration 14 electoral votes. My congressional district, and to an appreciable degree through my efforts, gave to our national ticket in excess of a 28,000 majority, which is better than 50 percent of the majority North Carolina gave to our President and Vice President.

I am sure you have been advised through your own Department that the selection of Wrightsville Beach, N.C., was based on the evaluation of sites made by an independent, out of Government, site selection board, and that political considerations did not enter into the choice. I am sure you have further been advised by your own Department that Wrightsville Beach has the highest rating of cities considered by the selection board and that the choice by the former Secretary of Interior was on this basis only, just as it was in the selection of the four other demonstration plants across the Nation.

ALTON LENNON,
Member of Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In concluding, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article which was published in the Wilmington, N.C., Morning Star of January 27, 1961, which occasioned the telegram from Representative LENNON, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

POLITICS THREAT TO SALINE PLANT AT WRIGHTSVILLE

(By Bob Garsson)

An aid to Gov. Terry Sanford said Thursday that the Chief Executive is "keeping closely in touch" with Washington officials on the proposed saline water conversion plant in Wrightsville Beach.

But a report from Washington Thursday night indicated the proposed plant is becoming a political football in connection with the fight to enlarge the House Rules Committee.

Graham Jones, press secretary to Sanford, said the Governor called Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall Thursday after learning of a report quoting Udall as not being in favor of 11th hour decisions. The decision to locate the plant in Wrightsville Beach was made by Interior Secretary Fred Seaton in the closing days of the Eisenhower administration. An aid to Udall confirmed in a telephone conversation with the Wilmington Morning Star Thursday night, that the Secretary and Sanford had conferred earlier in the day by telephone.

Udall's aid said the Wrightsville Beach plant "is one of the 11th hour decisions subject to review" and added that the decision is tied up with the current fight over liberalizing the Rules Committee.

He said, "Democratic members on Capitol Hill" are putting pressure on the Interior Department to use the plant as a lever over Representative ALTON LENNON, Democrat, of North Carolina, in an effort to swing him over to Speaker SAM RAYBURN's side.

RAYBURN is attempting to force enlargement of the Rules group to break the Republican-southern Democrat coalition which is expected to oppose many points in President John F. Kennedy's program. LENNON has indicated he is opposed to the Rayburn plan.

LENNON was attending a meeting in Washington Thursday night and could not be reached for comment.

Jones said Sanford had been attempting to contact LENNON all day, but had been unable to do so. He noted that in a press conference Thursday, Sanford said "the plant should be and would be located at Wrightsville Beach."

Sanford was asked at his press conference if he had discussed the rule fight with members of the State's congressional delegation. He said "Yes." Asked to be more specific, Sanford said: "I wouldn't care to discuss that matter further."

John Slear, administrative assistant to LENNON, said Thursday night that the statement of Udall's aid does not surprise him, but that it was the first he had heard of it. He said he believes LENNON is unaware of the development.

Wrightsville Beach Mayor Jack Thompson said he had not heard of the development concerning LENNON prior to a call from the Wilmington Morning Star and did not know enough about the new development to comment on it.

He said, however, that he had held several conferences Thursday with different agencies and "we still feel pretty good about it. I don't think we stand too much chance to lose it (the plant) as a result of Udall's review."

Jones said Sanford is keeping in touch with Washington officials "on this matter of great importance to southeastern North Carolina." He declined to go into detail on the substance of Sanford's conversation with Udall, saying "That would be up to Udall to release."

Udall declined to reveal the subject of the talk.

The Governor's press secretary did say Sanford regards the original decision to locate the saline plant in Wrightsville Beach as "not a partisan matter."

Jones pointed out that Sanford has been "scrupulously careful" not to interfere with decisions facing Members of the North Carolina congressional delegation.

As an example, Jones cited Sanford's recent appearance on a nationally televised show where the Governor was asked how he felt about a medical care program financed through social security. The Governor replied in substance that this question could properly be handled by the capable men who represent North Carolina in the Senate and House of Representatives.

He quoted Sanford as saying Thursday that "Congressman LENNON represents that district and represents it well."

Sanford's statements were made prior to the disclosure about LENNON by Udall's aid.

The report that the decision might be reversed was what sent Sanford hurrying to the phone to contact Udall, Jones said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 seconds, merely to say that Secretary Udall has subsequently announced that the plant in North Carolina will remain where it was sited, and it is not being changed. I want that in the RECORD in justice to the Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

MOMENT OF TRUTH IN THE CONGO

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I seek recognition again in the morning hour, all other Members who have sought recognition having been recognized.

I wish to make a brief statement on the Congo.

The moment of truth in the Congo has now arrived.

The confusion in the Congo calls for the display of spirit and determination by the U.N.

If this spirit and determination are not present now, the peace of Africa and the world is endangered and the position of the U.N. Secretary General Hammarskjold seriously undermined.

The resolution adopted early on the morning of February 21 by the U.N. Security Council urges that the United Nations take immediately all appropriate measures to prevent the occurrence of civil war in the Congo, including arrangements for cease fire, the halting of all military operations, the prevention of clashes, and the use of force, if necessary in the last resort.

There is ample authority for the U.N. to use force to carry out its mandate in the Congo. Secretary Hammarskjold's representative, Rajeshwar Dayal, apparently defines this resolution to mean that the U.N. force must enforce a cease fire by the forces which are cooperating with the U.N.—those of Leopoldville, Elizabethville, and the mining State of South Kasai—but give the U.N. force no authority to oppose the Gizenga-Lumumbaist forces from Stanleyville which do not acknowledge the control or authority of the U.N. It is these Communist-backed and openly Communist-supplied forces which are now moving into Leopoldville Province and on Leopoldville, the national capital; and it is inconceivable that this is not being done as a calculated Communist probe, aggressive and brassy, to capture the Congo while the free world is thinking and talking.

Such self-paralysis by the forces of freedom is intolerable. The U.N. mission is to maintain at least the status quo it found in the Congo, and that means heading off the Gizenga forces. Whether Mr. Dayal should go or stay is Mr. Hammarskjold's business, for it is Mr. Hammarskjold who is on trial here, not his lieutenant, and the stakes are very high. Prime Minister Nehru's backing for Mr. Hammarskjold strengthens his hand. There is no time to dally; the U.N. force has its mandate backed by the principal powers of the free world and by President Kennedy's solemn declaration of U.S. determination to support the U.N. in the Congo and it is at the Rubicon. The time has come to put up by ordering military action, or to shut up and gravely endanger the peace of the world.

THE WILKINSON REPORT ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 22, my friend and colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], placed in the RECORD a statement on Federal aid to education, and defined the position of the Republican Party on this important question in terms of the 1960 party platform. The Senator from New York desired to show that my statement of proposed Republican principles, which

charted a course for the handling of the Nation's educational needs without resort to Federal Government aid, was a personal view and not the party's. With this I agree. He went on to quote from the 1960 Republican Party platform a section pertaining to "Federal support to the primary and secondary schools by a program of Federal aid for school construction."

This was inserted into the platform over the strenuous objections of the majority of the platform committee's Subcommittee on Education, Science, and Technology. There was more than a suggestion at the time that the section did not meet with the approval of a majority of delegates. However, it went through the convention without a floor debate and without the delegates having a real opportunity to vote for or against the wisdom of Federal aid for school construction.

So, Mr. President, the real feeling of the majority of Republicans on this issue has been, at the very least, obscured. But that has been settled rather conclusively in recent days through a canvass of the 1,331 delegates to the Republican National Convention by Mr. Ernest L. Wilkinson, president of Brigham Young University and vice chairman of the Republican Platform Subcommittee on Education, Science, and Technology.

President Wilkinson sent ballots to the delegates asking them to express their views on general Federal aid to education, first, for schoolteachers' salaries and, second, for construction of school buildings.

In reply, Mr. Wilkinson received the views of 63 percent of these delegates. And these views showed that only 3 percent favored and 96 percent opposed Federal aid to education for teachers' salaries—1 percent not voting. On the question of Federal aid for school construction, 18 percent of the delegates were in favor and 81 percent opposed to the idea—1 percent not voting.

Of particular interest is the fact that of the New York delegates replying to Mr. Wilkinson's survey, only 1 voted in favor of Federal aid for teachers' salaries while 22 voted against it. On the issue of Federal aid for school construction, only 6 New York delegates favored the idea while 18 opposed it.

I wish to point out that New York's total delegation was not represented in this, but only 22.

In reporting his findings to Republican National Chairman THRUSTON MORTON, Mr. Wilkinson made this observation:

The overwhelming and decisive vote of the delegates against Federal aid for school construction (81 percent against to 18 percent for) makes it plain that the particular plank adopted at Chicago on that subject was not a true reflection of the convictions of four out of every five delegates. I think we should recognize that with the situation as it was at Chicago it was virtually impossible for the delegates to then fairly vote on this subject. And they did not, in reality, vote on it.

Members of Congress should not, therefore, feel bound by this plank of the platform, but should give due consideration to the expressed view of 81 percent of the delegates.

Mr. President, the Wilkinson report to Chairman MORTON has been officially released to the press, and I ask unanimous consent to have the report, a part of which is a letter to Chairman MORTON, printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY,
Provo, Utah, February 22, 1961.

Hon. THRUSTON MORTON,
Chairman, Republican National Committee, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: At the Republican National Convention held in July 1960, at Chicago, I had the privilege of serving as a member of the Republican platform committee to which I was duly elected by the Republican Party in my home State of Utah.

As a member of that committee and possibly because of my position as president of a large university, although I had indicated my preference for another committee, I was appointed to the subcommittee on education, science, and technology. On that committee were 11 men and women, from the States of Colorado, Iowa, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming. At the outset Hon. GORDON ALLOTT, Senator from Colorado, was designated as chairman by the officials of the convention and the committee honored me by electing me vice chairman.

Just before the convention we met 3 days as a subcommittee, hearing witnesses and drafting a plank to be presented to the full committee. Two of the most important questions that arose were whether the Republican Party should favor (1) Federal aid to States for the payment of schoolteachers' salaries, and (2) Federal aid to States for the construction of buildings for elementary and secondary schools.

On the first question the committee from the start was unanimously of the opinion that such aid was not in the public interest. As to the second, it was also apparent from the start that nearly all members were of the opinion that it was also unwise for the Federal Government to enter this new field of financial support.

The chairman, however, favored the second proposal. It was therefore debated fully and freely for a number of days, the chairman (with the acquiescence of the other members who were willing to hear all arguments) not putting it to a vote until possible influences and pressures had been brought to bear to change the minds of the majority of the subcommittee. However, despite the pressures and late night sessions, a majority of seven to four held steadfast against endorsing any such aid. They had been duly appointed to write a part of the platform, had arrived at their own views based on the facts presented to them as to what was in the public interest, and refused to yield to the entreaties and blandishments of anyone.

The subcommittee majority maintained this stand basically for the following reasons:

First—they felt that Federal aid to schools was inconsistent with the time-honored tradition of our country and the spirit of our Constitution. Local support and control of education has been and is about the most cherished of governmental functions which, up to the present, the States have preserved.

Second, they believed that Federal aid to schools would ultimately be accompanied by Federal control.

While the present Congress could give financial support and also promise no Federal dictation, the very allocation of funds by the Federal Government through the Federal and State Departments of Education would in and of itself shift administrative control from State legislatures and local boards of education to Federal and State bureaucracies (departments of education). Moreover, since the action of one Congress is not binding on another, a new Congress could impose more serious and drastic controls on the recipients of the Federal grants.

Third—the uncontradicted facts showed that either the shortage of classroom space in the country had been grossly exaggerated or had dramatically decreased in the last 6 years. Thus in October of 1954 the Commissioner of Education, without any real survey, had testified to a deficiency of 370,000 classrooms in our elementary and secondary schools, which he expected to increase. Not to be outdone, the Democratic chairman of the Senate Education Committee, in 1955, predicted that by 1958 there would be a shortage of 600,000 classrooms.

In 1959, however, the U.S. Office of Education canvassed the State Departments of Education regarding the existing shortage. The replies showed a shortage of only 132,400 classrooms (which certainly was not understated), and that over the past 5 years, while enrollments in our secondary and elementary schools increased 20 percent, the number of available classrooms increased 30 percent. In December of 1959 the Chief of the Projection section of the U.S. Office of Education estimated the construction need in the ensuing 10 years at 61,000 classrooms annually, whereas over the past 5 years we had built 68,000 classrooms per year.

The above information has now been corroborated by the message sent to the Congress on this week by President Kennedy. In that message he estimated that over the next 10 years the Nation will need approximately 600,000 classrooms. That averages 60,000 a year. Because over the last 5 years we have been building an average of 68,000 per year, it is clear that for us to maintain our present rate of school construction would be more than adequate, and could even decline in the 1960's and still provide sufficient classrooms.

The plain fact, therefore, emerges that while there may have been an emergency a few years ago, that emergency has already passed. There is no present emergency situation, except in the minds of those who would like to substitute more centralized Federal Government for less local autonomy and control.

And of even more importance, the evidence was clear that within 2 years the annual enrollment increases in the elementary and secondary schools will begin to decline. Between 1950–60 enrollments increased 44 percent. Between 1960–70 the increase will only be between 20 and 22 percent or one-half of what it has been the last decade. These figures could not be challenged, for the children are already born.

The majority of the committee was therefore of the clear opinion that we would successfully meet our educational needs without any program of general Federal aid. Indeed, they came to the conclusion that Federal aid, unless of mammoth proportions, might slow down, rather than accelerate, the construction of needed buildings. As support for this they had before them the report of the study committee on "Federal Responsibility in the Field of Education" made in 1955 to the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations appointed by President Eisenhower. That report read, in part:

"Research does not sustain the contention that Federal funds are essential to support the elementary and secondary school system—it is our opinion that the appropria-

tion of relatively small sums of Federal aid for school construction—amounting to 10 percent or 20 percent of the present State and local outlay of almost $2 billion a year[1]—may delay rather than advance school construction. Districts not eligible in one year may hold off their building plans on the chance of being able to buy their schoolhouses at 50 cents on the dollar a year or two later."

Fourth, the majority of the committee was convinced, after a realistic appraisal of the situation, that unless heavy additional Federal taxes are levied, the Federal Government is in a less-favored position to assume this new financial obligation than are the States. In this respect, the committee learned that the Federal indebtedness of our country for present and accrued liabilities totals $750 billion, which is the equivalent of $4,100 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. (Address of Hon. Maurice Stans, Director of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, before the Executive Club of Chicago, January 29, 1960.) The Federal budget for 1962, which we are now facing, will probably have a deficit of $5 billion, or possibly more. Indeed, at the present time the interest alone on our national debt is twice the size of the entire Federal budget when Franklin Delano Roosevelt became President.

As opposed to this enormous debt and the rising crescendo of Federal obligations, the committee was aware that the total State and local governmental indebtedness is only $62 billion and that some States have no indebtedness of any kind. Further, the committee was informed, even on the basis of a canvass of State superintendents of education made by the U.S. Office of Education, that only one-half of 1 percent of all the school districts in the United States have reached the limit of their available bonded indebtedness for school construction. Finally, no State, acting through its legislature and authorized by its Governor's signature, had ever applied to the Federal Government for such aid.

Because of the long attempt to change the mind of the subcommittee, the recommendation of the majority was not presented to the full platform committee until the second day of the convention, and only 24 hours before the platform was read to the entire convention (it was, in fact, the final plank offered to the full committee). This was done after an all-night session at about 7 a.m. when everyone was exhausted.

After I presented the majority report against any program of general Federal aid to education for school buildings, a minority report for such aid also was introduced. After a spirited debate, in which the rigid House of Representatives rules limiting the time of debate were applied for the first time in the full committee, the minority view in favor of Federal aid for school construction—pacing it to the real needs of individual school districts in States and territories, and requiring State approval and participation—was adopted by a relatively small majority.

Incensed over the way in which debate for the first time had been cut off, and the circumstances under which the majority report of the subcommittee had been rejected, certain members of the full committee reserved the right to take this issue to the convention floor the following evening. This group huddled far into the night and the next day trying to decide whether to take such action.

After due deliberation, although they still believed that a majority of the convention delegates would be opposed to an invasion by the Federal Government into this field of education, they decided not to bring the matter to the floor of the full convention because they had not time to prepare and print a minority report, and it was obviously impossible to present clearly such an issue in a hall mainly arranged for television and not designed or suited for deliberate debate among the delegates themselves. Another impelling factor behind the decision was the realization that the platform, as adopted by the full platform committee, would not be read plank by plank to the convention but would be only summarized by the chairman (as was actually done). It would, therefore, have been practically impossible to have had a full and intelligent vote on this issue by the delegates themselves.

Therefore, the delegates to the convention had no real opportunity to vote for or against the wisdom of Federal aid either for schoolteachers' salaries or for school construction. Later, as spokesman for the majority of the subcommittee, I was asked by certain delegates to the convention to poll all of the delegates to ascertain their real views.

Accordingly, I sent a ballot to each of the 1,331 delegates to the Republican Convention asking his or her views regarding general Federal aid to education (1) for schoolteachers' salaries, and (2) for school construction. I enclose a copy of the ballot sent to them.

I have now received replies of over 63 percent of these delegates. These replies show that only 3 percent favored and 96 percent were against Federal aid for schoolteachers' salaries (1 percent not voting); that only 18 percent favored and 81 percent opposed Federal aid for school construction (1 percent not voting). Of even greater significance is the fact that the majority of responding delegates in every State voted decisively against Federal aid for both teachers' salaries and school construction.[2]

I, therefore, submit the following observations for the earnest and solemn consideration of the party and its representatives in the Congress of the United States:

1. The delegates to the convention are practically unanimously against the Federal Government undertaking the new obligation of subsidizing of schoolteachers' salaries. In this respect my poll confirmed the platform adopted at Chicago which did not favor Federal aid for schoolteachers' salaries.

2. The overwhelming and decisive vote of the delegates against Federal aid for school construction (81 percent against to 18 percent for) makes it plain that the particular plank adopted at Chicago on that subject was not a true reflection of the convictions of four out of every five delegates. I think we should recognize that with the situation as it was at Chicago it was virtually impossible for the delegates to then fairly vote on this subject; and they did not, in reality, vote on it. Members of Congress should not therefore feel bound by this plank of the platform, but should give due consideration to the expressed view of 81 percent of the delegates. It should further be observed that even the platform as formally adopted does not accord with the recommendations made by President Kennedy earlier this week, for his proposal does not pace Federal aid to the real needs of individual school districts.

3. Using this unfortunate incident in the Chicago convention (where the platform expressed a view opposite to that of over 80 percent of the delegates) as a lesson for valuable learning, I suggest that national conventions in the future be arranged so as to permit orderly, intelligent deliberation and debate. At present we seem to be more interested in creating a television spectacle, the arrangements for which as presently made practically prohibit thoughtful deliberative procedures on important public issues.

May I suggest further that this would not detract from, but would augment intelligent public interest. For in these days of television what patriotic American citizen would not sooner see and have more confidence in a deliberative debate on the national issues, than the pandemonium which too often prevailed in both political conventions? And when the issues are thus resolved in an orderly manner, the public from now on will have ample opportunity to hear those issues discussed by the presidential candidate who is the choice of the convention.

The fact that the Republican convention is against Federal aid both for schoolteachers' salaries and school construction does not, of course, mean that Republicans are opposed to proper increases in teachers' salaries or against the needed construction of new schoolhouses. It merely means that with a Federal indebtedness of $750 billion for present and accrued liabilities, they believe it is time for the Federal Government to put its own house in financial order before assuming untold new financial responsibilities. They believe, along with all prior Presidents of the United States, that a program of general Federal aid is not a proper function of the Federal Government. Not until the present, has any President ever proposed such a program. Indeed, many of them have vigorously opposed such a course.

In 1806, Thomas Jefferson clearly indicated that a constitutional amendment would be required to take the Federal Government into education:

"Education is here placed among the articles of public care, not that it would be proposed to take its ordinary branches out of the hands of private enterprise, which manages so much better all the concerns to which it is equal; but a public institution can alone supply those sciences which, though rarely called for, are yet necessary to complete the circle, all the parts of which contribute to the improvement of the country, and some of them to its preservation. I suppose an amendment to the Constitution, by consent of the States, necessary, because the objects now recommended are not among those enumerated in the Constitution, and to which it permits the public moneys to be applied" ("The Works of Thomas Jefferson," vol. 10, Paul L. Ford, editor, G. P. Putnam Sons, New York, 1905).

The late Elbert D. Thomas (Democrat) former U.S. Senator from the State of Utah, recognized Jefferson's philosophy when he wrote:

"Jefferson thought of education as a function of the States, rather than of the Federal Government, and it is natural that he should do so. Before there was a Federation, he was already interested in education, and his later detailed plans for an educational system were built up around the State as a unit. There is no evidence that he came to think of the Federal Government as in any way responsible for the education of the citizens of the country" (Elbert D. Thomas, "Thomas Jefferson," Modern Age Books, New York, 1942, p. 73).

Woodrow Wilson, while still a professor of government, wrote a powerful statement that deserves to be remembered forever:

"Certain it is that there is more than one State which, though abundantly able to pay for an educational system of the greatest efficiency, fails to do so, and contents itself

[1] A National Education Association survey published in December of 1960 revealed that school construction during 1960–61 had reached a new high of $3,094 million in capital outlay; which suggests that local communities, now that they know the problem, are responding to the need.

[2] The ballots have been kept intact and are available for your inspection and audit should you desire to do so.

with imperfect temporary makeshifts because there are immense surpluses every year in the National Treasury which, rumor and unauthorized promises say, may be distributed among the States in aid of education. If the Federal Government were more careful to keep apart from every strictly local scheme of improvement, this culpable and demoralizing policy could scarcely live. States would cease to wish, because they would cease to hope, to be stipendiaries of the Union, and would address themselves with diligence to their proper duties, with much more benefit to themselves and the the Federal system" (Woodrow Wilson, "Congressional Government," 15th edition, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., New York, 1900, pp. 29–30).

In July 1949, while president of Columbia University, Dwight D. Eisenhower wrote: "* * * In my own mind I am perfectly clear as to basic principle and have more than once made public statements to the effect that I definitely oppose every unnecessary intervention of the Federal authority and the Federal Treasury in what should be local business and local responsibility. * * * I would flatly oppose any grant by the Federal Government to all States in the Union for educational purposes. Such policy would create an ambition—almost a requirement—to spend money freely under the impulse of competition with other localities in the country. It would completely decry and defeat the watchful economy that comes about through local supervision over local expenditures of local revenues" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 14, p. A3690).

In line with this philosophy of Jefferson, Wilson, Eisenhower, and all prior Presidents, the Republican delegates believe, now that the public has become aware of our educational needs, that local and State governments are meeting and in the future will more adequately meet the challenge. This is shown by a number of studies:

(a) Over the last 30 years the increase in salaries of schoolteachers was 106 percent in constant dollars. Other State and local employees had an increase of 58 percent and Federal civilian employees 73 percent.[3]

(b) The average annual salary of schoolteachers rose from $3,126 in 1950–51 to $5,389 in 1960–61, or 72.4 percent. The number of teachers with salaries below $3,500 decreased from 62 percent in 1952–53 to 9.6 percent in 1960–61, and the number with salaries of $4,500 or more rose from 13 to 63 percent during this same period.[4]

(c) School expenditures by the respective States, estimated at $16.4 billion this year, is up $1.2 billion over the previous year and $9.9 billion over 1950–51—an amazing increase of 153 percent in one decade, whereas enrollment increased only 44 percent. In addition, capital outlays for elementary and secondary school buildings, sites, and equipment are increasing at about $3 billion annually.[5]

(d) Over the past 20 years school enrollments grew 43 percent, but school funds increased 185 percent (in price-adjusted dollars).[6] Looking ahead to 1970, enrollment will climb approximately 20 percent while school outlays are likely to double if current trends continue.

President Kennedy's proposal to Congress earlier this week to authorize $5.6 billion in Federal grants and loans (accompanied by carefully prepared and nationwide publicity indicating how much each State would receive), is the most seductive legislative recommendation on education ever presented to the Congress.

Offered with utter disregard of the financial integrity of our Federal Government and without even a suggestion as to how the money will ever be raised, the White House scheme flagrantly attempts to marshal public support and purchase congressional votes by (1) holding before each college administrator the additional bait of $350 for each Federal scholarship student on the campus, even though schools have up to the present educated these students as a public service; (2) making funds available to all the States by completely ignoring the desegregation issue (despite the well-known views of the Kennedy administration on this subject); (3) promising a continuation of State and local control even though every responsible legislative and administrative official knows that if the Federal Government puts up the money, Federal control is not only proper, but ultimately inevitable.

To the extent the proffered Federal aid is a "loan" to the States, it is fictitious, for the States might as well borrow the money from other sources. To the extent it is a grant, it is a delusion, for whether funds are advanced by the Federal Government, or the State and local government, they will still have to be paid through tax revenues wrung from already overburdened citizens. If additional taxes for education are necessary, and I for one believe that in certain areas they may be, let them be imposed locally where the real needs may be assessed, costs kept to a minimum and local control permanently preserved.

As a taxpayer, the proposal offends my sense of fiscal responsibility. As an educator, it offends my sense of moral integrity, for my influence and views are not subject to presidential monetary barter. As a lover of my country, I very much prefer that the future of my children and the future of my country be premised on the American philosophy of President Kennedy as proclaimed in his inaugural address last month to "ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

This high ideal, which struck a responsive chord in all Americans, regardless of party, is now immediately liquidated as its author surrenders to the "socialist manifesto" (or Democratic platform) of Los Angeles. I hope and pray that patriotic Americans in the Congress, of both parties, will defeat this new intrusion of the Federal Government into the last time-honored sanctuary of local and State government—education.

Because this matter is of current public interest and is now before the Congress, I intend, after due time for delivery to you of this letter, to release it to the press.

I should be extremely appreciative of any comment you would choose to make on my suggestions.

Respectfully and earnestly yours,

ERNEST L. WILKINSON.

[3] "Taxes for Schools," Roger A. Freeman, Institute for Social Science Research, Washington, D.C., 1960.

[4] National Education Association, "Estimate of School Statistics" (1960–61).

[5] "Taxes for the Schools," by Roger A. Freeman, Institute for Social Science Research, Washington, D.C., 1960.

[6] Ibid.

Summary of replies made by delegates to Republican National Convention to questionnaire of Ernest L. Wilkinson on whether they favor Federal aid for teachers' salaries and school construction

	Ballots sent out	For school construction	Against school construction	For teachers' salaries	Against teachers' salaries	Others (both issues)	Total ballots returned
Alabama	22		12		12		12
Alaska	6		5		5		5
Arizona	14		11		11		11
Arkansas	16	1	9		10		10
California	70	11	26	2	37	2	39
Colorado	18	2	5		7		7
Connecticut	22		3		3		3
Delaware	12	3	3	2	4		6
Florida	26	2	19		21		21
Georgia	24	4	12	2	14		16
Hawaii	12	4	5	1	8		9
Idaho	14	2	9	1	10		11
Illinois	60	9	18		29	2	29
Indiana	32	1	20		21		21
Iowa	26	4	15	1	17	1	19
Kansas	22	1	12		13		13
Kentucky	26	9	9		19	1	19
Louisiana	26	1	21	1	21		22
Maine	16	5	4		9		9
Maryland	24	6	9		14	1	15
Massachusetts	38	7	17	1	23	2	25
Michigan	46	10	24	1	33		34
Minnesota	28	5	14		19		19
Mississippi	12		11		11		11
Missouri	26	3	11		14		14
Montana	14		11		11		11
Nebraska	18		11		11		11
Nevada	12		10		10		10
New Hampshire	14	4	4	1	9	2	10
New Jersey	38	6	14	2	18		20
New Mexico	14	1	12	1	12		13
New York	96	6	18	1	22	1	24
North Carolina	28	3	18		21		21
North Dakota	14	2	8		10		10
Ohio	56	4	26	1	29		30
Oklahoma	22	2	15		17		17
Oregon	18	2	10		12		12
Pennsylvania	70	7	38	3	42		45
Rhode Island	14	2	5		7		7
South Carolina	13		11		11		11
South Dakota	14	2	9		11		11
Tennessee	28	4	14	2	16		18
Texas	54	1	46		46	1	47
Utah	14	1	10		12	1	12
Vermont	12	2	4		5	1	6
Virginia	30	3	18		20	1	21
Washington	24		14		15	1	15
West Virginia	22	2	16		18		18
Wisconsin	30		21		21		21
Wyoming	12	1	9		10		10
District of Columbia	8	1	6		7		7
Puerto Rico	3	1	1		2		2
Virgin Islands	1						
Total	1,331	147	683	23	810	17	840
Feb. 22, 1961 (percent)		18	81	3	96	2	63

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, since he mentioned me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. In the first place, I wish to state that the Senator, with his customary candor and fairness, has made it clear he was not speaking for the party. The language itself was not as precise as it might have been on that score, though its meaning could be easily seen from the context.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENGLE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I seek recognition in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not see how the work of the convention can be undone by a postmortem survey. I have little doubt that on many close questions in the Senate some kind of postvote survey may show some other result. The point is that the language to which I referred was the mandate of the convention, which I cited in premise of committing the party to Federal aid at least to school construction. I believe, in the eyes of the country, and certainly in the eyes of the party, that mandate must stand. If people receive comfort from some post-convention survey which makes them feel that something else might have happened, I do not think that should in any way change, in terms of Republican voting, the position of the convention, the official position of a party, or change, in the eyes of the country what the Republican Party stands for, until it is changed at least in a similar organization. I say that with all respect, of course, to my colleague. He and I differ many times; nevertheless, we have kept our heads on our shoulders.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I never believed that postmortems accomplished too much, except possibly to show why the victim died. In this particular case, as the Senator from New York remembers, there was no floor vote on the issue. The Senator remembers also that there was quite a bit of disturbance about this particular report being made a part of the platform. I merely wanted to demonstrate by this work of Dr. Wilkinson, that had the great majority of the delegates present had an opportunity to vote on this issue, they would have voted in opposition, just as I openly expressed myself in opposition, to that part of the platform wherever I spoke in the country. So I, as one Republican, do not feel bound in the least to that particular part of the platform.

Mr. JAVITS. My only point was that the Senator from Arizona, as well as any others polled, could have raised this issue on the floor. Many times we see a question resolved here unanimously, when at a later date, if it could be changed, some would like to do so. So I think the record should be made clear, in terms of the country and the party. The party's position was that it favored at least Federal aid to school construction.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER BARBARA BATES GUNDERSON

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, today marks the conclusion of the term of service of Barbara Bates Gunderson, of South Dakota, as a member of the Civil Service Commission. When Mrs. Gunderson was nominated for that position a few years back a few Senators expressed concern because they thought she was not experienced in that particular career. However, no more enthusiastic words have been spoken about her work than by some of those who at that time expressed doubts about the appointment.

It was my privilege last week to attend the award dinner for the first Federal Women's Award, at which six women distinguished in various branches of public service were accorded a unique recognition. It was the first time in the history of the country that anything of that sort had happened. There was a large attendance at this dinner of people prominent in Government and in business and public life.

I believe everyone who was there will agree that if she had done nothing else than to propose the institution of this annual award for women who had made outstanding contributions to the life of the country, Mrs. Gunderson's service would be outstanding. But beyond that has been the way in which from day to day and week to week and month to month, Mrs. Gunderson has sought to improve the quality of Government service and has taken a real interest in the performance of both men and women in public service.

We in South Dakota are proud of the service that Barbara Gunderson has rendered, and are glad to note that many of the columnists and others who were a bit critical when she started have taken pains to write their praise for her work.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a comment by a prominent columnist in the Washington Post.

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

From "The Federal Diary" by Jerry Kluttz in the Washington Post, issue of February 26, 1961: "Barbara B. Gunderson's term expires Tuesday. She has done an excellent job and CSC employees will be sorry to see her go. If she weren't a Republican, she'd be a cinch for reappointment.

"But in leaving, Mrs. Gunderson will have the satisfaction of having received offers of support from several Democratic Senators who weren't too enthusiastic with her appointment a couple of years ago. One sent word to her that he was wrong and that she had made a fine Commissioner."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to add my word of commendation to the remarks which have just been made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in regard to Mrs. Barbara Gunderson, who has rendered outstanding service as a member of the Civil Service Commission.

As a ranking member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it has been my privilege to observe the workings of the various Chairmen and members of the Commission for many years, and I still remember, as the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has just mentioned, the misgivings that were prevalent around the Senate Chamber, and particularly in the committee, in regard to Mrs. Gunderson's lack of experience in this field in assuming this new position. I did not hesitate to endorse her at the time her nomination came before the Senate, and I am proud of the excellent record she made. She rendered service with dignity and understanding, and with human sympathy for the Federal employees of this Nation. It seemed as though a breath of fresh air from South Dakota came into the Commission and permeated it with a human kindness which I trust the future Commissioners and the members in administrative positions will continue after she has left this important position.

If the distinguished Senator from South Dakota does not have the article entitled, "The Commissioner Bows Out," written by Miss Helen A. Colson, which appeared in the Washington News yesterday, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

VENI, VIDI, VICI—THE COMMISSIONER BOWS OUT

(By Helen A. Colson)

Tomorrow evening Civil Service Commissioner Barbara Bates Gunderson will leave her Washington office for the last time.

Once again she will be Mrs. Robert W. Gunderson of Rapid City, S. Dak. Occupation: housewife.

After a 2-year, 7-month record-setting term, the bright, blond, breezy Commissioner is anticipating the change with delight.

"I want to go home and spoil my husband. I want to give dinner parties and eat chocolates and read light novels and sit at lunch for hours and talk about trivia," she said.

WITH VIGOR

Such a routine will indeed be a change.

Commissioner Gunderson, who was at first criticized for inexperience, has carried on her duties with a vigor that is astounding.

She has attended personnel management courses with the rank and file. She has traveled back and forth across the country meeting hundreds of Government employees and recording their suggestions.

And until the very last moment she has worked on her biggest contribution: The Federal Woman's Award. This first official Government recognition of its outstanding women was presented to six deserving civil servants on Friday.

For Mrs. Gunderson, who originated the project and guided it through the tangled redtape of Government, the awards presentations was a fitting finish to her term.

"I like to think of my greatest accomplishment as getting rid of the notion that no one could be a Civil Service Commissioner without years and years in Government," she said. "I hope to show that it is possible for someone to come to Washington, do their darndest, have a good time and leave gracefully."

WITH GRACE

Grace has been one of Mrs. Gunderson's greatest assets.

Without preaching the feminist doctrine, she has managed to make the point that a woman Commissioner can serve as effectively as a man.

"When I first came to town everyone treated me as if my husband had been appointed," she said. "I was invited to brunches and teas in the middle of the day. I found that the gentlemen were far too busy for these, so I declined too.

"I have also tried awfully hard never to give anyone cause to say, 'She carries too much luggage,' or 'She gets tired too soon.'

"I am proud that my desire to do this job has won respect from men. I hope that Mr. Kennedy may see fit to call on a woman from his party to fill it."

WITH PLEASURE

In the months ahead, however, there is only one man Mrs. Gunderson wants to impress. He's a South Dakota lawyer.

"After all he has done, my husband is richly deserving of a wife who will pay some attention to him," she explained. "When I got this job he said, 'You won't be able to get away but I'll come to visit you.' "

Mrs. Gunderson feels that the two and a half year separation with monthly visits has worked well.

"Of course there were moments of loneliness," she admitted, "but I wish more happily married couples of say 18 years, could have a separation like it. We wrote love letters like we did during the war and made long distance phone calls. Then when you get together, it's very exciting."

The Commissioner paused and looked at her calendar.

"Going home, though," she said, "My, it's going to be grand!"

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, that is one of the articles I had in mind, and I am glad to have the Senator from Kansas place it at the conclusion of his remarks.

PROPOSED STEP-UP OF NONATOMIC FORCES TO LESSEN THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in today's Washington Post a report was carried by the Associated Press that Secretary of State Dean Rusk has recommended a big step-up of nonatomic forces of America and its allies in order to lessen the danger of nuclear war.

There is a limit to funds available to the Defense Department. Therefore, any proposal to increase the size of conventional forces must necessarily cut into the development and number of this country's nuclear weapons.

Mr. Rusk's reported position is that nuclear weapon capability, both ICBM and SAC bombers, would be confined to deterring nuclear attack upon this country by an enemy. That this would deter nuclear blackmail.

Mr. President, I submit that this assumption is not well founded. It fails to meet the threat of nuclear war posed by the enemy.

Deterrent as used in this context calls for retaliatory capability against the enemy population. It, therefore, is used as a counterbalance against the enemy's threat to use nuclear weapons against our population. It does not meet the problem of tackling and destroying the enemy's nuclear war capabilities. It follows, then, that if the enemy is willing to sacrifice a large portion of its population, it could wage a nuclear war which, while seeing populations of both countries greatly harmed, would allow its nuclear war machine to operate without formidable threat to its own destruction.

Mr. President, there are also very good reasons which mitigate against conventional arms build up as a substitute for the nuclear war concept:

First. Massed forces required for any conventional type war call for concentration of troops, equipment, and logistic efforts. These areas of concentration are very susceptible to knockout blows from nuclear weapons now in the hands of enemy field forces.

Second. When the plans for NATO were being formulated, it was realized that the NATO forces could not possibly achieve the soldier and equipment capability to match conventional forces of the U.S.S.R. and its satellites. Therefore, stress was laid upon developing nuclear equipped forces which could contain the enemy with a much lesser number of conventional troops.

Third. There is the cost factor, for how long can the United States afford to maintain this cost of equipment and men and more importantly, to sustain a long drawn-out conventional war or the preparations and build up necessary to do so.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I must say that to return to the World War II-type military thinking, with primary emphasis on conventional forces, would much weaken the hand of the United States in dealing with the Communist military threat. Not only would the Russians be much more likely to step up limited war activities, but they would judge that they had finally achieved overall nuclear war superiority. Such an intelligence estimate on their part could well set the time for their launching an all-out nuclear attack on the United States—an attack which we could counter only by destroying Russian cities and one which our conventional forces would be unable to stop.

CUMBERLAND GAP NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on February 20 I introduced S. 1018, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 9 acres of land for addition to the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park.

Senator BYRD of Virginia, Senators GORE and KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, and my colleague Senator MORTON joined me in introducing this bill, representing each of the States in which Cumberland Gap National Park is located and which contributed the land for the park.

I hope the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will consider the bill at its earliest convenience, and report it favorably to the Senate. It involves the preservation of the beauty of the park and has importance, not only to the people of Middlesboro, Ky., and the nearby communities in Tennessee and Virginia, but also to the thousands of visitors attracted to the park in increasing numbers.

I take this occasion to point out that the National Park Service has recommended acquisition of the land facing the entrance to the park, and that enactment of this bill has been recommended by the Department of the Interior. It has also been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The bill we have introduced is identical to the proposed bill sent to the Congress by the Department of the Interior on January 18. I ask that the letter addressed by the Acting Secretary of the Interior to the Vice President and to the Speaker of the House, which accompanied the bill and gives the reasons for its enactment, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. I also ask that a letter I have received from the Honorable Henry Ward, chairman of the Kentucky State Park Board, which indicates that the State of Kentucky is willing to share a part of the cost of acquiring the acreage, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington D.C., January 18, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 9 acres of land for addition to Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

We recommend that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The proposed legislation will provide authority for the addition of approximately 9 acres of land to Cumberland Gap National Historical Park.

The park contains the mountain pass of the wilderness road explored by Daniel Boone, and the locale for a part of the trans-Allegheny migration which extended the western boundary of the Thirteen Colonies to the Mississippi. Land for the park, 20,184 acres, was donated to the United States by the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia, as provided in the act authorizing the establishment of the park.

The 9-acre tract which lies outside of the designated park boundary should be acquired and added to the park in order to forestall its use for commercial purposes in a manner detrimental to the park. It is situated between the park boundary and Little Yellow Creek opposite the park visitor center. Access to the tract may be had from U.S. Highway 25E. It is now zoned for medium density housing but efforts have been made recently to have the property rezoned commercial. The city of Middlesboro has so far rejected the efforts, but additional demands are anticipated.

In a resolution of May 3, 1960, the Common Council of the City of Middlesboro, Ky., passed a resolution to exclude the 9-acre tract from the corporate limits if it is acquired for inclusion in the park. This resolution would appear to satisfy the desire of the Congress, expressed in section 2 of the act of June 11, 1940, as amended (57 Stat. 85; 16 U.S.C. 262), not to include in the park any land in the city limits which the officials of the city feel is required for expansion of the city.

In view of the past cooperation of the States in acquiring land for the park, and the expressed willingness of the Common-

wealth of Kentucky to assist in acquiring the 9-acre tract described in this bill, the draft bill provides for the expenditure of Federal funds to acquire the property but limits such expenditure to no more than half of the acquisition costs.

It is estimated that if the bill is enacted the cost of acquisition to be borne by the United States will be approximately $30,000.

The Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1961, advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. ABBOTT,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS,
Frankfort, Ky., January 27, 1961.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: I have read with interest the proposal of the Department of the Interior which you enclosed in your letter of January 23 to me which approves the passage of legislation by Congress authorizing participation by the Federal Government in the purchase of additional land for Cumberland Gap National Park. Inasmuch as I was commissioner of conservation during the period when the State of Kentucky bought the last of the land for the Cumberland National Park, I can testify that we acquired the land which the National Park Service indicated was essential for the park development. Under the circumstances, I think the State of Kentucky could well insist that any additional purchases be made wholly at the expense of the Federal Government. I certainly believe that Congress would be perfectly justified in authorizing the purchase of the additional acreage wholly at the expense of the Federal Government.

However, I am authorized to state as chairman of the Kentucy State Park Board that if this action on the part of Congress is not possible, that we still recommend that this additional land be secured. In the event legislation of the type as outlined in the attached bill is the only type of legislation which can be secured, I will be prepared as chairman of the State park board to make a recommendation that the State of Kentucky participate in the cost of acquiring the additional acreage which I very definitely think should be secured for the benefit of Cumberland National Park.

With best wishes for success in the session ahead, I am,

Yours very truly,

HENRY WARD,
Commissioner.

EMERGENCY FEED GRAIN PROPOSAL OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the emergency feed grain proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture is similar in certain respects to the corn soil bank which was in effect in 1956, 1957, and 1958.

On February 8, when this proposal was first outlined to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, I wrote Secretary Freeman, asking for a comparison of the new plan with the old corn soil bank. Yesterday, I received the analysis from the Secretary, and I ask unanimous consent that the analysis and the exchange of letters be printed in the body of the RECORD.

Because solution of the feed grain problem is difficult, because the emergency proposal involves a cost of at least $500 million, and because there has not been time for extended hearings, I think this information may be useful to Members of Congress who must study this matter and will have to vote on the bill as well as to organizations and farmers who will be directly affected by it.

I point out that this analysis is in terms of the task force proposal, which called for price support to cooperators at a $1.30 per bushel with cash payments for retiring 24 percent of the acreage at 50 percent of the 1959–60 yield, and payments in kind at two-thirds of normal yield for retiring up to an additional 24 percent of corn acreage.

The administration proposal now before the Senate committee proposes price supports for corn at a $1.20 for cooperators, cash payments for retiring 20 percent of the corn acreage at 60 percent of normal yield, and payments in kind for retiring up to an additional 20 percent of corn acreage at two-thirds of normal yield.

I understand that the bill reported yesterday by the House Committee on Agriculture proposes discretionary price supports for corn for cooperators, cash payments for retiring 20 percent of the corn acreage at 50 percent of the normal yield, and payments in kind for retiring up to an additional 20 percent of the corn acreage at 60 percent of normal yield.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement regarding the feed grain proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture, my letter to him and his response, and an analysis of the old acreage reserve plan as relating to corn.

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

FEBRUARY 8, 1961.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, I am of course very much interested in the proposals for emergency action, to improve the price of feed grains, and to reduce surplus supplies and costs to the Government, contained in the task force report to the President.

It seems to me that cash payments for reducing corn and other feed grain acreage is similar to the acreage reserve program of the soil bank, for this was also a voluntary program with incentives in the form of cash payments to farmers who placed part of their corn allotment in the corn soil bank. It would be helpful to members of the committee, I should think, to review the results of that program, and to compare it with the proposals of the task force.

I would appreciate very much receiving before the next meeting of the committee an analysis by your Department of the corn soil bank—including the amounts paid per acre and the level of market prices and price supports at that time; the number of farmers participating; the reduction of acreage accomplished; the reduction in production, if any, and the costs of that program—by crop years and for the total period.

I would also appreciate your comments as to how the task force proposal differs from the old corn soil bank—indicating the amounts to be paid per acre as related to anticipated market prices and proposed price support levels, including those of alternative crops—and what the new proposals might be expected to accomplish in the light of our experience with the corn soil bank.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1961.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: In response to your request of February 8 I have had the attached analysis prepared of the acreage reserve program of 1956–58, including a comparison of its features and the task force feed grain program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

COMPARISON OF ACREAGE RESERVE WITH FEED-GRAIN TASK FORCE PROPOSAL

1. THE ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM

The acreage reserve program was in effect during 1956, 1957, and 1958. Under this program farmers who agreed to reduce their acreages of wheat, corn, upland cotton, rice (peanuts and extra long staple cotton in 1956 only) and most types of tobacco below their allotments for these crops were eligible to receive annual payments from the U.S. Department of Agriculture to compensate them for loss of income. The program was effective for corn and wheat only in areas designated as commercial under acreage allotment programs. Agreements or contracts were for 1 year, but in 1958 a 10-percent premium payment was offered to induce farmers to continue the same land in the reserve and thus reduce the yield-increasing effect of returning rested land to crops. Land in the acreage reserve had to be designated. No crops could be harvested from it, nor could it be grazed except in designated drought areas. In 1956 and 1957 there were no restrictions on uses that could be made of remaining land on farms where part of the land was placed in the program. Acreages of other crops, for example, could be increased by shifting land from pasture to crops. However, in 1958, farmers who participated were required to reduce their total harvested acreage of crops designated as soil-bank-base crops by the acreage they placed in the program. Soil-bank-base crops were cultivated crops, grains, and most others except those harvested for hay or forage.

The program for 1956 was late in being introduced, and requirements for participation were not announced until June 8. It contained special features.

The extent of participation by corn producers in the acreage reserve is shown in tables 1 and 2. Information concerning the number of farm operators participating is not available. It would be somewhat lower than the number of agreements since some operators had more than one agreement.

Table 1 indicates that a rather small proportion of corn producers participated in the program, but table 2 shows that those who went into the program retired a high proportion of their corn acreage but reduced overall potential production by only 10 to 14 percent.

Table 3 contains data on corn production, yields, corn allotments, and acreage reserve participation, with information on corn production for years before and after the acreage reserve program.

Table 4 summarizes corn price supports and U.S. average farm prices for corn from 1954 to 1960.

TABLE 1.—*Corn: Participation in the acreage reserve program of the soil bank*

Items	Units	1956	1957	1958	Items	Units	1956	1957	1958
Agreements	Thousand	315	324	356	Allotment acres	Thousand	43,281	37,289	38,818
Acres in the reserve	do	5,316	5,233	6,658	Proportion of—				
Payments	Thousand dollars	179,664	196,418	282,255	Allotment farms with acreage reserve agreements	Percent	18.6	18.1	19.4
Payment per reserve acre	Dollars	33.80	37.53	42.39	Allotment acres placed in acreage reserve	do	12.3	14.0	17.2
Payment per agreement	do	570.80	606.82	793.32					
Acres per agreement	Number	16.9	16.2	18.7					
Allotment farms	Thousand	1,698	1,790	1,832					

TABLE 2.—*Corn: Allotted acres, acreage reserve participation, reduction from historic acreage and estimated reduction in production* [1]

Items	Unit	1957	1958	Items	Unit	1957	1958
1. Total commercial area allotment acres	Thousands	37,289	38,818	7. Reduction from historic acreage by participants (4—6).	Thousands	10,175	12,070
2. Allotment acres for participants	do	7,535	7,963	8. Percentage reduction in acreage by participants (7÷4).	Percent	81.5	90.2
3. Percentage of participation (2÷1)	Percent	20.2	20.5	9. Estimated reduction in production as percent of actual production for all farms.	do	9.6	13.0
4. Historic acreage for participants	Thousands	[2] 12,476	[2] 13,375				
5. Reserve acreage for participants	do	5,233	6,658				
6. Permitted acreage for participants (2—5)	do	2,302	1,305				

[1] Data are not shown for 1956 because allotments were not used in the program for that year.

[2] Derived by dividing allotted acres in item 2 by the proration factor used for determination of State allotments.

TABLE 3.—*Corn: Acreage allotments, acreage reserve, and planted acreage, yields, and production in commercial and noncommercial areas, 1954–60*

Items	Unit	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Commercial area: [1]								
Allotments	Million acres	47.0	49.8	[2] 43.3	37.3	38.8		
Acreage reserve	do			5.3	5.2	6.7		
Allotments less acreage reserve	do			38.0	32.1	32.1		
Planted	do	60.2	60.0	57.9	54.0	54.5	64.6	64.1
Yield per acre	Bushels	43.4	43.4	49.6	52.1	57.0	55.8	57.5
Production	Million bushels	2,614	2,608	2,874	2,813	3,103	3,602	3,686
Noncommercial:								
Planted acres	Million acres	22.0	21.1	20.3	19.9	20.0	19.8	18.8
Yield per acre	Bushels	20.2	29.5	28.7	30.5	34.8	34.3	35.5
Production	Million bushels	444	622	581	609	698	679	667
U.S. totals:								
Planted acres	Million acres	82.2	81.1	78.2	73.9	74.5	84.4	82.9
Yield per acre	Bushels	37.2	39.8	44.2	46.3	51.0	50.7	52.5
Production	Million bushels	3,058	3,230	3,455	3,422	3,801	4,281	4,353

[1] Acreage, yield, and production for each year in the area determined as the 1958 commercial corn-producing area.

[2] "Base acreage" was 51,000,000 acres.

TABLE 4.—*Corn: National average level of price supports and U.S. average prices received by farmers, 1954–60*

[Dollars per bushel]

Year	Price support levels, commercial area [1]		U.S. average farm price	Year	Price support levels, commercial area [1]		U.S. average farm price
	To compliers	To noncompliers			To compliers	To noncompliers	
1954	1.62	(2)	1.43	1958	1.36	1.06	1.12
1955	1.58	(2)	1.35	1959 [3]	1.12		1.04
1956	1.50	1.25	1.29	1960 [3]	1.06		.96
1957	1.40	1.10	1.11				

[1] Support in noncommercial area was at 75% (82.5% for 1956) of rate that would have been in effect if designated as a commercial area.

[2] Supports were available to all producers at the same national rate. Acreage allotments were discontinued beginning with the 1959 crop.

[3] Supports were not available to noncomplying farmers prior to 1956.

Table 5 contains estimates prepared by the Soil Bank Division, CSS, showing payments per acre under the acreage reserve, the estimated reduction in production, and payment cost per bushel of reduced production. In most years when there were corn allotments in the commercial corn area, most producers did not comply with allotments and therefore the allotment was substantially overplanted. The acreage reserve program required them to reduce below their allotments (or base acres in 1956) and paid them only for the reduction below allotments. Conversely, those who already were planting less corn than their allotment, received payments based on the acreage by which they were below their allotment. The estimated reduction in production includes an allowance for the total reduction made by farmers. This explains most of the difference between the cost per bushel of reduction accomplished in 1957 and 1958 and the payment rate of $0.90 per bushel of normal yield on the acres reduced below the allotment level. The high per bushel cost in 1956 resulted from the special drought-relief features of the program in that year.

TABLE 5.—*Corn: Allotment acres in acreage reserve, estimated reduction in production, total payments, and payments per acre and per bushel of production reduced* [1]

Items	Unit	1956	1957	1958	Items	Unit	1956	1957	1958
Allotment acres in programs	Thousands	[2] 5,316	5,233	6,658	Estimated reduction in production as percent of actual production:				
Estimated reduction in production.	Thousand bushels	112,500	329,000	493,000	U.S. total	Percent	3.3	9.6	13.0
Total payment	Thousand dollars	179,664	196,418	282,255	Commercial area	do	3.9	11.7	15.9
Payment per acre in reserve	Dollars	33.80	37.53	42.39					
Cost per bushel of production reduced.	do	1.60	0.60	0.57					

[1] Estimates prepared by Soil Bank Division, CSS, Feb. 9, 1959.

[2] In 1956 corn bases were in effect instead of allotments.

2. COMPARISON OF FEED-GRAIN TASK FORCE PLAN AND THE ACREAGE RESERVE

Task force proposal	*Acreage reserve*
1. Voluntary in 1961. Mandatory thereafter.	Voluntary.
2. Freeze CCC stocks except for a payments-in-kind program.	No similar provisions.
3. Limit price support to those who participate. These must reduce acres of corn and/or sorghums by 24 percent for price support in 1961.	No special price-support for participants in acreage reserve. Price supports at a lower level available to noncompliers with allotments. In 1956 participants had to put at least 15 percent of corn base acres in either acreage reserve or conservation reserve. In 1957 and 1958 the high price support was available to cooperators who did not exceed their acreage allotment.
4. Stocks acquired in 1961 program year to be released in following 12 months.	No similar provision.
5. Program limited to corn and sorghum except in small grain regions where it also applies to oats and barley.	Applied to corn and wheat (in commercial areas only), also upland cotton, rice and tobacco. Peanuts and extra long staple cotton, 1956 only.
6. Base for calculating reductions in production to be paid for is in bushels. (Reduction below 1960 acres times 1959–60 yields.)	Base for calculating reductions to be paid for was the acreage allotment. (In 1956 a concept of "corn base acres" was used.)
7. Conservation practice payments at 50 percent of gross value of production on retired feed grain acres (based on 1959–60 yield times $1.30). Payments made for all acres taken out below 1960 (the 24 percent reduction).	Payments based on normal yield times 90 cents a bushel (60 percent of support price in 1956; 64 percent in 1957 and 66 percent in 1958). Payments made only on acres reduced below allotments (or base in 1956).
8. No cross-compliance except for total acres of corn plus sorghums (and other small grains in applicable areas).	No cross-compliance until 1958 except that any participant in the conservation reserve, or the acreage reserve for any commodity had to comply with all crop allotments on the farm. In 1958, had to reduce total acres of those harvested crops designated as "soil bank base."
9. Soil conservation practices required on retired land and land may not be employed in any productive use.	No conservation practices required.
10. Support level equals $1.30 per bushel for corn. Other feed grains at equivalent prices.	Support levels on corn:

	Compliers with allotments	*Noncompliers with allotments*
1956	$1.50	$1.25
1957	1.40	1.10
1958	1.36	1.06

(other grains also supported and corn in noncommercial areas).

11. Optional payment-in-kind at two-thirds of yield for each additional acre retired in excess of item 3 above of corn and/or sorghum acres. (Not to exceed 24 percent.)	A 5-percent incentive was offered to those who would take available feed grains in lieu of cash.

3. COMPARISON OF COST AND EFFECTIVENESS OF REDUCING FEED GRAIN PRODUCTION BY ACREAGE RESERVE AND TASK GROUP PROPOSAL

A direct comparison of costs incurred in reducing production by the acreage reserve program with anticipated costs under the Task Force plan is difficult.

Superficially, table 2 indicates that participating farmers in 1958 reduced their own potential corn production about 90 percent, at a land rental cost of 90 cents a bushel and a realized payment cost of 57 cents a bushel when compliance with allotments meant an additional support price of 30 cents a bushel. The overall potential production was reduced 13 percent.

In 1957, overall potential production was reduced an estimated 10 percent and potential production on participating farms by 82 percent at the same land rental rate and a realized payment cost equal to 60 cents a bushel of reduction. In 1957, compliance with allotments brought an increase in supports of 30 cents a bushel. There was only 10 percent additional participation in terms of number of agreements but a 27 percent increase in reserve acreage in 1958. Most of the improved performance of the program in 1958 is a result of the tighter restrictions imposed and of 3 years of informational efforts among farmers.

The realized payment cost appears to be more comparable with the Task Force conservation payment than the $0.90 diversion payment for reasons given previously. The Task Force plan envisions a reduction of almost 20 percent in production on complying farms at a cost of 65 cents a bushel in payments with support prices at $1.30 a bushel, which is 24 cents above the probable price support rate for 1961 of $1.06, and 34 cents above the January 15 farm price of 96 cents. This 20-percent reduction is expected to be realized from a 24-percent reduction in acres. The inducements of the two plans appear to be roughly comparable.

Experience of the land retirement program of 1956–58 indicates that feed grain production may continue to rise even with sharp reductions in potential production. Effects of the acreage reserve and conservation reserve programs cannot be sharply delineated but tables 6 and 7 contain acreage and production information that helps to judge the combined effects of both, and some of the special effects of the acreage reserve. Data for wheat and soybeans also are shown on these tables.

From table 6 it can be seen that total feed grain acreages dropped about 10 million acres from 1955 to 1956. This is only a little more than the acreage of corn allotment land put into the soil bank plus the increased acres in wheat and soybeans. In 1957, corn acreage dropped by only 4 million acres with payments made on 5.2 million acres while total corn allotment land in the soil bank remained about the same as 1956. Acreage seeded to barley increased by 1.7 million acres. Acres of all soybeans planted increased by 5 million, and grain sorghums harvested rose by 10 million acres. In 1958, soybean and corn acreages increased somewhat but total feed grain acreages dropped by 4.5 million acres. Corn allotment acres in the soil bank increased, and the tighter program controls apparently encouraged reductions in acreages of other feed grains. Wheat acres seeded however increased sharply, and this also tended to reduce acreages of barley and grain sorghums.

Examination of total feed grain acreages in 1955 and 1959 suggests that the acreage reserve program held down the total acreage of feed grains significantly.

Table 7 indicates that the acreage reserve was not effective in controlling the rising trend in feed grain production largely because of yield increases. The 1958 sorghum yield of 36.6 bushels per harvested acre was nearly double the 1955 yield of 18.9 bushels. After a minor decrease from 1955 to 1956, probably caused by the drought, feed grain production increased steadily each year. Soybean output also rose substantially during this period.

TABLE 6.—*Feed crops and wheat acreage, 1955–60*

[In acres]

Year	Wheat seeded [1]	Soybeans planted	Corn planted	Oats seeded	Barley seeded	Grain sorghums harvested	Three feed grains planted plus grain sorghums harvested	Year	Wheat seeded [1]	Soybeans planted	Corn planted	Oats seeded	Barley seeded	Grain sorghums harvested	Three feed grains planted plus grain sorghums harvested
	Thous.	*Thous.*	*Thous.*	*Thous.*	*Thous.*	*Thous.*	*Millions*		*Thous.*	*Thous.*	*Thous.*	*Thous.*	*Thous.*	*Thous.*	*Millions*
1955	58,241	19,959	81,097	47,523	16,335	12,866	157.8	1958	56,269	25,270	74,513	38,406	16,309	16,658	145.9
1956	60,658	21,960	78,219	44,691	14,835	9,342	147.1	1959	57,722	23,407	84,390	35,937	16,992	15,572	152.9
1957	49,852	22,149	73,947	42,577	16,535	19,503	152.6	1960	55,633	24,463	82,906	32,337	15,641	15,444	146.3

[1] Includes wheat seeded preceding fall.

TABLE 7.—*Feed crop and wheat production, 1955–60*

Year	Wheat	Soybeans	Corn	Oats	Barley	Grain sorghums	Four feed grains	Year	Wheat	Soybeans	Corn	Oats	Barley	Grain sorghums	Four feed grains
	Million bushels	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Million tons*		*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Million tons*
1955	935	374	3,230	1,503	401	243	130.9	1958	1,462	580	3,801	1,416	475	610	157.6
1956	1,004	449	3,455	1,163	377	206	130.2	1959	1,127	533	4,281	1,066	422	585	163.5
1957	951	484	3,422	1,301	437	564	142.9	1960	1,363	559	4,353	1,162	423	638	168.5

The task force plan should be more effective in controlling total feed grain output in the first year of operation. The denial to noncompliers of price supports on all feed grains would give a stronger impetus to participation and the margin between market price and the support level probably would be somewhat wider than the former differential between participating and nonparticipating supports. Freezing CCC stocks would narrow this differential but this would be offset in part if payment-in-kind is large. If the program were continued for several years, rising yields might have an effect similar to that of the acreage reserve period.

The task group was unable to estimate the degree of acceptance of the payment-in-kind feature. There was no directly comparable scheme in the acreage reserve plan. The 5-percent incentive for payment-in-kind was available all 3 years but was used to a very limited extent. The maximum use of payments in kind was in 1956 when they amounted to about $3 million for all feed grains. This feature might contribute materially to production reduction if the conservation practices required on the land taken out were not expensive.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEATING BEFORE EASTERN AREA MEETING OF UNITED PRESBYTERIAN MEN

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the recent celebration of Brotherhood Week should serve to remind all Americans about the need to strengthen the moral fiber of our Nation. Our spiritual strength is vital in the world conflict with communism, and it is essential for the building of our internal capacities.

These truths and others were underscored in eloquent fashion by our distinguished colleague, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, in a recent adress to the eastern area meeting of the United Presbyterian Men at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in New York City. I noted with particular interest Senator KEATING's emphasis on the need for the establishment of a code of ethics for Congress, so that there will be no double standard of ethics—one for the executive and another for the legislative branch of Government.

I think this speech merits wide circulation, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE EASTERN AREA MEETING OF THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN MEN AT THE STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 18, 1961

Today we live in an age of tremendous ferment. Great new pressures of history are reshaping the world—politically, socially, economically—creating a new context in which men must live, must learn to live. Humanity isn't resting at a milestone in time, as it so often has in past centuries. It is moving in an accelerated, almost feverish march toward new goals, new dreams, new destinies. A major aspect of this new search, this new striving, emerges with each passing day. It is the quest for an ever-enlarging area of freedom, of dignity, of self-fulfillment on the part of those who have hitherto enjoyed only the fringe benefits of democracy, or no benefits at all.

This is a quest with which every Christian should, by his very name of Christian, be identified. In our own Nation it must take the form of the release of the manmade chains that bind humanity to the past, a release of the great potentialities that now lie imprisoned behind the barriers of discrimination based on race, color, creed, and national origin. As Americans we cannot, in justice, in terms of our avowed concept of brotherhood, or in patriotism, continue to keep the gold of our citizen's talent, the gold of their energies, their dedication locked in a sealed vault of bigotry and discrimination.

By the same token, we cannot, in good conscience, wring our hands over the denial of human rights in remote lands—in lands half a world away—if we continue to deny human rights, legal rights, God-given rights—to any American because the color of his skin is different from ours. The color of his heart is not—nor is there a distinction in the priceless value of his soul. Freedom, dignity, equality—these must not be made oratorical catchwords, but living realities. And until they are, we cannot hope to persuade the teeming millions who stand at the crossroads of history that the road to their best future is the road marked "Democracy." Until such phrases become living realities, we give communism the card that trumps the fine words we speak and the good deeds we perform in the name of freedom, dignity, and equality.

As a member of the Congress, I have been proud to stand in the forefront of this struggle to make freedom and equality in our land realities rather than slogans—and I shall continue in this struggle, because I believe that the American Constitution was conceived as a shelter for all, with none outside the door of freedom, none forced to stand in the cold of injustice, and of a rationed equality.

Jesus said, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."

In ancient times our brother was simply defined. He was of the tribe, of the community, of the homogeneous grouping that race, and geography and color and creed delineated. But the definition of Jesus was not confined by mountains, by borders, by oceans. It was the divine concept of fellowship—in Christ—an all-encompassing union that made men brothers because they came not from the same land—but from the same hand—the creating hand of God.

Particularly at this time, in a week formally dedicated to the concept of brotherhood should we remember that all our brethren do not stand as we, in the sunlight of freedom and equality. The darkness of bias, of prejudice, of hatred, is a manmade darkness and it remains for men to scatter this darkness, to make it disappear from the land. And, on the larger world scene, as new nations emerge into the light of freedom, we must extend the hand of brotherhood to them. At the same time as the pressures of history make our world smaller, love must make our hearts larger, to make room for all men of good will—to bear witness to them that while America may be oceans away in distance it is only a heartbeat away in brotherhood.

We speak so often of the way to fight against the contrived and fallacious brotherhood of communism. And so often, that it seems like a perversity, we miss the whole point. There is only one way to fight godlessness—and that is with godliness—in its true, its deep, its fullest meaning.

The greatest anti-Communist weapon we have is the practice of Christianity. Not the mere affirmation of Christian beliefs. Not the testimony of words, alone, but the dynamics of action. Man must live what he believes, else his beliefs have no life. He must translate the concept of love into the reality of love, he must translate the thought of brotherhood into the act of brotherhood.

He must make Christ not a name but a revelation, not a symbol but a presence, not a dream but a fulfillment. If he does not, he stands, a Christian soldier in name alone, without arms, without armor, naked before his enemy, vulnerable unto death.

Christ was a man of action. He remade the world. And His voice, His message rings to this day across the centuries, clear as truth is clear, only seeking to be heard, to be believed, to be diffused and, above all, to be translated into the deeds that give it meaning.

History holds no more tremendous irony than this: That communism owes its growth to its success—not in fighting Christianity but in counterfeiting it. The Communists have acted to replace God by dressing up man as a god. They have taken the Christian concept of fellowship and made it a brotherhood in slavery rather than a brotherhood in freedom. They have minted the currency of hatred—and circulated it as the currency of love.

In its true essence, therefore, communism stands before us as a spiritual challenge. Only secondarily is it a military challenge. The way to meet it, to vanquish it, was revealed to us 2,000 years ago. It is not a passive way, unless men make it passive, and so forswear it. It is a militant way, with a marshaling of the soul's strength, the heart's resolve, the body's energy.

Only Christianity in action is true Christianity—and only true Christianity—Christianity that makes Christ living, loving, and real, is the sublime and certain road to peace in our hearts, peace in our consciences, peace in our world.

In a pushbutton universe, where man is mesmerized by his own magic, where computers are our new Delphic oracles, where speed is less a rate of movement than a way of life—we have glorified such words as automatic, prefabricated, and instant. And when I speak of instant, I'm not referring alone to the magic whereby a teaspoonful of powder becomes a cup of hot coffee before your eyes. Or of breakfast cereal that is cooked not in minutes but in split seconds.

You remember the days when your mother used to spend hours preparing a meal. Now a huge corporation is the family cook, and

assembly line dinners, untouched by human hands, come to us preplanned and precooked. Today the only requisite for serving a meal is the knowledge of how to open an oven door. And this elimination of the time dimension is not confined to material things alone. The other day I saw an advertisement for a course in "Instant French."

But let not this concept of the easy way be transferred into spheres where it does not belong. Let us remember that there are no such things as "instant morality, instant character, instant religion, or instant patriotism." Before there is a flowering there must be a growth—before there is a growth there must be a seed. In the matter of man's spiritual development, time is not something that can be cheated, but something that is indispensable to growth.

Let us apply this to the practical field of ethics in business and in Government. The cynic drawing attention to abuse of trust and abuse of public office, will say that Christianity has failed. Which is tantamount to saying that the summit of the hill has failed because the climber did not make the effort to reach it.

In this connection, I should like to touch briefly on one specific area that has concerned me deeply, and in which I have attempted to introduce corrective action. I am a cosponsor, with Senator JAVITS, of recently introduced legislation to protect against conflicts of interest in both the legislative and the executive branches of the Federal Government.

This proposed legislation is based on my conviction that there is an urgent need for Senators, Representatives, and the some 22,000 employees in the legislative branch of the Federal Government to have the benefit of a clearly defined code of ethics. It is completely incongruous for Senate committees to put Cabinet appointees through rigorous questioning as to their financial affairs and outside interests which might conflict with their new duties, when those of us in Congress and our staffs are not subject to similar standards and requirements.

For our own guidance as well as for the protection of the public interest, we should enact a clearly defined, enforcible ethics code. We should not continue to function on what appears to many to be a double standard of ethics, one set of standards for the executive branch but none for the legislative branch.

In the Government, as in other fields of human activity, the right will not prevail unless men make it prevail.

Christian principles remain an untapped wealth until they are put into circulation; until they are made the spiritual coin of the realm.

Today, when science and the quest for security have turned the heavens into a kind of cosmic shooting gallery, we hear much about the so-called problem of reentry, of bringing man back alive from outer space.

How this consideration pales when one contemplates the immensity and significance of the overriding problem of our times, the problem of the reentry of the Christian into the tremendous struggle that challenges him, the struggle to extend the frontiers of love and brotherhood—to make Christ known where He is unknown—to be a witness for Him, not in name alone, but in the fire of zeal, in the eloquence of action.

"God so loved—that He gave."

Let man so love that he, too, gives—for only in the giving of himself does he enrich himself—only when he makes Christianity a living thing does he too live, only when he seeks God does he find himself.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires recognition during the morning hour, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENGLE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, if there is no further morning business to be transacted, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be concluded, because the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] desires to make a speech beyond the 3-minute limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

NOMINATION OF WALTER N. TOBRINER TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on the District of Columbia the nomination of Walter N. Tobriner to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be considered immediately and acted upon. It has been cleared on both sides, and it comes to the Senate as the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and without objection the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a newspaper article and two editorials in support of the nomination, which speak more eloquently in support of this nominee than I could myself.

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

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 1, 1961]

TOBRINER BRINGS EXPERIENCE, WIT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POST

Walter N. Tobriner brings to the District Building experience. There is also a certain toughness and cunning in the man.

But all three frequently break up in a wide, boyish grin, an irrepressible and fast wit—one apparently difficult to keep under control. He does not take himself too seriously.

Nominated as a Commissioner by President Kennedy under confusing circumstances, he nevertheless found time to laugh infectiously over an apparent case of conflicting interests.

His wife—he describes her as a "good egg"—realized that she might find it difficult to serve in one of her civic posts, that of a member of the District Commissioners Advisory Committee on Trees.

"She has decided to resign," said Mr. Tobriner.

And there is perhaps only one thing that obviously worries the Commissioner-designate in the days ahead. He is very frankly concerned over the number of veal cutlets and speeches at high noon facing a District Commissioner.

KNOWS SERIOUS SIDE

This is not to indicate Mr. Tobriner treats or views the city's problems with amusement. Few Commissioners have brought to the office as much participation in past rough-and-tumble decisions which have shaped the city.

He has been thoroughly involved in the city's network of hospitals and, of course, established his reputation in civic affairs as a member of the board of education.

A lawyer here since 1926, a Democrat, a native of the District, Mr. Tobriner was appointed to the school board in 1952. It is an accepted fact that as a member of the board he was the first to move in the pre-integration turmoil to prepare the school system for the shock of merging the old white and Negro divisions.

Community meetings were held, plans and policy set. And following the Supreme Court's decision, integration proceeded here with a minimum of trouble in comparison to other sections of the country.

As president of the board, Mr. Tobriner ran a smoothly functioning organization, shutting off endless debates which had marked meetings before his tenure. It was rare if he did not know how each member felt on a given issue. There were few surprises.

CAN BE BLUNT

He can be brutally blunt—but only after he has studied a situation and carefully written down his feelings.

Once, he stood before the student body of District Teachers College and suggested abolishing the very school he was addressing. He had recommended setting up a junior college—a controversy that remains today.

He has worked for higher teacher salaries, but, at the same time, has ruffled the feathers of teacher organizations by attempting to set up some screening process which would prevent the hanging on of what he has frequently termed "deadwood" and "incompetents."

Tobriners have been here since shortly before the Civil War.

ORNATE SAFE REMAINS

Mr. Tobriner's father, Leon, was a prominent Washington lawyer, a president of the Washington Bar Association, and a designer of portions of the present District of Columbia Code. He died in 1953 at the age of 96, leaving an estimate of approximately $515,000.

His father's old, huge, ornate safe remains in Mr. Tobriner's office in the Southern Building at 15th and H Streets NW.

"The thing doesn't work," Mr. Tobriner said once, "but I'm sentimental."

Mr. Tobriner, 58, has practiced law here since 1926, following his graduation from Harvard Law School. It has been a quiet practice, in wills and trusts, estates and corporations, contrasted with his civic and political undertakings.

He was married in 1933, and the Tobriners have two children, Mrs. David Povich, daughter-in-law of Shirley Povich, sports columnist of the Washington Post, and Matthew W. (Hoby) Tobriner, a senior at Princeton and 200-pound guard on the varsity.

Mr. Tobriner himself is tall and thin. In the basement of his home, 6100 33d Street NW., he mysteriously turns out cabinets and coffee tables that look like the work of a professional. They do not rock.

Mrs. Tobriner is equally energetic. She figure skates, plays Mozart on the piano, and is a member of a flock of civic organizations as well.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Full name: Walter N. Tobriner.

Claim to fame: Nominated by President to be District Commissioner.

Home: 6100 33d Street NW.

Birthday: July 2, 1902.

Education: Graduated from Princeton in 1923; Harvard Law, 1926.

Jobs: Attorney; president of District Board of Education.

Family: Wife, Marienne; a son, Matthew, and a daughter, Constance.

Hobbies: Woodwork.

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 1, 1961]

COMMISSIONER TOBRINER

The selection of Walter N. Tobriner as the next District Commissioner is an excellent one. In the community at large he enjoys the highest regard and respect, a tribute he has fully earned through arduous and effective service in half a dozen civic enterprises. We hope now that no time is lost in the formality of his nomination, and that this is quickly confirmed by the Senate so he can assume immediately the leadership of District affairs.

Mr. Tobriner is best known to the public as a member of the District Board of Education since 1952, and its president for the past 3 years. To him is due a substantial share of credit for the swift and remarkably smooth integration of public schools which followed the Supreme Court decision of 1954. In addition, his experience with school affairs has given Mr. Tobriner a direct and intimate knowledge of District fiscal problems—certainly the foremost initial challenge he will face at the District Building. Not quite as well known, perhaps, are his contributions in the field of health, as president of the Metropolitan Area Hospital Council and of the Washington Hospital Center, and, in the field of housing and urban renewal, as a board member of the National Capital Housing Authority. All in all, it would be hard to find a citizen (a native of Washington, incidentally) so admirably equipped for the varied responsibilities of his new job.

The Star reported last Monday, on the basis of authoritative information, that President Kennedy intended to name Frank D. Reeves, Democratic national committeeman from the District, as the next Commissioner. Monday evening, in a reversal of this decision, the White House announced Mr. Tobriner's selection—along with the appointment of Mr. Reeves as a special Presidential assistant. Whatever the reasons for this change, we do not think they bear upon the abilities of Mr. Reeves. If he should later be appointed to fill another vacancy as Commissioner, as speculation has it he will be, we know of no reason to think he would not be a good one.

Meanwhile, the course of events indicates that Commissioner McLaughlin will remain in office until his term expires June 30. Presumably, as should be the case, Mr. Tobriner will take over the presidency of the Board of Commissioners from Mr. McLaughlin immediately. The replacement of only one of the three board members during the next few months, however, will permit a more orderly transition of leadership than would otherwise be possible, an advantage of no small consequence in the troubled period ahead.

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 1, 1961]

OUR NEW COMMISSIONER

The appointment of Walter N. Tobriner to the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners is about the best thing that could have happened to this city, and we congratulate President Kennedy on his choice. Although Mr. Tobriner has been active in Democratic politics, so have lots of other Washingtonians, and this selection, obviously, was no political payoff. Whatever finally led the President to pick him, he hardly could have found a better man.

During his 9 years on the District School Board, Mr. Tobriner has demonstrated a brand of courage and intellectual honesty that knows no compromise. Once convinced that a certain course of action is right, he pursues it and does not falter. He is a worker, not a talker, but when he says something, it means something.

He has a fine legal mind (he would make a good judge and someday we hope to see him become one) and, in all his actions, he is completely fair.

The honesty, swiftness, and relative ease with which the District responded to the Supreme Court's desegregation ruling is largely to his credit. So is the fact that the size of classes in District public schools has been reduced from an average of 36 pupils per teacher (and sometimes as many as 45) to an average of just over 30.

This meant money for new buildings, new classrooms in old buildings, and more teachers. Mr. Tobriner doggedly set out to get the necessary funds from the Commissioners—and Congress—and succeeded where others had failed.

He was instrumental in bringing Carl F. Hansen here as School Superintendent and, more than anyone else, he was responsible for seeing to it that this able, forceful, and exciting educator should have a free hand in achieving his high standards of scholarship and teaching.

In fact, what Mr. Tobriner has done for District public schools will continue to benefit children here long after he is gone.

In his new job as District Commissioner and—hopefully—as president of the three-man Board of Commissioners, he will have a chance to use his talents in a greatly expanded field of public service. We have seldom felt as confident that a man chosen for a particular challenge was so well equipped to meet it.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1961]

MAN AT THE TOP

President Kennedy's selection of Walter Tobriner for the District Board of Commissioners is admirable on two counts. It honors a Washingtonian who has served his community with exceptional ability and devotion; and it gives this colonial dependency of the United States a native-born governor sympathetic to its aspirations and exceptionally qualified to advance them.

Mr. Tobriner shares with Superintendent Hansen a great deal of the credit for piloting the District schools through the difficult transition from segregation to integration. That this transition was undertaken even before the Supreme Court commanded it—and accomplished speedily, democratically, and with immense benefits to the quality of education for white and colored students alike—is attributable in large measure to Mr. Tobriner's imaginative and energetic leadership.

It is heartening that he will now assume leadership at the community's top level. He can be counted upon to bring the same sort of imagination and energy to the tough problems of municipal administration, urban renewal—and the attainment of home rule—which Washington must solve. Walter Tobriner has richly earned the kind of reward for public service he is likely to value most—an opportunity to render greater public service.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

SOCIAL SECURITY SHOULD BE LIBERALIZED AND EXPANDED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Americans who retire in their later years have earned the right to live comfortably, with dignity, and free from the haunting insecurity of penniless old age.

The Social Security Act, one of the greatest and most humane legislative achievements of all time, was passed to help make this possible. It is my view that of the many imprints Franklin D. Roosevelt left upon the pages of history, this act will be the greatest monument to his memory. Today, under the beneficent provisions of the act, more than 72 million Americans have assurance that in their old age they will enjoy a measure of security.

Since the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935, Congress has made changes in keeping with the fast-changing times. It is my happy personal recollection that, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, I helped to draft the present liberalized and expanded social security law.

However, in the decade just passed, the need for broader, more sweeping changes has outstripped our efforts to meet the needs of our rapidly growing and constantly changing society. Our social security program today does not give enough protection to enough people. It has not kept pace with the times, nor has it kept pace with expanding needs of our elderly citizens.

Today most of our over-65 population have inadequate incomes, cannot afford proper medical care, and many are ill housed and ill fed. It is clear that expansion on a broad level in social security must be made now to avoid a future catastrophe of sweeping proportions among our aged.

Indeed, Mr. President, as we enter the 1960's under the leadership of President John F. Kennedy, the time has come for a major breakthrough toward the new frontier—a crash program in social security.

Piecemeal, patchwork, and after-the-fact legislation has proven inadequate to meet the needs of America's elderly population. We must learn to anticipate needs, not get tangled in the confusion of interpreting them long after they have swept onto the scene.

Mr. President, during the last session of Congress, the Senate passed a series

of liberalizing amendments to the Social Security Act which would have gone far toward alleviating many of these needs. Although a few, including the abolishment of the arbitrary age 50 limitation for disabled workers, were agreed to by the other body, most of the more beneficent amendments were killed in conference. As the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] said at the time:

> We sent over a henhouse filled with hens, and the House of Representatives conferees gave us back a bag of feathers.

That was how we fared at the last session.

Mr. President, it is my fervent hope that this Congress will complete the work begun by the 86th Congress, the work of modernizing and expanding our social security program. First and foremost is the need for a medical care plan for the aged within the framework of our social security system.

This can be accomplished with but a slight increase, not to exceed one-fourth of 1 percent for the employed and employer, and not to exceed three-eighths of 1 percent per annum for the self-employed. Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, stated that social security would continue actuarially sound by doing this.

Tremendous debt should not be a penalty paid by elderly people when the calamity of prolonged illness or expensive surgical attention comes into their homes. The proposed added protection against a disaster of this sort is a pressing social welfare problem which we should meet.

We must be realistic, Mr. President, and legislate in recognition of the fact that medical and surgical expense for older people, particularly those in their seventies, is probably three times the expense incurred by those in their forties and fifties. For many thousands of these people living on small incomes or pensions, the rising cost of hospital and medical care presents an increasingly cruel and worrisome dilemma.

Mr. President, those persons who oppose a forward-looking program to liberalize our social security system speak of health insurance procured from private companies. The facts are that only one in eight persons who would be benefited by the enactment of the proposed legislation has health insurance procured from a private company.

Ironically, however, men and women above the age of 65 are the very ones who are confronted with the threat of the highest expense for medical services and hospital care. It is a fact that the average medical bills of this group during the 6 years from 1952 to 1958 increased by nearly 75 percent.

Mr. President, there are facts and figures, but they all add up to the simple fact that medical expenses rise with a person's years. At the same time, for most people, the ability to meet them declines rapidly once they are off the payroll.

It is a tragic situation that here, in the richest country in the world, millions of elderly persons live in constant fear that savings they have set aside for a dignified old age will be washed away by one serious illness.

I do not advocate any change whatsoever in the freedom we Americans enjoy to be attended by doctors of our choice, and surely I subscribe to the view that physicians and surgeons may choose the patients they desire to attend and have full freedom to choose the hours they decide to give to rendering professional services.

Legislation we should enact would provide payment from the social security fund in the manner private insurance programs are operated.

The most vociferous and most formidable opponent of this forward-looking legislation has been the American Medical Association. The bogus label of "socialized medicine," applied by their propagandists to any form of payment for medical care, is nonsense.

This proposal is not socialism. It is simple commonsense. It is no more socialistic than any other form of social security. The charge of "socialism" against it is as empty, meaningless, and vicious today as it was against social security 25 years ago.

It is no surprise that ruling officials of the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce should also take this position. They have been wrong on every issue affecting the well-being of the American people since the turn of the century.

Mr. President, for years the ruling clique of the American Medical Association and its powerful lobby in Washington have been using the timeworn tag of "state socialism" or "socialized medicine" on all legislation which they oppose.

Once again they are dusting off their favorite falsehood. A display poster has been sent to doctors' offices throughout the Nation, twisting the facts on medical aid for the aged and attempting to show that the present proposal is socialized medicine. The outright lies on this propaganda poster are shockingly blatant. They prove that the little band of willful men who exercise iron control over American Medical Association policy are determined, at whatever cost, to stop this bill.

A generation ago, the American Medical Association opposed the reporting of tuberculosis cases to a public authority, although this practice has since become the basis of all TB control. The American Medical Association opposed the National Tuberculosis Act, which Congress passed unanimously.

It stubbornly resisted the Social Security Act. To this day it continues to oppose the inclusion of physicians and surgeons under the beneficent coverage of the social security law. Physicians and surgeons are the only professional men in the United States who are not so included.

Mr. President, the list of progressive laws which was unsuccessfully resisted by the American Medical Association seems endless. It includes public venereal disease clinics; free public diagnostic centers for tuberculosis and cancer; the Red Cross blood banks; Federal aid to medical education; voluntary health insurance; Blue Cross; school health services; and Federal aid to public health. The small group controlling the American Medical Association has opposed all the forward steps the American people, through the Congress, have taken.

American Medical Association ruling officials even had the temerity to assert that Government medical care for dependents of men in the Armed Forces might be harmful to national defense.

What is progress to all other Americans is socialism to the managing dictators of the American Medical Association and like-thinking groups.

Of the small group controlling the policies of the American Medical Association, fewer than 40 family doctors are seated in the 192-member house of delegates that hands down policy for the 180,000 dues-paying physicians and surgeons. The remainder of the policymakers are either specialists, medical diplomats, or medical politicians.

These medical politicians of the AMA are ready to throw all its resources—funds, propaganda, and lobbying activity—against this program.

They appear to have little concern for the problems of older Americans. In opposing this proposal, which is urgently needed by men and women of America beyond age 65, who have retired, and need surgical, medical, and hospital care, this group of dictators of the American Medical Association are, in effect, saying to them, "Get lost, drop dead, but don't get sick."

Mr. President, if the Federal Government steps in to provide insurance for the aged against catastrophic illness, it will not be moving in where private industry can do the job. To the contrary, it will be assuming responsibility in an area where private industry cannot offer the needed protection.

Mr. President, in addition to an adequate medical care plan for our older citizens, there are other vitally needed improvements in our social security system to remedy which I shall introduce legislation at the conclusion of my remarks.

This Nation no longer can afford to handicap its elderly with inadequate benefits while, at the same time confining them to an unrealistic, unfair, and unnecessary earnings limitation. Last year we in the Senate passed an amendment which would have permitted a social security beneficiary to earn up to $1,800 annually, instead of the then $1,200 limitation. The conferees of the House of Representatives refused to agree to this. The best we could obtain was an amendment which at best allows beneficiaries to earn only $150 more a year without suffering equivalent deductions from their social security benefits, for which they have paid premiums.

This present limitation imposes cruel financial punishment on persons still able to work after 65 and denies them a right they have earned by their own contributions into the social security fund, which is an insurance system, Mr. President. As you know, the correct

name is "Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance System." It is, and has been throughout its entire existence, an actuarially sound insurance system. The work and the money of those who have made contributions to the social security fund have built this fund.

It is reasonable to look forward to dramatic new breakthroughs in the search for cures for cancer and heart disease that will push higher and higher the life expectancy of Americans. Men and women of 65 and 70 and 75 will—and many now do—have the ability to participate in gainful employment after retirement. It is unfair to bar these men and women from receiving social security retirement payments for which they have paid premiums during their more active years. This can be remedied, at no cost whatsoever to taxpayers, by increasing the earnings limitation.

If there is no substantial increase in the earnings limit, the so-called soaring sixties will never leave the launching pad for millions of our elderly citizens.

Mr. President, our social security program should be universal—covering all employed and self-employed, whatever their occupation or profession.

For years, the ruling clique of the American Medical Association, and its powerful lobby in Washington—which is said to be the most powerful lobby maintained by any group in Washington—have stood in the way of inclusion of the medical profession under the beneficent provisions of the social security program. They have even resisted the overwhelming sentiment within the ranks of the American Medical Association itself to give coverage to physicians and surgeons.

Wherever doctors have been polled—in Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York and other States—from 60 to 70 percent have expressed themselves in favor of compulsory coverage. Nevertheless, State medical associations and the American Medical Association continue to bar the door. For instance, in Ohio, 68 percent of the physicians and surgeons decided, in a referendum held by the State medical association, that they wanted to be included under compulsory social security coverage. Nevertheless, the State Medical Association of Ohio and the Cleveland Academy of Medicine, of my home city of Cleveland, have all along refused to go along with the wishes of those two-thirds of the physicians and surgeons of Ohio who want this coverage.

The dentists of the United States became protected by the social security program after they voted for coverage in referendums conducted by their various State dental associations.

Self-employed lawyers have also been covered.

I recall that about 5 years ago, as president of the Cuyahoga County Bar Association, I came to Washington and testified before the Senate Finance Committee after we had taken a referendum and the lawyers of Cuyahoga County, including the city of Cleveland and all its suburbs had, by a nearly unanimous vote, voted that they wished to be included.

At that time we were told that if the bar associations had previously sent representatives to Washington, self-employed lawyers would have already been included.

Finally, at the request of the vast majority of the lawyers, Congress voted, 4 years ago, to include self-employed attorneys under the social security program. There has never been any objection on the part of any lawyer from whom I have ever heard. The only objection has come from the American Medical Association through its high-salaried leaders, political doctors who control the organization. They have prevented the same coverage for physicians and surgeons despite the mounting evidence that most doctors themselves want it. The attitudes and actions of the AMA keep doctors as the only professional group who are still holdouts.

Mr. President, there are those who say that if the rank and file American physicians and surgeons do not care enough to make their desire for inclusion heard, they should not be allowed the benefits of social security. I, for one, feel that the fine medical men of this country deserve from their Government better treatment than that which they are receiving from the ruling group of the American Medical Association.

Mr. President, retirement benefits, which now average only $72 a month should be increased by at least 10 percent, and the minimum benefit payment, now $33 a month, should be substantially increased. The present minimum is certainly unrealistic.

It seems tragic that a huge, important, and deserving segment of our population has been, economically speaking, traveling by mule train while most of our society has traveled by jet. I refer to our fast-growing population of persons over 65. Today three-fifths of them have less than $1,000 income annually. Four-fifths have less than $2,000. Aged widows, most of whom are on social security, are the most impoverished group in America. They receive on the average only $56 a month.

Coinciding with these shocking statistics is the fact that life expectancy is constantly increasing. The consequences of longer life on less money hold out the prospect of an increasingly impoverished, rapidly expanding elderly population.

Only an ostrich would fail to see that care of the aged has become a major national problem.

Part of this deep-rooted problem can be met and solved through increasing social security benefits and through increasing the wage base from $4,800 to $6,000.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference two bills to amend certain provisions of the Social Security Act. One would increase the earnings limitation to $1,800, and also provide another step toward making the program truly universal by bringing all physicians and surgeons under its coverage. The second would provide an approximate increase of 10 percent in social security retirement benefits, and, in order to keep the program actuarially sound, raise the maximum amount of annual earnings on which benefits are based and premiums paid from $4,800 to $6,000.

I ask that the bills be received and appropriately referred.

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

The bills, introduced by Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 1120. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of doctors of medicine under social security, and to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits; and

S. 1121. A bill to increase the benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, and to increase from $4,800 to $6,000 the maximum amount of annual earnings with respect to which benefits under such system may be based.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, our social security system is an actuarially sound insurance system, and must remain so. I have stated so before, and I reiterate this fact despite the untruthful statements made by the ruling group of the American Medical Association. The system must be kept sound, and we in the Congress are determined to do it.

The hope we all cherish is an old age free from care and want. To that end people toil patiently and live closely, seeking to save something for the day when they can earn no more.

There was no more pitiful tragedy than the lot of the worker who had struggled all his life to gain a competence and who, at 65, was poverty stricken and dependent upon the charity of the Government or his relatives.

The dignity of every individual is involved. Something deep inside a person is offended if, after a lifetime of productive effort, all he or she gets is a handout.

In expanding the system of safeguards against the hazards and cruelty of penniless old age or crippling disability, new concepts of security and human dignity are involved, as well as a new relationship between the individual and his Government.

Mr. President, I assert that the Federal Government can provide reasonable security for the aged and less fortunate among us without in any way sacrificing that liberty which we know as the American way of life.

The truth is, Mr. President, that the adoption of a modernized and expanded social security program such as I have outlined here today will mean a stronger, more vibrant America, a Nation of expanded opportunity for all, where no one is forgotten, where the young have faith and the aged have hope, and where the dignity of the individual is still looked upon as the highest goal of civilized society.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON DESK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education, introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on February 20, 1961, continue to lie on the desk until Thursday next.

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

URBAN AIR POLLUTION BY OXIDES OF NITROGEN APPEARS INEVITABLE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for the past 5 years, a research program of ever-widening scope has been carried on under direction of the U.S. Public Health Service and under a law which I had the privilege of proposing in the hope of obtaining desperately needed information for protection of the American people against the scourge of air pollution.

A significant amount of technical data has been accumulated which demonstrates beyond all doubt that our Nation's increasing mechanization, motorization, and industrialization call for unremitting efforts on a number of fronts to identify all of the causes, to formulate corrective measures, and to reduce to safe levels emissions of contaminants into the atmosphere.

I have been disturbed to learn that what appears to be a new form of smog—or at the least a recently recognized different type of pollution—has been observed in Los Angeles, where the most comprehensive and longest conducted program of measurement and investigation has been conducted.

Technicians and engineers are concerned by the discovery that there seemingly is an increase in the intensity or frequency of certain oxides of nitrogen, an obnoxious chemical believed to result from a large number of combustion processes. On two occasions in less than a month, the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District found concentrations of this pollutant reached the level warranting an "alert."

The existence of this chemical combination has been known for some time to researchers who have been working on air pollution problems. For the past 2 years cooperative surveys in the Los Angeles area have been conducted under the Public Health Service's auspices to determine how serious the condition may be. Investigation of this aspect of the problem also has been done by Caltech under contract with the PHS.

I am informed that such occurrences now appear to be a probable threat in many metropolitan areas. In fact, it is the fear of USPHS Air Pollution Division that they are inevitable in urban areas.

Some weeks ago, in association with several of my colleagues who joined as cosponsors, I introduced a bill which would strengthen the role of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Surgeon General, and the USPHS in their participation in antipollution activities. The observance of this latest annoying phenomenon appears to provide further evidence that such legislation is urgently and desperately needed. If, as I am told, pollution of urban atmosphere by oxides of nitrogen seems inevitable, I believe there should be no delay in giving those agencies of the executive branch the authority proposed in S. 455 to hold hearings on problems which are of possible regional or national significance, as the bill would provide.

In this regard, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks a statement by Los Angeles County Supervisor Warren M. Dorn and a news story about the oxides of nitrogen phenomenon.

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

STATEMENT BY SUPERVISOR WARREN M. DORN

During the past 2 months, the air monitoring program of the air pollution control district has revealed the emergence of a new dimension to the community air pollution problem—a rapid increase in measurements of oxides of nitrogen.

On December 19, 1960, oxides of nitrogen levels in the central Los Angeles area climbed to first-alert levels for a period of 5 minutes. Again on January 13, 1961, the same area recorded oxides of nitrogen levels as high as 3.73 parts per million of air. During this second episode, however, the measured concentrations remained above the first alert level for 2 hours and 5 minutes, between the hours of 8:50 p.m. and 10:55 p.m.

In reviewing these alerts so as to determine the proper course for this board to follow, I met yesterday with the county counsel and assistant air pollution officer. We also talked by telephone with the Governor and with the State health officer.

It will be recalled that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted regulation VII of the air pollution control district on June 20, 1955, setting alert levels for toxic air pollutants. A first alert for oxides of nitrogen was set at 3 parts per million, a second alert at 5 parts per million and a third alert at 10 parts per million.

In 1959 the legislature at its general session passed SB 117, requiring the State department of public health to develop and publish standards of emissions from motor vehicles which are compatible with the preservation of the public health, including the prevention of irritation to the senses. To date the State has set no standards for oxides of nitrogen, pending tests to determine the degree to which human beings are affected.

On March 22, 1960, this board learned of the discovery of a principle by scientists of the air pollution control district and UCLA, working independently, that could lead to control of 80 to 90 percent of the oxides of nitrogen from motor vehicles at a cost of only $2 to $15 per vehicle.

On that date I introduced a motion which was passed unanimously urging Federal and State officials, as well as the Automobile Manufacturers Association, to do whatever is necessary to have the new principle put into effect on the 1961 models. Letters were sent by the clerk of the board to the Secretary of HEW, the Surgeon General, the chairman of the Health and Safety Committee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the two U.S. Senators from California, the chairman of the California delegation in Congress, the Governor, members of the Los Angeles County delegation of the legislature, and to the Automobile Manufacturers Association, informing them of the board's action.

Answers were received from Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, from the Governor's office and from the Automobile Manufacturers Association thanking us for so notifying them.

Despite this board's awareness of the possibility of a problem from oxides of nitrogen, and our pointing out the success of research into a principle for solving it, progress has been lacking.

The episodes of December 19, 1960, and January 13, 1961, assume a significant deserving of specific action by this Board for the following reasons:

1. Oxides of nitrogen are primary ingredients in the atmospheric reaction that results in the formation of eye irritation, damage to vegetation, and visibility reduction.

2. Oxides of nitrogen are toxic at high concentration levels, particularly if those levels persist for an appreciable period of time. Because of their toxicity, they are designated in regulation VII as one of the contaminants which can trigger an alert.

3. Oxides of nitrogen are formed by all combustion processes, but are derived in principal measure from the operation of motor vehicles. The occurrence of the two recent episodes in central Los Angeles suggests that the problem resulted almost exclusively from vehicle exhaust emissions.

4. The two episodes are unique in the history of Los Angeles County. The sudden occurrence of these conditions on days of high traffic density and poor meteorology, suggest that they will recur with increasing intensity and frequency as our motor vehicle population continues to increase.

5. Because of previous lower measured levels of this contaminant in the atmosphere, and because of the existing program to control hydrocarbon emissions (the other primary causative substance in the smog-forming reaction), no early control measures had been scheduled to abate oxides of nitrogen emissions from motor vehicles.

The December and January episodes clearly indicate that vigorous measures now must be taken to determine safe atmospheric levels of oxides of nitrogen, and to provide for source controls appropriate to the restoration and maintenance of such levels.

Since a principle exists for exhaust recirculation which results in reducing oxides of nitrogen emissions from motor vehicles by 80 to 90 percent, and since the legal responsibility for the control of motor vehicle contaminants now is vested in the State of California, I, therefore, move:

1. That the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors hereby express to the Governor its deep concern over current oxides of nitrogen levels in the Los Angeles atmosphere.

2. That in view of these levels, the Governor be requested to take the following action:

a. Direct the State board of public health to immediately undertake the development of both an air quality, and a vehicle emission standard for oxides of nitrogen.

b. Direct the State motor vehicle pollution control board to immediately undertake appropriate testing and evaluation of oxides of nitrogen control techniques applicable to motor vehicles.

3. That the air pollution control officer of Los Angeles County be instructed to cooperate with appropriate Federal, State, and private agencies to insure rapid and comprehensive research, development, and control action appropriate to the full and final resolution of this problem.

NITROGEN-OXIDE SMOG REACHES ALERT LEVEL FOR SECOND TIME IN LOS ANGELES

LOS ANGELES.—A variety of smog produced by oxides of nitrogen has reached alert level in Los Angeles for the second time on record, the air pollution control district said Saturday.

The district said concentrations of this obnoxious chemical combination went over the alert level of 3 parts per million in the downtown area at 8:05 p.m. Friday and remained above 3 until 10:55 p.m. A peak of 3.37 was reached at 8:50.

Smog control director Smith Griswold has called for a meeting of his scientific committee to evaluate health implications of the new oxide levels.

An APCD spokesman said no alert was called Friday. He said the concentration was so unusual it was thought at first that measuring instruments were off.

A first-stage alert entails warning government agencies and industry that the danger point is being approached.

Since measurements began in 1955, the oxides-of-nitrogen level had exceeded 3 once previously—last December 19. The high reading then was 3.13.

Up to that time only ozone concentrations—another source of smog—had reached alert level.

Surface inversion occurs when air at ground level is cooler than the air directly above. This forms a trap from which smog cannot escape.

Oxides of nitrogen are a chemical union formed during most combustion processes.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when I introduced the bill embodying the President's recommendations for financial assistance for elementary and secondary education last week, I asked that it lie on the table to permit other Senators to cosponsor it, if they chose to do so.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, S. 1021, be printed in the RECORD. I understand consent has been granted for the bill to lie on the table until Thursday, but I wish to have the text of the bill printed at this point in my remarks.

My reason for making the request is that many Senators have called my office asking for copies of the bill, preparatory to deciding whether they wish to cosponsor the bill. Some have suggested that I ask to have it printed in the RECORD today, so that they can study it between now and Thursday.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1021) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1021

A bill to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "School Assistance Act of 1961".

Declaration of purpose

SEC. 102. It is the purpose of this title to authorize a three-year program of Federal grants to States to assist their local education agencies to construct urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities, to employ needed additional public school teachers and pay them adequate salaries, and to undertake special projects directed to special or unique educational problems or opportunities. It is the intent of Congress that with this assistance the quality of public elementary and secondary education will be substantially improved in all States and that inequalities of educational opportunities within and between States will be substantially reduced.

Assurance against Federal interference in schools

SEC. 103. In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 104. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without any limitation of such appropriation or condition inconsistent with or contrary to the terms or purposes of this title, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, $666,000,000, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, $766,000,000, and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, $866,000,000, for the purpose of making payments to State education agencies as provided in this title.

Allotments and payments to States

SEC. 105. (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 104 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per public school pupil, the number of such pupils, and the effort for public school purposes of the respective States. Except as provided by section 106, and by subsection (b) of this section, such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year, an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 104 for such year as the product of—

(1) the number of public school pupils in the State in the preceding fiscal year, and

(2) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (c))

bears to the sum of corresponding products for all the States.

(b) Subject to the provisions of section 106, a State's minimum allotment for any fiscal year shall be the product of $15 multiplied by the number of public school pupils in such State in the preceding fiscal year. If, for any fiscal year, the amount allotted to any State under subsection (a) is less than such State's minimum allotment, the Commissioner shall deduct from the sums appropriated pursuant to section 104 of such fiscal year, such amount as may be necessary to allot to each such State its minimum allotment for such fiscal year, and shall thereafter reallot among the remaining States and in accordance with subsection (a), the balance remaining after such deduction, and shall repeat such deductions and reallotments until, for each fiscal year, the amount allotted to each State is not less than such State's minimum allotment.

(c) For purposes of this title—

(1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per public school pupil for the State by the income per such pupil for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands), except that the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75.

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and August 31 of such fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this title. Allotment ratios for each fiscal year shall be computed on the basis of the average of the incomes per public school pupil for the States and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for the purposes of this title, except that the Commissioner may estimate and subsequently revise such allotment ratios, and, as so revised and promulgated, such promulgation shall be equally conclusive.

(3) The term "income per public school pupil" for any fiscal year for a State or for all the States means the total personal income for the State or for all the States in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of public school pupils in the State or in all the States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

Maintenance and improvement of State and local support for public school financing

SEC. 106. (a) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 105 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, shall be reduced if such State's effort for such fiscal year is not at least equal to such State's base effort for such year. The amount of such reduction shall be the difference between the State's public school expenditures in such year and the public school expenditures it would have made in such year had it exerted the State's base effort for such year.

(b) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 105 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, shall also be reduced if such State's effort for such year is not at least equal to the State's base effort for such year plus the average rate of increase in the national effort over the five fiscal year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961. The amount of the reduction under this subsection (which shall be in addition to the reduction, if any, under subsection (a)) shall bear the same relation to the sum otherwise allocable to the State under section 105, (1) as the difference between the State's effort and the national effort for such year bears to the national effort for such year, or (2), if it would result in a smaller reduction, as the difference between the State's expenditure per public school pupil and 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year, bears to 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year. This subsection shall not apply to any State for any year for which the State's effort equalled or exceeded the national effort for such year, or the State's expenditure per public school pupil equalled or exceeded 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year.

(c) The total reductions which may be made under subsections (a) and (b) from the sum otherwise allocable to a State for any fiscal year, shall not exceed one-third of such sum.

(d) The sum of the reductions under this section for each fiscal year shall be reallotted by proportionately increasing the allotments under section 105 for such year of those remaining States (other than the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands) whose allotments for such year have neither been increased to achieve their minimum allotments under section 105(b) nor been reduced under this section.

(e) For purposes of this section—

(1) (A) A "State's effort" for any State for a fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the State's expenditure per public school pupil by (ii) the income per such pupil for the State; except that the State's effort shall be deemed to be equal to the State's base effort and to the national effort in the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia.

(B) A State's "base effort" for a fiscal year means the average State effort over the 3 immediately preceding years.

(2)(A) The "national effort" for any fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the expenditure per public-school pupil for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (ii) the income per such pupil for all such States.

(B) The average annual rate of increase in the natonal effort over the five-fiscal year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961, shall be determined by dividing the difference between the national effort for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, by 4.

(3)(A) The "public-school expenditures" of any State in any fiscal year means the total expenditures by the State and subdivisions thereof in such year for public elementary and secondary education made from funds derived from State and local sources in the State (including payments in the nature of payments in lieu of taxes from any sources).

(B) The "expenditure per public-school pupil" for any State for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing the State's public-school expenditures in such year by the number of its public-school pupils for such year.

(C) The "national expenditure per public-school pupil" for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the public-school expenditures of all the States in such year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (ii) the number of public-school pupils in all such States for such year.

(4) The Commissioner's determinations of the State effort, base effort, income, public-school expenditures, and expenditure per public-school pupil, for any State, and his determinations of the national effort, average rate of increase, and expenditure per public-school pupil, shall be conclusive for purposes of this title, except that the Commissioner may estimate and subsequently revise any such determination, and as so revised, such determination shall be equally conclusive.

Payment of allotments to States

SEC. 107. Payments to States which have submitted and had approved their applications under this title of Federal funds allotted to them pursuant to section 105 (as adjusted by the application of the provisions of section 106 and as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditure by the States of the funds so allotted.

State agency administrative costs

SEC. 108. From the sums allotted to it under section 105, as adjusted by section 106, for each fiscal year, a State education agency may use such amount as it deems necessary for any supervision, services, and other costs of administering its activities under this title in that year, except that such amount shall not be more than whichever is the lesser of (1) ten cents multiplied by the number of public school pupils in the State during the prior fiscal year, and (2) $150,000, except that if, for any State, such lesser amount is less than $25,000, such amount shall be increased to $25,000.

Special educational projects

SEC. 109. Each State education agency shall set aside, from the sums allotted to it under section 105, as adjusted by section 106 for any fiscal year, an amount equal to 10 per centum of the sums so allotted to it for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, for paying part of the costs of pilot, demonstration or experimental projects of local educational agencies designed to meet public school problems or to develop or evaluate public school programs of a special or unique nature, including but not limited to:

(1) Remedial or special instructional programs or services for pupils having special language or adjustment problems;

(2) Programs or services for adapting curriculums to the needs of deprived or disadvantaged pupils;

(3) Programs or services for pupils from inmigrant or unusually mobile families;

(4) Programs for coordinating the school-system planning and programs in the area served by the local education agency, with the planning and programs of other public or private nonprofit agencies dealing with problems related to the alleviation of the same deteriorated or depressed areas and of the families and children residing therein;

(5) Programs for developing new types of elementary or secondary instruction or programing;

(6) Programs for developing multipurpose uses of elementary and secondary school facilities;

(7) Programs to stimulate improvements in construction, design, or location of elementary and secondary school facilities;

(8) Programs to encourage and stimulate educational excellence, including programs for exceptionally gifted children.

State applications

SEC. 110. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments under this title shall submit through its State education agency an application to the Commissioner which:

(1) provides assurance that the State education agency shall be the sole agency for administering the funds received under this title;

(2) provides for specifying at the beginning of each fiscal year the proportion of its allotment for such year that will be expended for (A) public school teachers' salaries and (B) the construction of public school facilities; and provides that such allotment, except for sums used in accordance with sections 108 and 109, shall be used exclusively for either of such purposes;

(3) sets forth criteria and procedures to insure that in allocating funds received under this title (exclusive of amounts to be used for projects under section 109 and amounts to be used under section 108) to local education agencies (A) the amounts to be used for school facilities construction will be allocated within the State so that priority is given to local education agencies which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for additional school facilities and which are least able to finance the cost of needed school facilities, and (B) the amounts to be used for schoolteachers' salaries will be allocated so that preference is given to local education agencies which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for additional teachers or increases in their teachers' salaries and which are least able to finance such costs;

(4) sets forth the criteria and procedures, consistent with the purposes of section 109, on the basis of which local education agency projects under such section will be approved;

(5) provides assurance that every local education agency whose application for funds under this title is denied, will be given an opportunity for a hearing before the State education agency;

(6) sets forth procedures for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, funds paid to the State and by the State to the local education agencies under this title, which procedures shall include provision for repayment to the United States of any sums received by the State under this title which are not obligated by it in accordance with the provisions of this title by the end of the fiscal year following that in which such sums were received, or which are not expended in accordance therewith by the end of the second fiscal year following that in which they were obligated (unless such sums have been deducted from subsequent payments pursuant to section 107);

(7) provides assurance that the requirements of section 112 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this title; and

(8) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require and for access by the Commissioner, upon request, to the records upon which such information is based.

(b) In the case of any State in which a State education agency has exclusive responsibility for financing the construction of school facilities or for the payment of teachers' salaries, the Commissioner may modify or make inapplicable any of the provisions of subsection (a) with respect to funds specified for school construction or teachers' salaries, as the case may be, to the extent he deems such action appropriate in the light of the special governmental or school organization of such State.

Review of State applications

SEC. 111. (a)(1) The Commissioner shall approve an application of a State which fulfills the conditions specified in section 110(a), and shall not finally disapprove a State application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency.

(2) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency, finds that such agency is not complying substantially with the provisions required to be included in its application under section 110(a), or that any funds have been diverted from the purposes for which they have been paid, the Commissioner shall forthwith notify the State education agency, and he shall thereafter withhold further payments to the State under this title until there is no longer any such failure to comply, or, if compliance is impossible, there is a repayment, or an arrangement for repayment, of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended.

(b)(1) A State education agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State or agency is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(2) Upon the filing of the petition referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(3) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any

action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

Labor standards

SEC. 112. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of construction work financed in whole or in part under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality to be determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276c–5) for construction projects under this title, and every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight hours in any workday or 40 hours in the workweek, as the case may be; but the State education agency may waive the application of this section in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of the project, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the State education agency determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the education agency undertaking the construction. The State education agency of each State shall take such steps as shall be necessary to assure that the wage standards required above shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and in each bid proposal form and shall be made a part of the contract covering the project. The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this provision the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Definitions

SEC. 113. For the purposes of this title—

(1) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education.

(2) The term "local education agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision.

(3) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

(4) The term "State education agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public schools.

(5) The term "public school pupils" means pupils in average daily attendance at public schools within a State, or within all of the States, as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with criteria developed by him to assure uniform determinations for all the States.

(6) The term "public schools" means schools providing free education at public expense, under public supervision and direction and without tuition charge to resident pupils, and which is provided as elementary or secondary school education for local communities.

(7) The term "elementary and secondary education" shall not include any education provided below the kindergarten level or beyond grade 12.

(8) The terms "school facilities" and "public school facilities" mean, classrooms and related facilities (including furniture, instructional materials other than textbooks, equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes) for public schools, and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such terms do not include athletic stadiums, or structures, or facilities intended primarily for events, such as athletic exhibitions, contests, or games, for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

(9) The terms "construct", "constructing", and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

(10) The term "teacher" means any member of the instructional staff of a public school as defined by the State education agency of each State.

(11) The term "teachers' salaries" means the monetary compensation paid to teachers for services rendered in connection with their employment.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 874

Federal acquisition of real property

SEC. 201. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 237), is amended by striking out "ending prior to July 1, 1961".

Employment on Federal property

SEC. 202. (a) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out "ending prior to July 1, 1961".

(b) Clause (B) of paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of such section, relating to computation of the amount of entitlement, is amended to read: "(B) the sum of the number of children determined under subsection (a) and one-fourth of the number of children determined under subsection (b)".

Eligibility requirements

SEC. 203. (a) Clause (B) of paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(B) amounts to 3 per centum or more in the case of subsection (a), or 6 per centum or more in the case of subsection (b), of the total number of children who were in average daily attendance during such year and for whom such agency provided free public education, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, in the case of subsection (b), the percentage requirement shall be 4 per centum and 5 per centum, respectively, instead of 6 per centum".

(b) Paragraph (2) of such subsection (c) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and substituting therefor "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions the Commissioner may waive the conditions of entitlement contained in clause (A) or (B) of this paragraph whenever, in his judgment, exceptional circumstances exist which would make the application of such conditions inequitable and would defeat the purposes of this Act."

Computation of local contribution rate

SEC. 204. Subsection (d) of section 3 of such Act, relating to the computation of the local contribution rate, is amended in the following respects:

(a) The first sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "and the local educational agency".

(b) Clauses (1) and (2) of the first sentence of such subsection are amended to read:

"(1) he shall place each school district within the State into a group of generally comparable school districts; and

"(2) he shall then divide (A) the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which he is making the computation, which all of the local educational agencies within any such group of such comparable school districts made from revenues derived from local sources, by (B) the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such second preceding fiscal year."

(c) The third sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "If, in the judgment of the Commissioner, the current expenditures in those school districts which he has selected under clause (1)" and substituting in lieu thereof "If, in the judgment of the Commissioner, the current expenditures in the school districts within the generally comparable group as determined under clause (1)".

(d) The fourth sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "(i)" and "or (ii) 50 percentum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States (which for purposes of this sentence and the next sentence means the fifty States and the District of Columbia), but not to exceed the average per pupil expenditure in the State: *Provided*, That if, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the application of clause (ii) of this sentence results in a lower local contribution rate than resulted from the application of such clause during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, as such clause was then in effect, then such clause, as in effect during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, shall be in effect during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959".

(e) The fifth sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out ", or in the United States," and ", or in the United States, as the case may be".

Adjustment for certain decreases in Federal activities

SEC. 205. Subsection (f) of section 3 of such Act, relating to adjustment for certain decreases in Federal activities, is repealed.

Sudden and substantial increases in attendance

SEC. 206. (a) Section 4 of such Act, relating to sudden and substantial increases in school attendance as a result of activities of the United States, is repealed.

(b) Section 1 of such Act is amended by striking out "; or (4) there has been a sudden and substantial increase in school attendance as the result of Federal activities".

(c) Clause (A) of section 3(c)(4) of such Act is amended by striking out "(including funds available under section 4 of this Act)".

(d) Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act, relating to the method of making payments, is amended by striking out "section 2, 3, or 4" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 2 or 3".

(e) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "sections 2, 3, and 4(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 2 and 3".

Definition of Federal property

SEC. 207. The third sentence of paragraph (1) of section 9 of such Act, relating to the definition of "Federal property," is amended by inserting "and" before "(B)" and by striking out ", and (C) any school which is providing flight training to members of the Air Force under contractual arrangements with the Department of the Air Force at an airport which is owned by a State or a political subdivision of a State".

Definition of average daily attendance of federally connected children

SEC. 208. Paragraph (10) of section 9 of such Act is amended by adding the following additional sentence thereto: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, average daily attendance under subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner on the basis of the average daily attendance determined in accordance with State law (excluding children for whom the local educational agency received tuition) multiplied by the membership ratio between children qualifying under subsections (a) or (b) of section 3 and all

children for whom free public education is provided; such membership ratio shall be derived from membership counts for two days during the fiscal year covered by the application, in accordance with such regulations."

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 815

Employment or residence on Federal property

SEC. 301. (a) Paragraph (2) of section 5 (a) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 635), relating to the determination of the number of children residing on Federal property or residing with a parent employed on Federal property for purposes of the limitation on the total of the payments to any local educational agency, is amended by striking out "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "25 per centum".

(b) Section 5(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "two or more" and inserting in lieu thereof "both".

Sudden and substantial increases in attendance

SEC. 302. (a) Section 5(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "; and" at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period and by striking out paragraph (3) thereof.

(b) The first sentence of section 3 of such Act, relating to the dates of filing applications, is amended by striking out ", except that the last such date with respect to applications for payments on account of children referred to in paragraphs (2) or (3) of section 5(a) shall be not later than June 30, 1961".

(c) The last sentence of section 5(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "paragraph (1), (2), or (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (1) or (2)".

(d) Section 5(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)", by striking out "or 10 per centum in the case of paragraph (3),", and by striking out ", and unless, in the case of paragraph (3), the construction of additional minimum school facilities for the number of children in such increase will, in the judgment of the Commissioner, impose an undue financial burden on the taxing and borrowing authority of such agency".

(e) Section 5(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "paragraph (1), (2), or (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (1) or (2)".

(f) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act, relating to the definition of "base year", is amended by striking out ", except that in the case of an application based on children referred to in paragraphs (2) or (3) of section 5(a), the base year shall in no event be later than the regular school year 1958–59".

Additional Federal payments

SEC. 303. Section 8 of such Act, relating to additional Federal payments in unusual cases, is repealed.

Definition of Federal property

SEC. 304. The third sentence of paragraph (1) of section 15 of such Act, relating to the definition of "Federal property," is amended by striking out "(A)" and by striking out ", and (B) any school which is providing flight training to members of the Air Force under contractual arrangements with the Department of the Air Force at an airport which is owned by a State or a political subdivision of a State".

Average per pupil cost of construction

SEC. 305. The first sentence of paragraph (6) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out "increased by a percentage estimated by the Commissioner to represent additional costs for site improvements, equipment, and architectural, engineering, and legal fees, and multiplied by a factor estimated by the Commissioner to represent the area needed per pupil in minimum school facilities" and inserting in lieu thereof "multiplied by 95".

Indian lands

SEC. 306. (a) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 14(a) of such Act are amended by striking out "Federal property" and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian lands".

(b) Section 14(b) of such Act is amended by substituting in the first sentence thereof "July 1, 1966" for "July 1, 1961" and "$60,000,000" for "$40,000,000" and by substituting in the last sentence thereof "June 30, 1966" for "June 30, 1961".

Children for whom local educational agencies are unable to provide education

SEC. 307. Section 10 of such Act is amended by inserting the following sentence after the first sentence thereof: "In any case in which the Commissioner makes arrangements under this section for constructing or otherwise providing minimum school facilities situated on Federal property in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, he may also include minimum school facilities necessary for the education of children residing with a parent employed by the United States though not residing on Federal property, but only if the Commissioner determines, after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency, (1) that the construction or provision of such facilities is appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, and (2) that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children."

Technical amendment on judicial review

SEC. 308. Section 11(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "The local educational agency affected may file with the court a petition to review such action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. Upon the filing of the petition the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm or set aside the action of the Commissioner in whole or in part." Section 32 of the Act of August 28, 1958 (Public Law 85–791), is repealed.

Effective date

SEC. 309. The amendments made by this title and title II of this Act, other than section 308, shall be effective for the period beginning July 1, 1961.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask that the description of the measure furnished by Secretary Ribicoff of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appear at this point in the RECORD, together with the accompanying chart, showing the distribution by States of the grants provided in the bill.

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

Title I of the draft bill would carry out the recommendations on public elementary and secondary education contained in your February 20, 1961, special message to the Congress on education. Appropriations of $666 million in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961; $766 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962; and $866 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, would be authorized for the purposes of assisting the States to construct public elementary and secondary schools, and to employ needed additional public school teachers or pay them adequate salaries. The sums appropriated each year would be allotted to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam on a basis which takes into account the number of pupils each State has in average daily attendance in its public schools, and the personal income of individuals in the State per public school pupil, the needier States receiving the larger allotments. Each State would be entitled to receive at least $15 multiplied by the number of such pupils.

A portion of each State's annual allotment of Federal grants, equal to 10 percent of its first year's allotment, would be available for expenditure by a State solely for pilot, demonstration, and experimental projects designed to meet educational problems, or to develop or evaluate educational programs, of a special or unique nature. A State could also use a small portion of its allotment (not to exceed 10 cents per pupil, within a maximum of $150,000 and a minimum of $2,500) for State agency administration of the new program. The rest of any State's allotment would be distributed to its local educational agencies for use by them in paying public school teachers' salaries or in constructing public school facilities. In using the Federal grants, the States would be free to make their own allocation between school construction and teachers' salaries.

In order to assure both the maintenance and improvement of present State effort to meet its needs for school construction and improved public school teachers' salaries, the bill contains provisions to reduce the size of the grant otherwise allocable to any State that, in either of the last 2 fiscal years of the program, reduces its school effort (i.e., the ratio of the school expenditures per public school pupil in average daily attendance within the State to the average personal income per such pupil) below the average level of its effort during the 3 fiscal years immediately preceding the second or third year of the program, as the case may be. A State's allotment would also be reduced if it failed to increase its effort in the second and third fiscal years of the program by a fixed percentage (equal to the average annual increase in the national effort, over the 5 fiscal year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961, inclusive) unless, in either such year, it exerts the same or greater effort as the Nation as a whole, or makes an expenditure per public school pupil which exceeds the national average expenditure per such pupil by 10 percent. However, no State would have its allotment for any year reduced under these provisions by more than one-third.

To participate in the program, a State would submit an application to the Commissioner of Education which would provide for specifying at the beginning of each year the proportion of the grant to be used for teachers' salaries and the portion to be used for school construction, and set forth the criteria that will be used to distribute the grant money (exclusive of the amounts available for special educational projects and State administration expenses) to local education agencies within the State which, in the judgment of the State education agency administering the funds, are most deserving of assistance, taking into account their needs to increase teachers' salaries or the number of teachers, or to construct school buildings, as the case may be.

In its application a State would also undertake to provide assurance that the State education agency would be the sole agency for administering the funds received under the program; and that every local education agency whose application for a share of the Federal funds is denied will be given an opportunity for a hearing before the State education agency. The application would also set forth procedures for such fiscal controls and accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of the Federal funds paid to the State, and would provide for making reports, from time to time, which the Commissioner may need to perform his functions under the program.

The Commissioner, before finally refusing to approve a State application, or before withholding grant funds in case of the State's noncompliance with its approved application, would be required to afford the affected State an opportunity for an administrative hearing, and his final action after such hearing would, if the State seeks the same, be reviewable on the record by a U.S. court of appeals.

The draft bill would require each State to give adequate assurance that laborers or mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on construction projects financed with the aid of Federal grants will be paid at not less than the wage prevailing for similar construction in the locality, and that they will receive overtime pay at a rate of one and a half their regular pay for work in excess of 40 hours in any week or 8 hours in any day.

Titles II and III of the draft bill would amend Public Law 874 (20 U.S.C. ch. 13) which authorizes Federal financial assistance in the maintenance and operation of public elementary or secondary schools in federally affected areas, and Public Law 815 (20 U.S.C. ch. 19) which authorizes Federal financial assistance in the construction of such schools.

The amendments we are proposing to Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 would make permanent certain provisions which expire June 30, 1961, and would bring these laws more nearly in line with the underlying justification for the Federal payments to school districts which both laws authorize; that is, fair compensation to school districts for educational burdens imposed upon them by the location in the vicinity of tax-exempt Federal property on which public school children reside or their parents are employed.

The following four amendments are the most significant:

1. The draft bill would amend both Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 to make permanent the Federal payments authorized to be made to school districts to help them pay the local share of the cost of providing free public education to children whose parents are employed on tax-exempt Federal property but live in private homes (or are employed on private property but live on Federal property). The bill would, however, reduce the Federal payment per child under Public Law 874 from the present 50 percent of the district's local contribution rate to 25 percent of such local contribution rate. It also would make a corresponding reduction in Federal payments under Public Law 815 for public school enrollment increases in the number of such children by reducing the Federal payment per child from 50 percent of the State average per pupil construction costs, as at present, to 25 percent of such costs.

2. The draft bill would amend section 3(c) of Public Law 874 to require that school districts, in order to be eligible for Federal payments on account of children who either reside on Federal property or reside with a parent employed on Federal property, must have in the school year 1961–62 at least 4 percent of their current year's total average daily attendance consisting of such children. In the school year 1962–63 the required minimum percentage would rise to 5 percent, and in the school year 1963–64 and thereafter the required minimum would be 6 percent.

3. The provisions in Public Law 874 authorizing, as an alternative local contribution rate, one-half of the national average expenditure per public school child would be eliminated by the draft bill.

4. The draft bill would repeal categories of Federal payments under both Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 which are not based on the school attendance of children whose parents live or work on Federal property.

These four amendments, as well as other amendments which titles II and III would make to Public Laws 815 and 874, are described more fully in the enclosure.

Estimated allotments to States under the proposed administration School Assistance Act of 1961: Fiscal year 1962, fiscal year 1963, fiscal year 1964

States	Fiscal year 1962		Fiscal year 1963		Fiscal year 1964	
	Amount per State	Amount per pupil in average daily attendance in public schools	Amount per State	Amount per pupil in average daily attendance in public schools	Amount per State	Amount per pupil in average daily attendance in public schools
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands	$666,000,000	$19.75	$766,000,000	$22.04	$866,000,000	$24.22
Alabama	19,691,692	27.27	22,583,245	31.06	25,327,454	34.65
Alaska	555,000	15.00	645,000	15.00	750,000	15.00
Arizona	6,260,276	22.60	7,619,234	25.74	9,043,884	28.71
Arkansas	10,538,844	28.18	11,874,871	32.09	13,101,790	35.80
California	52,733,321	16.82	64,313,909	19.16	76,414,133	21.37
Colorado	7,157,176	19.83	8,603,311	22.58	10,074,516	25.19
Connecticut	6,600,000	15.00	6,960,000	15.00	7,305,000	15.00
Delaware	1,155,000	15.00	1,215,000	15.00	1,290,000	15.00
Florida	19,120,968	20.65	23,494,752	23.52	28,120,464	26.23
Georgia	22,014,247	26.05	25,488,608	29.67	28,859,731	33.10
Hawaii	3,121,256	22.95	3,711,812	26.14	4,285,832	29.16
Idaho	3,760,723	24.91	4,339,997	28.37	4,872,393	31.64
Illinois	23,310,000	15.00	24,060,000	15.00	24,780,000	15.00
Indiana	16,956,529	18.51	19,671,096	21.08	22,317,020	23.52
Iowa	11,280,457	21.20	13,016,980	24.15	14,680,475	26.94
Kansas	9,445,918	21.97	11,033,685	25.02	12,613,723	27.91
Kentucky	14,583,887	24.97	16,638,833	28.44	18,558,615	31.72
Louisiana	15,034,329	23.56	17,525,995	26.84	19,997,176	29.94
Maine	4,125,926	22.30	4,750,050	25.40	5,326,446	28.33
Maryland	8,976,670	16.09	10,773,691	18.32	12,629,855	20.44
Massachusetts	11,790,000	15.00	12,090,000	15.00	13,273,515	16.09
Michigan	27,070,253	17.67	32,079,528	20.13	37,150,155	22.45
Minnesota	13,062,937	20.28	15,270,830	23.10	17,445,053	25.77
Mississippi	14,687,634	29.67	16,255,415	33.80	17,565,544	37.69
Missouri	12,246,808	17.03	14,064,931	19.40	15,795,929	21.64
Montana	2,919,012	20.85	3,419,626	23.75	3,920,101	26.49
Nebraska	5,321,259	20.00	6,129,038	22.78	6,912,416	25.41
Nevada	952,274	15.87	1,174,979	18.08	1,411,359	20.16
New Hampshire	1,734,218	17.70	2,035,633	20.15	2,337,963	22.48
New Jersey	14,400,000	15.00	14,985,000	15.00	15,555,000	15.00
New Mexico	5,275,194	24.88	6,263,277	28.34	7,302,037	31.61
New York	37,650,000	15.00	38,715,000	15.00	39,735,000	15.00
North Carolina	27,905,485	27.25	32,093,440	31.04	36,142,562	34.62
North Dakota	3,100,067	24.60	3,558,869	28.02	3,969,490	31.26
Ohio	28,735,988	16.30	33,879,936	18.56	39,031,368	20.71
Oklahoma	11,951,838	24.39	13,723,715	27.78	15,400,110	30.99
Oregon	7,095,843	20.10	8,356,592	22.89	9,601,681	25.54
Pennsylvania	26,880,000	15.00	30,986,280	17.06	34,942,097	19.03
Rhode Island	1,800,000	15.00	1,845,000	15.00	1,974,787	15.67
South Carolina	15,228,456	28.25	17,537,616	32.18	19,776,441	35.89
South Dakota	3,262,057	23.81	3,796,681	27.12	4,295,246	30.25
Tennessee	19,542,885	26.13	22,526,242	29.76	25,390,845	33.19
Texas	40,262,707	21.40	47,368,850	24.38	54,438,623	27.19
Utah	5,778,627	25.34	6,725,922	28.87	7,662,943	32.20
Vermont	1,459,990	21.16	1,638,770	24.10	1,827,851	26.88
Virginia	17,846,093	22.88	20,821,009	26.06	23,746,498	29.07
Washington	11,408,373	19.67	13,486,454	22.40	15,567,293	24.99
West Virginia	10,658,865	25.56	12,110,817	29.11	13,443,253	32.47
Wisconsin	11,615,012	17.63	13,630,448	20.07	15,650,932	22.39
Wyoming	1,541,357	21.11	1,803,631	24.05	2,065,380	26.82
District of Columbia	1,620,000	15.00	1,620,000	15.00	1,635,000	15.00
Guam	363,080	27.93	445,341	31.81	567,685	35.48
Puerto Rico	14,243,895	27.93	17,050,201	31.81	19,904,454	35.48
Virgin Islands	167,575	27.93	190,860	31.81	212,882	35.48

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, considerable discussion has already arisen about the recommendations contained in titles II and III of S. 1021, relating to Public Laws 815 and 874, the so-called aid to impacted areas laws. It will be helpful to have appear in the RECORD an analysis of these changes, under the heading "Summary of Proposed Amendments to Federal Impact Area Laws," and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL IMPACT AREA LAWS

Amendments to Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, made by titles II and III of the draft bill to achieve the general objective of limiting these laws more closely to payments in the nature of payments-in-lieu-of-taxes, are:

1. Section 201 of the draft bill would extend on a permanent basis section 2 of Public Law 874, which expires June 30, 1961. This section provides for payments in the nature of payments-in-lieu-of-taxes to school districts which have lost 10 percent or more of their real property tax base as a result of Federal acquisitions since 1938.

2. Section 202 and section 301 of the draft bill would amend Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, respectively, to make permanent—as is already the case with respect to children of persons who both work and live on Federal property—the Federal payments authorized to be made to school districts to help them pay the local share of the cost of providing free public education to children whose parents are employed on tax-exempt Federal property but live in taxable houses (or who live on Federal property but work on taxable property). The bill would, however, reduce the Federal payment per child under Public Law 874 from the present 50 percent of the district's local contribution rate, to 25 percent of such local contribution rate. It would also make a corresponding reduction in Federal payments under Public Law 815 for public school enrollment increases in the number of such children, by reducing the Federal payment per child from 50 percent of the State average per pupil construction costs as at present to 25 percent of such costs.

Existing law proceeds on the assumption that one-half of the local revenues for public school purposes is derived from local real property taxes on residential property, and the other half derived from taxes on commercial and industrial property; on the basis of this assumption, both laws now provide for a Federal payment of one-half of the entire educational costs met out of local revenues in the case of children whose parents live in taxable private homes but work on Federal property (presumably classifiable as industrial or commercial property or live on Federal property but work on taxable property).

Available data on the source of real property taxation do not support this assumption. The report of a study of property tax assessments in the United States made by the Governments Division, Census Bureau dated December 16, 1957, indicates, instead, that, on the basis of nationwide averages, only 27.7 percent of the value of locally assessed taxable real property is commercial and industrial property. The highest percentage of such property value in any State is 37.1 percent while the lowest is 9.3 percent. The same Census Bureau figures indicate that 54.1 percent of the value of locally assessed taxable real property is residential property, and the balance (18.2 percent) is acreage and farm property, vacant lots, and other types of real property. Although this ratio in the United States is 27.7 percent, the ratio recommended in the draft bill is 25 percent. The lower figure is believed to be supportable in view of the fact that many school districts eligible for Federal payments under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 will be suburban communities, and the likelihood that in such communities the proportion of local real property revenues derived from taxes on industrial and commercial property will be somewhat less than the proportion prevailing for all the school districts in the Nation, or in each State, averaged and taken as a whole, as in the Census Bureau figures.

3. Section 203 of the draft bill would amend section 3(c) of Public Law 874 to require that school districts, in order to be eligible for Federal payments on account of children who either reside on Federal property or reside with a parent employed on Federal property, must have in the school year 1961–62 at least 4 percent of their current year's total average daily attendance consisting of such children (instead of 3 percent as at present). In the school year 1962–63 the required minimum percentage would rise to 5 percent, and in the school year 1963–64 and thereafter the required minimum would be 6 percent.

In view of the substantial economic advantages that inure to most of these communities by the presence nearby of Federal activities, the fact that most such communities have had ample time to adjust their school tax structures to compensate for insubstantial school enrollments of these children, and the proposed availability of general Federal aid to States under title 1, we believe that payments under Public Law 874 to school districts with less than 6 percent of their school enrollments composed of this category of children can no longer be justified on payment-in-lieu-of-tax theory.

Also, section 203 of the draft bill would repeal the provision of Public Law 874 which specifies that Federal payments to a school district which is eligible in any year will continue for the two subsequent years even though the school district fails in the subsequent years to meet the eligibility requirements of the act. Since the eligibility conditions of the act are presumed to reflect a minimum recognizable financial burden or tax-deprivation by reason of the tax-exempt status of Federal property, school districts which fail to meet these requirements in any year should not be eligible for payments merely because such districts may have been eligible in some preceding year.

4. Section 204 of the draft bill would eliminate the provisions authorizing, as an alternative local contribution rate, one-half of the national average cost per child.

When Public Law 874 was originally enacted, it provided that the local contribution rate (the rate of payment per child) was to be the current operating expenses per child met from local revenue sources in the second preceding year in the most nearly comparable school districts in the same State.

By amendment in 1953, a minimum local contribution rate was authorized, which was one-half of the State average cost per child in average daily attendance the second preceding year, and school districts could then in effect choose either of the two methods (comparable districts or one-half the State average) as its local contribution rate.

In 1958 Congress provided for still another alternative minimum rate, which is one-half of the national average cost per child in average daily attendance in the entire United States in the second preceding year, not to exceed the average cost per pupil in the State. This provision, which is still in effect, would be eliminated by the draft bill because it bears no reasonable relation to the portion of educational costs met out of local real property taxes in the particular school district in which tax-exempt Federal property is located. Under it, in fact, some applicant districts are paid the entire cost per child during the year, rather than the local share of the cost. This provision is actually designed to more nearly equalize education in some of the Nation's school districts, rather than to compensate them for a financial burden imposed by the tax immunity of Federal activities, as Public Law 874 is intended to do. To the extent that greater equalization of educational opportunity is a desired Federal objective—and it is—it is properly achieved through the general Federal aid program in title 1 of the bill.

Also, section 204 of the draft bill would amend Public Law 874 to provide that, for the purpose of determining the local contribution rate, the Commissioner, in consultation with the State education agency, shall classify school districts in each State into one or more groups in which the districts would be generally comparable to each other. The local contribution rate for any applicant district would be the average expenditures per child for current operating expenses from local revenue sources in all districts in each group. This change would be made in order to facilitate administration of Public Law 874.

5. Section 205 of the draft bill proposes to eliminate subsection (f) of section 3 of Public Law 874 which now authorizes the Commissioner to make a supplementary payment to a school district which made preparation to provide education for a substantial number of children who are expected to enroll in the school district because of an expected expansion of Federal activities, but who do not enroll because the expanded Federal activities fail to materialize. Here, again, the hardship is not caused by the tax immunity of Federal property.

6. Sections 206 and 302 of the draft bill would repeal categories of Federal payments not based on the school attendance of children whose parents live or work on Federal property. Both laws now provide (sec. 5(a)(3) of Public Law 815 and sec. 4 of Public Law 874) for Federal payments to a school district on account of increases in the number of children whose parents move into the school district to work for Federal contractors in taxable enterprises. Such payments must be justified, if at all, on some basis other than any direct or indirect loss of revenues resulting from the tax immunity of federally owned property; in such situations the property where the parents of the children live and work is fully taxable, and, in fact, the Federal contracts of the employing enterprises generate other revenues to many school districts.

Such burdens as affected communities may experience from sudden and substantial public school enrollment increases occasioned by increased Federal contract activity in the area do not stem from the tax immunity of Federal property and do not differ from the burdens imposed on school districts by the advent of large private industries not connected with the Federal Government or by other situations resulting in sudden and substantial school enrollment increases. The States can and should make provision for assistance to local school districts to alleviate hardship in such situations and general Federal assistance under title I of the draft bill would be available to the States to help the districts meet any additional teachers' salary or school construction needs in such situations.

7. Sections 207 and 304 of the draft bill would amend the definition of Federal property (sec. 9(1) of Public Law 874 and sec. 15(1) of Public Law 815) to exclude any school which is providing flight training to members of the Air Force under contract with the Department of the Air Force at a

State or municipally owned airport. The inclusion of these schools as Federal property is unjustified since the schools are not Federal property, and their tax-exempt status is not due to any Federal tax immunity.

8. Section 208 of the draft bill provides authority in Public Law 874 to require that federally connected membership counted for payment shall be determined on the basis of two pupil-parent surveys made each year, one in the fall and one in the spring, and the ratio of Federally connected children to total number of children shown by these two counts applied to total average attendance in the school district at the end of the school year to determine average daily attendance of federally connected children for which payment is made. This change would simplify, and make more objective and uniform, the determinations of average daily attendances under the law.

9. Section 303 of the draft bill would eliminate section 8 of Public Law 815 which presently authorizes additional payments to a school district of an amount sufficient to finance an approved construction project to house a federally connected enrollment increase if without such additional payments the school district would be unable to construct the project. Consistent with the in-lieu-of-tax payment rationale, the Federal Government has fully discharged its equitable obligation when the formula payment authorized by the law has been made on account of recognized categories of children connected with tax-exempt Federal property.

10. Section 305 of the draft bill proposes to determine the State average cost of constructing school facilities for purposes of determining rates of payments under Public Law 815 by computing the basic contract cost per square foot for all school facilities constructed in the State in the base year and multiplying this square-foot cost by a factor of 95.

Experience over the last 10 years in the operation of this program has shown that a factor of 95 times the square-foot cost, fairly represents the cost per child for minimum school facilities, including architects' fees, equipment, site improvement, and administrative items.

11. Section 306 of the draft bill would extend section 14 of Public Law 815 for 5 additional years with an increased authorization for appropriation. Section 14 was added to Public Law 815 in 1953 to meet the unusual circumstances in school districts which have large numbers of "unhoused" schoolchildren living on tax-exempt Indian lands and which would not meet the enrollment increase eligibility requirements under other provisions of the act. An expenditure limitation of $20 million under this section was first authorized and was later raised to $40 million. The draft bill proposes to extend this section until June 30, 1966, and increase the authorization from $40 million to $60 million to meet a continuing need of approximately $3 million a year for facilities for Indian children living on Indian lands. In addition, the draft bill would limit this section to children living on tax-exempt Indian lands, in order to prevent application of the more liberal financing provisions of this section to any school district having children living on Federal property (other than Indian lands), but who are unable to meet the increase requirements for eligibility under the other sections of the act.

12. Section 307 of the draft bill would amend section 10 of Public Law 815 relating to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Wake Island, and Guam. In 1953, section 6 of Public Law 874, which directs the Commissioner to provide free public education for children living on Federal property when suitable free public education could not otherwise be provided for them, was amended to authorize attendance in schools constructed on Federal property of children of parents employed by the United States stationed in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Wake Island, and Guam when the Commissioner determined after consultation that no suitable education otherwise was available for such children. At that time, section 10 of Public Law 815 (which is the companion provision to section 6 of Public Law 874 and which relates to construction of school facilities for children living on Federal property) was not amended to permit construction onbase of additional school facilities for these offbase children because it was assumed that the number of such offbase children seeking admission to onbase schools would not be sufficient to require any change in Public Law 815. Experience has indicated that this assumption was incorrect. A number of Federal agencies have indicated that they will find it extremely difficult to recruit and hold qualified personnel in Puerto Rico if the children of these Federal employees are not able to attend the onbase school facilities. The draft bill proposes to amend section 10 of Public Law 815 to permit the Commissioner to construct school facilities on Federal property for the children of Federal employees living off Federal property in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Wake Island, and Guam who cannot otherwise receive suitable free public education.

13. Section 308 would make a technical amendment in the judicial review provision of Public Law 815 (section 11(b)) in order to make applicable the provisions of Public Law 85–791 relating to the procedure and records on the review of enforcement of orders of administrative agencies by courts of appeal.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the subcommittee on education will be examining these proposed changes very carefully. It should be noted that they are now included in an omnibus measure, and must be considered in that context. Significant changes, of course, in title I would require a reexamination of titles II and III.

Mr. President, I wish to say, in conclusion, what I indicated when I first discussed the bill a week ago Wednesday, that I think we have an administration bill which is deserving of the support of the Senate. I hope that as the bill lies on the table now and Thursday a large number of my colleagues will study it and will give me the assistance of their cosponsorship of the bill, because I think it would be very helpful to have the bill go to the subcommittee for hearings with a large number of cosponsors.

Mr. President, this is why the request was made today to have the bill lie on the table until Thursday next.

I announced when I first discussed the bill on the Senate floor that we hoped to start hearings on the bill Wednesday of next week. I am still hopeful we may do so, but I wish to say we may not be able to reach hearings until after Wednesday of next week—although I hope still the hearings will start sometime next week—because of the fact that the Subcommittee on Labor has started hearings on the minimum wage bill. Several members of my subcommittee will be participating as members of the subcommittee considering the minimum wage bill.

In complete cooperation with the very able chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, my very good friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], I have agreed, have notified the administration—and I now notify the majority leader—that I will postpone hearings on the aid to education bill until the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] completes hearings on the minimum wage bill.

We hope to complete those hearings this week, but the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] told me at lunch that it may be necessary to adjourn the hearings at least part of next Thursday, because of an announcement that some proposed legislation will be presented to the Senate for consideration next Thursday afternoon, and the minority leader [Mr. Dirksen], who is also a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, desires very much to be present in the Senate Chamber when that bill is considered. Therefore, in a spirit of cooperation in regard to hearings on the minimum wage bill, which may be temporarily laid aside next Thursday afternoon, I understand—which, the Presiding Officer will fully appreciate, may make it necessary for me at a later date to postpone starting hearings on the aid to education bill— I wish to say to my colleagues, before I yield to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], who I understand desires to make a comment on this subject matter, that I intend to press forward on subcommittee consideration of the aid to education bill with all speed, commensurate, of course, with thorough consideration and with accommodating my majority leader and other Senators who may wish to have other items considered and to have the aid to education bill temporarily laid aside from time to time.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I apologize to the Senator for being absent from the Chamber. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that he did not intend to start hearings on the aid to education bill next Tuesday or Wednesday, as planned?

Mr. MORSE. We hope we can start hearings Wednesday. I explained, in the absence of the majority leader, one of the reasons I may have to postpone hearings for a day or two is that the Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, may not be able to complete his hearings on the minimum wage bill this week. The Senator notified me at lunch, for example, that he may not be able to proceed Thursday afternoon, because apparently a very important bill is coming before the Senate for consideration Thursday afternoon, and the minority leader, who is also a member of the subcommittee, desires very much to be present in the Senate for the debate. If that occurs, we shall have to postpone temporarily the continuation of the hearings on the minimum wage bill, and that in turn will affect the later hearings on the aid to education bill, because several members of the Subcommittee on Labor are also members of the Subcommittee on Education.

However, I want my majority leader to know, as I have announced, that I shall watch this matter very carefully.

I shall proceed with all speed in getting hearings on the aid to education bill behind us, so that we can proceed with executive hearings.

The Senator from Montana knows how difficult it is to make any accurate predictions as to what is going to happen in a Senate committee, but I wish to have the Senator know the goal for which I am shooting. I hope to have the aid to education bill before the Senate within 30 days after we start hearings, which means that I expect to dispose of the hearings and also to get the bill through the subcommittee and through the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, so that we can report the bill to the Senate within 30 days.

I think the Senator will agree that is a worthy goal, and that if I am successful it certainly will be in keeping with what I know are the majority leader's desires, which include the speediest possible consideration of these pieces of so-called "must" legislation.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for his explanation, and I assure him that his word is good enough for me. I know he will act as expeditiously as is reasonably possible and that at the first available opportunity we shall have the aid to education bill before us for consideration. Again I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on February 20 President Kennedy sent a message to Congress urging legislation to provide the Federal aid which is sorely needed by our public schools. For a decade or more it has been clear that the public schools of the Nation must receive financial help on a scale which can only be provided by the Federal Government if our system of public education is to serve its indispensable purposes. Underpaid teachers and dilapidated classrooms have characterized the schools of entirely too many communities for much too long. The net—and tragic—result is that there are too few teachers, too few qualified teachers, and far too few classrooms. Believing as I do, deeply, that democracy and education are one and inseparable, and that this deplorable condition exists in virtually every State, though of course in different degree, I welcome President Kennedy's farsighted, constructive, and realistic move to afford Federal assistance to our State for public school education.

We now have the opportunity of this generation to begin to remedy the plight of the schools. For this proposed legislation is only a beginning. It is a step—though a moderate one—but in the right direction.

My own position on Federal aid to the public schools has consistently been that of support for adequate contributions to meet obvious needs from the Federal Government, provided, of course, that they implied no Federal control. The proposed legislation makes crystal clear that there will be no Federal control, and that the funds will be disbursed wholly by the State and as the State authorities wish. That should dispose of the frequently voiced objection to Federal aid to education, that it means Federal control.

During the last session of Congress I was a cosponsor and a strong supporter of the amendment to the aid to education bill, S. 8, introduced by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], which would have increased the funds to be allocated to the States from $500 million annually to twice that amount, allowing a contribution to each State of $25 a year for each school-age child. I regretted deeply when this amendment, receiving a tie vote, was defeated by the vote of the former Vice President, and I protested this action on the floor immediately thereafter. The Monroney amendment which offered a little less than the Clark amendment was then adopted and I supported this compromise, for it constituted, in my view, an improvement on the bill. I supported the bill as passed, providing a contribution of $20 a child, and was again distressed that even this measure could not be enacted by the other body, in part because of the threat of a Presidential veto.

I have consistently supported the principle that funds should be available to the State for aid in the payment of teachers' salaries as well as for construction of buildings.

When President Kennedy sent his message urging legislation to carry out the proposals for Federal assistance to public schools I have long believed to be imperative, I welcomed this powerful support of a program which under the past administration was condemned as unnecessary.

To my sorrow, however, I have discovered that the formula which is applied to calculate amounts of funds to which the States are entitled is most unrealistic and unjust to Alaska. Indeed, it will produce a mere pittance—for a State which needs the assistance the bill would provide as badly as almost any in the Union. While Alaskans have no wish to make a special case for themselves, or to obtain favors from the Federal Government more generous than the facts justify, nevertheless there are unique aspects of our economy which, in all justice, must be taken into account.

I should make clear that my colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Representative from Alaska in the other body [Mr. RIVERS] fully share this view.

Alaska, although rich in undeveloped resources which will some day—not too distant—make it a great and prosperous State and a great contributor to the national economy, is, during a transitional period from territorialism to statehood, an economically poor State. During this transitional period, it needs such assistance from the Federal Government as is justified to overcome the retardation imposed upon it by past longstanding Federal action and inaction.

I might say, parenthetically, that if Alaska were a foreign country, it would have received this aid many times over during the last 10 years and our economy would now be fully able to take care of our needs. It came into the Union as a State under a handicap of long years of territorial status under which its economy was stifled by the all pervading tentacles of Federal bureaucracy.

No less was Alaska also the victim of discriminatory legislation enacted by previous Congresses. It was the victim of exclusion from beneficial legislation enacted by previous Congresses. Indeed while with statehood Alaska achieved political equality, the economic consequences of 90 years of colonialism persist.

I may say, parenthetically, that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who is in charge of this legislation and so graciously yielded to me, was the first to apply the term "colonialism" to the treatment Alaska was receiving, when he came to Alaska as a member of a Senate committee in 1950. The facts fully justified his use of that word.

Owing almost entirely to unbearably high costs of transportation to Alaska—a direct result of legislation enacted by an earlier Congress—our economy has always suffered from a cost of living which is, in some instances, 100 percent higher than that of other locations in the United States. One economic study of Alaska after another has demonstrated that our cost of living is the highest in the United States.

Imagine our dismay to find that the very economic phenomena which make us economically a poor State cause us to be included with the wealthier States of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Illinois when allocations would be made under the proposed Federal aid to education legislation. Along with these industrial giants, Alaska would receive the minimum allocation of $15 per public school child—an amount that will not go far in a place where it may cost as much as $233 per child to deliver fuel oil for heating a school room.

Alaska would receive, under the bill proposed by the President, only $550,000 in the first year of the operation of the legislation. This amount, according to the State board of education, would build but 14 classrooms, in a State where there is now a need for at least 369 new classrooms.

Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed at the close of my remarks the text of a telegram from the State board of education which states in some detail the nature of the problem faced by Alaska, which message amply demonstrates the statistics of the National Education Association showing that the per pupil cost of education in Alaska is higher than anywhere else in the United States.

Yet, we would receive the minimum amount to be allocated.

The reason for this is that the application of a formula which may be fair enough in other States results in a complete distortion of the economic facts of life in Alaska. As I have pointed out, and as is well known, our cost of living is the highest in the Nation. Incidentally, exact data on this are not yet

available, as the Bureau of Labor Statistics has not completed its first survey of the cost of living in Alaska.

That was another discrimination. For many years Alaska, as a territory, was excluded from the benefits of this survey available to all the States, and it required statehood for us to acquire it. There is, however, competent economic opinion on this to show the abnormality of our cost of living.

Anyway, one need not be a professor of economics to understand the impact of higher costs of everyday household items when they are bought in Alaska as compared with the costs of the same things if bought in the other States.

I have recently received the quarterly report of the University of Alaska Agriculture Extension Service on Alaska food prices. This report shows the differences in average retail prices of 40 items in 9 Alaska cities, as compared with costs of the same items in Seattle.

Mr. President, a few examples will demonstrate the enormous disparity in prices:

For example, a quart of milk which usually costs 24 cents in the rest of the United States, will cost 36 cents at Ketchikan, 50 cents at Seward, 53 cents at Fairbanks, and 81 cents at Nome.

A 5-pound sack of flour which costs 56 cents in most localities in the United States will cost 77 cents at Juneau, 79 cents at Anchorage, 94 cents at Fairbanks, and 99 cents at Nome.

A jar of baby food which retails for 10 cents elsewhere, costs 14 cents at Petersburg and Seward and 15 cents at Nome.

Similarly, a 75-cent pound of coffee costs 87 cents at Kodiak and Seward, 86 cents at Fairbanks, and 94 cents at Nome.

And so it goes, whether the item is shortening, oleomargarine, sugar, or a can of pork and beans. It all costs more—far more—in Alaska than elsewhere.

The high cost of living results in high wages and salaries. These, then, give a false appearance of high income when the same factors are supplied in Alaska as in other localities. Our money wages, our money salaries appear high, and are high in comparison with those paid in the other States, but the real wages and the real salaries in terms of purchasing power are on a par with some of the economically poorer States.

To give a realistic picture of the Alaska economy account must also be taken of the fact that an extremely high proportion of the wealth earned in Alaska never stays there. We have a very high percentage of workers who earn good wages in Alaska during the summer months and save it all up for their living costs in the "lower 48" States in the winter. I have grave doubts that sufficient weight has been given to this factor in computing the income of Alaska for the purposes of this legislation.

There are many other reasons why the formula applied for allocation of funds to the other States must be adjusted for the purpose of making a fair distribution to my State. Many of those reasons are now reducible to statistical facts; others can be analyzed accurately only after completion of economic studies of the kind which have long been available for the other, older States, but not to Alaska.

Again, I commend the President for coming forward with this badly needed program of Federal aid to education. It is sorely needed, and has been for a long time. Now we must find a way to tailor the legislation recommended by the White House to meet fairly the needs of all 50 of the States of the Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the telegram sent to Secretary Ribicoff by the Alaska Board of Education which brings out very specifically the facts I have stated; and also my telegram to Secretary Ribicoff, which was sent before I had actually seen the bill. In fact, I have not yet seen the bill; but in discussing it I am acting on assumptions which I believe to be correct.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the table of average retail prices, from which I have selected a few examples.

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

FEBRUARY 24, 1961.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Following wire sent to HEW Secretary Ribicoff:

"The Alaska State Board of Education fully endorses and supports a program of Federal aid to education. However, the board strongly objects to the formula used as it relates to the State of Alaska. Raw figures on per capita income in Alaska are not a valid measure of the wealth of the State, nor a sound basis for determining the ability of the State to adequately support an educational program. The following factors must be considered if comparisons with other States are to be fair and equitable:

"1. On the basis of the '1959 consumer price index in seven Alaskan cities,' prepared by Joseph Ward, the cost of food and housing in central Alaska, which area accounts for three-fourths of the total income and two-thirds of the population of the State, were 42.7 percent and 45.7 percent higher than in Seattle. Since the costs of living in Seattle are above the national average, this would indicate that Alaska costs would be more than 50 percent above national average. The costs of food and housing in Fairbanks were 50.1 percent, 83.9 percent respectively higher than Seattle. These items in towns and cities not on regularly scheduled air routes were even higher, due to additional transportation costs.

"2. Since Alaska's labor is seasonal, a large proportion of this income goes to transient laborers with most of the earnings going outside Alaska to support families or become savings.

"3. The ratio of school-age children in Alaska to the adult population is twice as high as the national average, and one-third higher than the next ranking State.

"4. Alaska's schools are scattered across four time zones, and in most instances people, supplies, equipment, building materials, and fuel must rely upon airplane transportation. Many of the schools are not in areas served by scheduled carriers. The result is that flights must be chartered, which greatly increases costs. As an extreme example, the cost of delivering 75 drums of stove oil to Anaktuvuk Pass was $6,300 or $233 per student.

"5. Since so many schools are located in areas where housing is not available for teachers, the State has the additional cost of providing teacherages.

"6. Instructional costs must be much higher than in other States, when the costs of living are so much higher.

"7. Construction costs in most of rural Alaska are extremely high. A school building just completed at Bethel, Alaska, cost $44 a square foot. If $555,000 is to be in the annual amount of Federal aid and if the entire amount were to be spent on construction, using the cost of construction at Bethel as a basis we could build only 14 classrooms per year. Our immediate need is for 369 new classrooms.

"8. Twenty-eight percent of the elementary schools in Alaska have fewer than 20 students. The smaller the number of students, the higher the per pupil cost. Most of Alaska's high schools are small, and to provide an adequate high school program, the pupil teacher ratio must be low. The cost per student is considerably higher than in other States which can have large consolidated schools. Thirty-three percent of Alaska's high schools have enrollments of less than 40 students.

"9. All of these small schools must be maintained. In the native villages it is not possible to secure competent maintenance help. Consequently it is necessary to fly people into these areas to perform necessary maintenance work.

"10. The sparsity of population in Alaska makes it necessary to transport both elementary and high school students great distances to schools. One out of every ten dollars appropriated by the State legislature for education is spent for student transportation.

"11. National Education Association statistics show that the per pupil cost of education in Alaska is the highest in the Nation. If Alaska were to provide the same type of educational opportunity as some other States which provide swimming pools, elaborate athletic fields, gymnasiums, auditoriums, etc., the costs would be even higher. Alaska cannot afford many of the educational advantages which other States have and consider essential."

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION.
GEORGE E. SMITH, *President.*
HUNT GRUENING, *Vice President.*
WILLIAM V. BOGGESS, *Member.*
WILLIAM G. MORAN, *Member.*
MRS. MARCELLA C. BUCKALEW, *Member.*
MRS. MARY M. KELLIHER, *Member.*
DR. THEO J. NORBY, *Commissioner of Education.*

FEBRUARY 24, 1961.

Hon. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

I greatly appreciate your cooperation in sending Mr. Radcliff and Mr. Conger to my office to discuss Alaska's problem in connection with the formula in the administration's aid to education bill. Needless to say, the Members of our Alaska delegation are heartily in favor of the whole purpose and content of the proposed legislation but are greatly distressed with the proposed formula which works out so unfairly and so unrealistically in the case of Alaska. The cost of living in Alaska varies in different parts of Alaska from a 30-percent to a 100-percent increase over the average cost in the United States. Consequently, salaries and wages are higher, and the annual reported income in Alaska is, therefore, higher in dollars but actually no higher in purchasing power. As a result, Alaska is bracketed with the wealth-

ler States, such as New York, Illinois, New Jersey, and Connecticut, whereas actually, from a standpoint of need, it should be bracketed with the poorer States.

Conversely, in addition to the above, the actual dollars appropriated under the bill buy much less. So Alaska gets trimmed coming and going. For instance, the $550,000 which Alaska would get under the proposed formula the first year might build two reasonably sized schoolhouses in the 48 older States but would build only one in Alaska; and so on.

I would like to urge that the formula be modified to take into account the purchasing power of the dollar, or that Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands be given an offshore rating and that all offshore areas be accorded the treatment proposed for the last three. This could be justified further by the fact that the Federal Government gives a cost-of-living differential to its employees in these areas.

Our entire delegation is gravely concerned about this and hopes your Department will be able to work out a more realistic and fairer formula for calculating Alaska's participation. Or, as another alternative, why cannot a flat and equal sum be allocated to each child throughout the Union, treating them all alike and not attempting to go into the complexities of each State's economy. It would seem to me that that method would avoid a lot of criticism and be manifestly justifiable as giving exact and equal treatment to all.

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

December average retail prices of 40 items in 9 Alaska cities, compared with Seattle and the United States

Food item	Unit	U.S. average [1]	Seattle	Ketchikan	Petersburg	Juneau	Kodiak	Seward	Anchorage	Palmer	Fairbanks	Nome
Flour	5 pounds	$0.56	$0.59	$0.76	$0.82	$0.77	$0.82	$0.75	$0.79	$0.80	$0.94	$0.99
Rolled oats	3 pounds	.58	.66	.67	.74	.73	.79	.77	.76	.78	.85	1.00
Corn flakes	12 ounces	.26	.27	.30	.34	.34	.40	.32	.35	.33	.47	1.42
Bread	1½ pounds	.31	.36	.42	.44	.47	.48	.47	.47	.47	.42	.55
Round steak	Pound	1.04	1.11	1.11	1.12	1.10	1.31	1.34	1.52	1.19	1.76	1.24
Chuck roast	do	.60	.67	.74	.77	.74	.77	.94	.90	.78	.94	.84
Ground beef	do	.51	.48	.68	.72	.59	.69	.73	.69	.72	.79	.74
Bacon, slices	do	.68	.70	.76	.84	.79	.90	.84	.89	.84	.92	.97
Luncheon meat	12 ounces	.50	.50	.53	.60	.59	.60	.60	.62	.63	.70	.70
Frying chicken	Pound	.41	.51	.65	.68	.69	.71	.75	.74	.69	.76	.82
Milk	Quart	.25	.24	.36	.37	.35	.50	.47	.45	.44	.53	.81
Ice cream	do	.55	.53	.88	.83	.69	.88	.83	.74	.74	.88	1.00
Butter	Pound	.76	.75	.78	.84	.77	.88	.87	.86	.86	.92	1.05
Milk, evaporated	14½ ounces	.16	.16	.18	.20	.18	.21	.21	.18	.20	.22	.23
Eggs, large A	Dozen	.69	.63	.72	.78	.69	.86	.81	.80	.79	.90	1.02
Strawberries [2]	10 ounces	.27	.26	.32	.35	.33	.36	.35	.35	.33	.42	.43
Orange juice [2]	6 ounces	.23	.24	.29	.32	.27	.31	.31	.31	.32	.40	.36
Apples	Pound	.14	.18	.25	.28	.29	.30	.31	.32	.29	.32	.44
Bananas	do	.16	.18	.31	.37	.39	.56	.35	.38	.39	.44	.64
Oranges	do	.29	.26	.28	.27	.30	.27	.26	.32	.33	.32	.38
Potatoes	do	.07	.07	.10	.11	.10	.11	.09	.09	.10	.11	.13
Onions	Pound	.09	.09	.12	.10	.12	.12	.13	.19	.18	.16	.18
Carrots	do	.14	.15	.19	.21	.23	.25	.27	.20	.22	.25	.42
Lettuce	do	.19	.15	.30	.35	.41	.40	.39	.41	.39	.48	.60
Cabbage	do	.08	.09	.17	.18	.20	.21	.19	.21	.18	.21	.41
Tomatoes	do	.24	.23	.44	.50	.54	.61	.44	.64	.54	.58	.84
Orange juice	46 ounces	.43	.48	.61	.62	.72	.64	.70	.67	.69	.85	.80
Peaches	No. 2½ can	.34	.31	.39	.40	.42	.44	.43	.45	.48	.56	.52
Fruit cocktail	No. 303 can	.27	.26	.33	.31	.33	.32	.34	.34	.35	.40	.37
Peas	do	.22	.21	.25	.24	.30	.26	.24	.30	.26	.32	.34
Tomato soup	11 ounces	.12	.12	.15	.17	.16	.18	.18	.17	.18	.19	.22
Pork and beans	16 ounces	.15	.15	.22	.22	.21	.18	.22	.23	.25	.26	.26
Jello	3 to 4 ounces	.09	.09	.10	.12	.11	.12	.13	.12	.12	.13	.15
Baby food	4½ to 5 ounces	.10	.10	.12	.14	.10	.13	.14	.13	.12	.13	.15
Coffee	Pound	.75	.76	.75	.80	.73	.87	.87	.79	.80	.86	.94
Shortening	3 pounds	.84	.83	1.10	1.09	.96	1.14	1.12	.98	1.02	1.16	1.20
Oleo	Pound	.27	.29	.35	.32	.24	.37	.34	.26	.25	.42	.44
Salad dressing	Quart	.72	.76	.74	.74	.65	.84	.74	.77	.80	.88	.96
Sugar	10 pounds	1.19	1.20	1.36	1.61	1.55	1.68	1.64	1.52	1.59	1.74	2.16
Total		16.15	16.56	19.60	20.83	20.04	22.44	21.82	22.04	21.47	24.91	26.76
Percent of Seattle		98	100	118	126	121	136	132	133	130	150	162
Total:												
September 1960		$15.84	$16.68	$19.45	$20.58	$20.09	$22.04	$22.06	$21.64	$21.62	$24.91	$27.33
December 1959		$16.04	$16.74	$19.44	$20.42	$20.34	$21.97	$21.87	$21.86	$22.10	$24.68	$28.15

[1] Based on Nov. 15, 1960, U.S. Department of Labor, BLS, "Retail Food Prices by Cities."

[2] Frozen.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I yield with pleasure to my able and enlightened colleague who is handling this important piece of legisaltion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Alaska for his able representation of the people of Alaska this afternoon on the floor of the Senate.

I fully appreciate the special problems that economically and physically exist in Alaska and must be considered in connection with any piece of legislation, such as this one, that is to have uniform application; and I wish to say to the Senator from Alaska that, here and now, I invite him—as I know he would ask to be represented, anyway; but, as chairman of the subcommittee, I particularly invite him—to appear as a witness before my subcommittee, and to present in detail the information to which he has alluded this afternoon on the floor of the Senate.

I can assure him that he will receive a full and fair hearing. I also assure him that he will receive very careful consideration of any recommendations in the form of amendments or suggested changes in the bill that he presents to the subcommittee.

When I make the following remarks, I want him to understand that in no way do they indicate a closed mind on the part of the chairman of the subcommittee. Instead, I shall speak, not as a rejoinder to the remarks of the Senator from Alaska, but, on the contrary, really as a supplement to what he has said, and in order to present for the record some of the problems which confront us in connection with any uniform bill such as this one—problems which must be faced by those of us who are in charge of the bill.

I happen to know that the President and his advisers gave very careful consideration to the formula that is contained in this bill. They had the benefit of the advice and the detailed research studies of groups of educators in this country, upon whom we rely very heavily for expert advice on a matter such as this one; and it seemed to be the consensus of opinion of the educators who advised in connection with this bill that, taking all things into account, this was a fair formula for the country as a whole. I am sure—although I cannot speak for them—that any one of those experts would have to admit, on the basis of the information the Senator from Alaska has presented this afternoon, that the formula does, in some respects, work to the disadvantage of Alaska. I am glad the Senator from Alaska brought out, for example, the great difference between the cost of education in Alaska and the cost of education in other parts of the Nation. He referred to the fact that it costs more than $200 per child to supply the oil that is needed to heat one schoolroom in Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. That is merely the cost of the transportation of the oil.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, just for the transportation of the oil itself. That figure

relates to a problem with which those of us who represent other States are not confronted.

From my conversation with the Senator, I understand that even the matter of the transportation of students to school, to some of the centers where are located what would correspond to consolidated schools in other States, is much more expensive in Alaska than it is in other States.

As the Senator from Alaska has also pointed out, the cost of living factor also undoubtedly creates a special case for Alaska.

I am sure the President wishes to have justice done and inequities removed.

But I point out that the responsibility of the subcommittee and, I say respectfully, of the Senate itself is to proceed with a bill which contains the fairest possible formula for the entire country, and to get that principle established in the law, because I believe that the first step which is so important is that we recognize that the Federal Government has a responsibility in the field of education, to the extent of doing what it can to help the States, without the slightest interference by the Federal Government with the right of a State to maintain complete jurisdiction over its educational system. The Federal Government has a duty to help the States assure that all children in the States are guaranteed the standards of education that will give them an opportunity to develop their intellectual potential. I am sure that is the objective of the President, in this bill.

My mind is open; and if the burden of proof is sustained by those who believe that some modification of the formula should be made, I certainly will follow where the evidence leads.

But I want the Senator from Alaska to know that, on the basis of my study of the bill, I intend to support it in its present form, so far as the bill itself is concerned. If the evidence shows a need for doing so, I shall then suggest to Secretary Ribicoff and to the White House that we give consideration to any amendment which can be clearly established, on the basis of the facts, as necessary in order to assure that injustice will not be done to some particular part of the country.

But I believe the formula in its present form will stand up, following the hearings; and I believe that probably what we may have to do is to give consideration to some special provisions in order to meet problems of the kind the Senator from Alaska has mentioned this afternoon.

As all of us know, Alaska is one of the great defense areas of our Republic. A great deal of our defense funds must be spent in connection with very costly bases in Alaska—costly because, as the Senator from Alaska well knows, the colder climate there makes it more costly to operate bases there.

Mr. GRUENING. And there is also the transportation problem with its high maritime rates.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; particularly in connection with the transportation of our defense supplies and defense installations there.

We may have to give some special consideration to an amendment in the nature of a federally impacted area amendment, if the Senator from Alaska can make his case for it, before the subcommittee.

I do not want anything I say this afternoon to be regarded as meaning that I shall be at the door, ready to open it for the easy admission of amendments to the bill. But, at the same time, I want the Senator from Alaska to know that I shall not bar the door, either. I believe that every Senator should be assured by the chairman that the evidence he presents will be considered on the basis of its merits.

The main thing I shall fight for is to get this bill in its main structural form enacted into law. Then we can give special consideration to special hardship cases—which is what I infer the Senator from Alaska has been pleading for here, this afternoon, in the course of his very timely and very helpful speech on the special problems which confront Alaska.

I make only one additional point. It is interesting to note that we do have some areas under the American flag that are not States, and they, too, are not directly contiguous to American shores. It is interesting to note that when we deal with the educational problems in our colonies, so to speak—and most people do not realize we do have colonies, small though they are—we take into account the very problems the Senator has referred to this afternoon that are singular to Alaska so far as our States are concerned.

So I intend to ask the staff of my subcommittee, in view of the speech of the Senator from Alaska, to proceed immediately to prepare for the consideration of the subcommittee the educational policies that we follow with regard to our Pacific colonies, for example, in the hope that they may shed some helpful light on the steps which must be taken in the special consideration of the Alaska problems to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his very understanding presentation. He appreciates that we do not seek any special or unusual privileges. We would merely like to have proposed legislation adjusted to the harsh realities. The basic harsh reality is the distances involved and the transportation monopoly which was fastened on Alaska 40 years ago by a previous Congress. We in Alaska have the highest freight rates in the world. They are reflected in Alaska's high cost of living. It works against us both coming and going. On the one hand, our salaries and labor wages are high. A common laborer who in one of the other States might be paid $2 an hour is paid $5 an hour in Alaska.

Hence Alaskans appear to be high salaried, highly paid. On the other hand, when funds are allocated to Alaska for schools, the costs of construction are also 2½ times higher. We are faced with facts which embody the realities of our unique situation and work to our disadvantage in this and other legislation.

In my communication to Secretary Ribicoff I pointed out two or three alternatives which would in no wise jeopardize the bill. I shall present them and possibly others to the subcommittee of which the Senator from Oregon is the chairman.

I greatly appreciate the consideration of the Senator from Oregon.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I cannot too highly applaud the President for his message on education, for the purpose behind the bill, and for the wise procedure in entrusting it to the senior Senator from Oregon, who is so much concerned with the problem of education, which must be the first concern of a free society.

I yield the floor.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY LIBYAN PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the first nation to admitted to the United Nations as a free and independent people at the end of World War II was Libya. One of our colleagues, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], was our representative to the United Nations upon this occasion and cast the deciding vote. Libya was admitted by one vote. I introduce today with pleasure and honor to the U.S. Senate a delegation of members of the Chamber of Deputies from the Parliament of Libya. They are:

Ulayman Al-Abdalli, Defense and Foreign Affairs Committee.

Saiah A. T. Felfel, Public Works and Communications Committee.

Anwar Sulaiman Bin Gharsa, Defense and Foreign Affairs Committee.

Musa Abdul Razik Lawag, Health, Education, and Social Affairs Committee.

Ali Mustafa El-Misurati, one of the seven Secretaries of the Chamber.

Ahmed Moheishi and the escort-interpreters, Fuad S. Kerry and Camille Nowfel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). It is a pleasure to receive our friends from across the ocean. On behalf of the U.S. Senate we welcome you, and trust your stay in our country will be pleasant and enjoyable.

(The distinguished visitors rose in their places, and were greeted with applause.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senate is indebted to our colleague, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], for inviting to the Senate today the distinguished representatives of the Libyan Parliament.

It is a fact that following World War II the United Nations passed a resolution which prescribed the method by which Libya would achieve self-determination. The people of Libya followed the method prescribed by the United Nations, and in 1951 made their report to the United Nations. That year I had the honor to be a member of the U.S. delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations. The other representative of the United States, from Congress, at that time was the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I also had the honor in that session to represent the United States on the question of receiving the report of Libya upon the question of its admission to the United Nations.

I am happy that in that year the great country of Libya was admitted to the United Nations. I make the point that following their travail and sacrifice in World War II the people of that country made their decision toward self-determination. They decided the kind of government that they wanted.

In the years that have passed their King and democratic government have maintained the principles of democracy and freedom, and have exercised them.

Before that, the people of that country had a liberation and revolutionary movement which, though suppressed for a time, finally came to fruition. We know of their deep interest in democratic government. We know that they are practicing democratic government. We know their deep interest and concern for justice and peace in the world.

Therefore, today I am happy, speaking in behalf of the members of the minority party, the Republicans, to join the distinguished Senator from Tennessee in welcoming these distinguished guests from Libya.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. Senator COOPER has recalled it to my mind, the year 1951, when we were both delegates to the United Nations representing the United States at the sixth Conference of the General Assembly of the United Nations in Paris.

I recall the outstanding work performed by the Senator from Kentucky, who represented the United States on the question of Libya. I am happy to recall also that it was a close vote, and that, on the one-vote basis, the Senator from Kentucky cast his vote in our friends and colleagues from Libya.

We know that you, members of the delegation, have great difficulties in your country. You have a huge country to govern. You do not have too much, as yet, in the way of resources. You do have a glorious culture and a glorious tradition. I am happy to join with my colleagues in the Senate in extending to you our best wishes, and to express the hope that in the future you will prosper, and that you will be the beneficiary of such prosperity, and that this will only be the first of many visits on your part to the United States of America.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Libyan delegation has asked me to express the appreciation and the gratitude of the delegation to the U.S. Senate, to the Presiding Officer, to Senator COOPER, and to Senator MANSFIELD for this generosity.

Perhaps we have witnessed a historic event. For the first time, of which I am aware, there has been a simultaneous Arabic interpretation of two speeches in the Senate.

WASTE IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, for a long time many of us have been convinced that under its present organization setup the Department of Defense has been wasting vast amounts of the taxpayer's money.

With me here today is a documented report presenting where many millions of dollars have been wasted; and also illustrating how the combat capability of our forces has been impaired.

This report concerns itself with the procurement of nine series of combat and tactical vehicles, including 19,000 pieces of equipment.

The total value of these defense units, as priced by the Department of the Army, amounts to $1.6 billion. This figure is exclusive of both spare parts and necessary modification costs.

The wide range of the deficiencies in these combat vehicles is hard to believe possible in a country like ours, long noted for its production efficiency.

The most prevalent failures in these units were in the engine, transmission, and track and suspension systems.

Defects revealed seriously impaired operations and maintenance.

Many of the defects were found in the initial prototypes—but many more were located in actual production.

Despite these findings, procurement continued, without adequate means of evaluating said equipment; and therefore no effective basis for taking corrective action.

Following are the vehicles examined: Medium tank, M-48 and M-48A1; heavy tank recovery vehicle, M-51; carrier, light weapons, infantry, M-274; heavy tank, M-103; armored personnel carrier, M-59; self-propelled mortar carrier, M-84; 10-ton truck tractor, M-123; self-propelled 106-millimeter multiple rifle, M-50; semitrailer—electric van, M-348A1.

Here are some of the findings.

In the procurement of M-48 and M-48A1 medium tanks, the Government spent $1.25 billion.

At one location, 64 of these tanks were examined. These 64 had 1,311 performance failures, although used only 58.6 miles per vehicle per month.

Some of the weaknesses discovered were tracks falling off frequently on rough terrain; and range finders on the 9-millimeter guns seldom being used because of frequent maladjustment.

The M-51 heavy tank recovery vehicle had comparable defects and similar breakdowns.

Reports on the operation of 40 of these vehicles showed that 682 failures, involving 421 different parts, occurred in 1 year, even though the vehicles themselves had averaged only 582 miles usage for the entire year.

The M-274 light-weapons carrier was found to have 16 serious defects. Most of the latter had been disclosed in the testing period, before production began. Nevertheless millions of dollars were expended on procuring them with their already discovered defects.

Among the latter were frequent engine failures, defective welding, and the continual working loose of the steering column from the steering gearbox.

The heavy tank, the M-103, on which tens of millions of dollars were spent, was found generally incapable of performing the basic functions for which it was designed. These tanks were nevertheless shipped to the 7th Army in Europe, without sufficient testing or action to eliminate their deficiencies.

Over $200 million were spent on the purchase of the M-59, Army personnel carrier, even though this carrier contained many major defects which limited its performance.

Not only was this vehicle discovered to be underpowered, but its powerplant obviously lacked adequate durability. At one installation, of the 143 M-59's in use, average failure was one per vehicle over a 9-month period, even though average use was only 60 miles per month.

The self-propelled mortar carrier, the M-84, on which many millions were expended, was found to have the same basic defects discovered in the M-59. The defects of the latter were known prior to the procurement of the former.

The 10-ton truck tractor M-123, also involving millions, proved generally inadequate for the mission for which it had been designed.

The self-propelled 106-millimeter multiple rifle, the M-50—with millions of dollars also expended here—had a high percentage of failures involving the armament system, track and suspension system, transmission, cooling system, control and instrument gages, and the engine itself.

Two-thirds of these vehicles showed at least one engine or transmission failure during the period of examination.

The semitrailer, electric van, M-348A1, was found unsuitable for its intended purpose, because of inferior materials, inferior workmanship, and basic defects in design. It was estimated that correction of the defects in said unit would cost $3,000 per vehicle. The original cost was $8,000.

Comptroller General Joseph Campbell and his able organization should be congratulated for the ability and endurance they have demonstrated in wading through the current maze of overlapping Pentagon authority and responsibility to find this incredible waste.

I will present shortly additional information about additional waste which has taken place in the Department of Defense.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very glad to yield to the able Senator and my good friend from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, is the Senator from Missouri in a position to advise me whether it is true that we had started to produce an amphibian plane which was to be used in connection with our submarine detection work and our rescue work and our coastal patrol work, both in the United States and elsewhere in the world, and that, although we finally produced two of them, both contained such serious internal defects that they crashed, and therefore the entire program had to be abandoned, and that at the present time we are not producing any, although another amphibian plane may have been started on the drawing board?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have heard about it, but as usual, I am not as current on my facts as is the Senator from Oregon.

I shall look into the matter with interest, because the American people are entitled to know about what has been going on with respect to their defense dollar.

Mr. MORSE. I do not have the facts. I have been reliably informed, but I do not have the facts as to the amount of the loss. I should like to have the Senator be of assistance to me, because he is my adviser on matters of air defense, in view of his great record in this field, both before and since he came to the Senate.

I wish he would have someone look into this matter to find out whether there is any danger that we will abandon entirely the use of the amphibian plane. There is a strong body of expert opinion, of which I am aware, that in some areas of the world, such as in Africa and southeast Asia and elsewhere, even though such planes are considered conventional planes, they still do a type of work that a jet plane cannot very successfully perform. In this jet age and nuclear age, it is very easy to make the false assumption that what we ought to be doing is pouring more and more money into jet expenditure and nuclear expenditures. We would thus forget the fact that unless we have a balanced defense program, the jets and the nuclear weapons cannot save us.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my distinguished friend from Oregon for his kind words, and I assure him that I will look into the matter and undertake to present it promptly to the Military Preparedness Subcommittee.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his typical graciousness and courtesy in yielding to me so that I may go back to committee.

Mr. GRUENING. It is always a great pleasure to listen to the wise words of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Alaska for his courtesy.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, provides that the Joint Committee on Defense Production shall be composed of 10 members, 5 of them members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and 5 of them members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The law provides that these five members from each of the committees are to be appointed by the chairman of the respective committee, three from the majority and two from the minority party.

During the last session of Congress the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production were Senator Sparkman, Senator Frear, Senator Capehart, Senator Bennett, and myself.

Senators SPARKMAN, CAPEHART, BENNETT, and I wish to continue as members. In addition, in accordance with section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, I have appointed Senator DOUGLAS as a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

A meeting of the Joint Committee on Defense Production will be called in the near future.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF HOWARD MORGAN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I have said many times in the Senate, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to be able to commend the press of this Nation when, in my judgment, it performs its vital public service of educating the public.

An example of the able editorial writing I have in mind is to be found in the January 1960, issue of the Oregon-Washington Farmer Union, the official publication of the Farmers Union of my State. The editorial to which I refer is entitled "Morgan on Power Commission."

I am particularly pleased to bring this editorial to the attention of my colleagues for two reasons. The first is that the editorialist gives just and due praise to a prominent Oregonian, Mr. Howard Morgan, whose name has been submitted to the Senate by the President for appointment to the Federal Power Commission. Needless to say, I fully concur in the high estimate of Mr. Morgan's qualifications described in the editorial.

Second, I am pleased because the editor, Arthur H. Bone, an old and highly respected friend of mine, takes occasion to discuss the argument of Peter T. Odegard, formerly president of Reed College, and one of the Nation's most respected political scientists, in connection with the functioning of a regulatory commission. Dr. Odegard's comments and seasoned inclusions are worthy of the most careful consideration by legislators concerned with the problem of the responsible functioning of independent boards and commissions within the Federal Establishment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I referred be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Oregon-Washington Farmer Union, January 1961]

MORGAN ON POWER COMMISSION

The appointment of Howard Morgan of Sisters to the Federal Power Commission is one of the best yet made by President Kennedy. Morgan, former public utilities commissioner in the Holmes administration and long a member of the Farmers Union, is well qualified to serve on this important Commission by both training and experience. Furthermore, he will bring to his new assignment a record of honesty on behalf of the public interest, a quality sorely needed by the regulatory commissions.

The Landis report on these Federal regulatory commissions has focused new attention on the sorry record made in recent years by this fourth branch of Government. The Federal Power Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission—and the others—are all guilty. And this is not a partisan matter. As pointed out by Landis, the deterioration started under Truman and was made worse by Eisenhower. What is needed is a new concept of the role these regulatory commissions should play in Government.

Some students of political science are raising the question of whether the regulatory commissions have any place in our system of government. Peter T. Odegard, former president of Reed College and now professor of political science at the University of California, in a recent article in the Washington Post, has proposed that the regulatory agencies be scuttled. He argues that it is impossible to separate administrative functions from politics.

"Administration," he says, "is not something apart from politics but an integral part of a unified, if complex, political process." And Professor Odegard thinks that Congress erred in seeking to immunize the regulatory commissions from politics.

He continues: "This immunizing has been done by placing them outside the executive establishment, limiting the number of commissioners who may be appointed from any one party, giving them overlapping terms longer than the 4-year term of the President and by limiting the President's power to remove them for any reason other than 'inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.' The result has been to create a politically irresponsible 'headless fourth branch of Government.' "

Because of the economic interests affected by the regulations of these various regulatory commissions, they are up to their ears in politics. They are under constant pressure from lobbyists for special interests—railroads, TV and radio interests, private utilities, and big business in general. Yet because of their "nonpolitical" nature, the people, whose interests they have been set up to protect, have little or no control over them.

"Most serious students of the problem," says Odegard, now agree that it is useless to pretend that "we can preserve democracy and still vest economic power in a governmental agency that is not clearly subject to officials who in turn are responsible to the people. By making commissions independent, we make it virtually impossible for any administration, Republican or Democratic, to develop and administer a coherent and consistent economic policy."

We are inclined to agree with Professor Odegard that the regulatory commissions should be abolished and their duties transferred to executive agencies directly responsible to the President. But until such time as Congress abolishes the commissions, the only protection the people have is to make sure that members named to the commissions will honestly and faithfully represent the public interest. This we can be sure Mr. Morgan will do as a member of the Federal Power Commission. We predict there will be no more Hells Canyon giveaways while Howard Morgan serves in Washington.

RESOLUTIONS OF WESTERN FORESTRY AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, several days ago I had an opportunity to consult with Mr. H. R. Glascock, of the Western Forestry and Conservation Association,

and Mr. Dave James, of the Simpson Timber Co., on forest and conservation matters. These gentlemen left with me some of the resolutions this association made at their last annual convention. I got in touch with Mr. Glascock and secured the balance of their resolutions, and I think they are of sufficient interest to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

I should like to commend this association in particular for the good work that it is doing in furthering sound, working relationships with Canada and Mexico, as evidenced by their Resolutions 1 and 2.

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

RESOLUTION 1

(Approved at 51st Western Forestry Conference, Victoria, British Columbia, December 9, 1960)

ESTABLISHMENT OF CANADIAN DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY

Western Forestry and Conservation Association commends the creation of the Canadian Department of Forestry, and congratulates the Honorable Hugh J. Flemming on his appointment as the first Minister of Forestry.

Western Forestry and Conservation Association extends its support and cooperation to the Minister of Forestry and the department in its development of sound, progressive and essential cooperative forest policies and programs with the several Provinces of the Dominion in the administration and management of their important forest resources.

RESOLUTION 2

(Approved at 51st Western Forestry Conference, Victoria, British Columbia, December 9, 1960)

ESTABLISHMENT OF ONE FOREST UNDER THREE FLAGS

In the light of the accelerated interest in forestry evidenced by the participation in the Fifth World Forestry Congress by the Government, forest landowners and forest operators of Mexico and the common interests and characteristics of forestry and forest resources of western North America, the Western Forestry and Conservation Association is urged, through its forest counsel, to acquaint the proper authorities of Mexico, the forest landowners and forest operators of that country with the aims of the Western Forestry and Conservation Association and invite their active participation in association activities to the end that Western Forestry and Conservation Association may in future years become one forest under three flags.

RESOLUTION 3

(Approved at 51st Western Forestry Conference, Victoria, British Columbia, December 9, 1960)

PROTECTION OF FORESTS FROM PESTS

Western Forestry and Conservation Association recognizes the need for protection of the forests from damaging diseases, insect and animal pests. To attain this objective the association recommends that:

1. The National Plant Board under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture for the United States be expanded to include representatives of Government forestry agencies and private forestry associations, and its activities expanded to include forest pests.

2. The departments of agriculture of the several States, Provinces and Federal Governments immediately adopt quarantines against the European pine shoot moth to prevent movement of infested material into noninfested areas.

3. The advisory committee of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the U.S. Department of Interior be continued, and its membership include two foresters conversant with the use of chemicals in control of forest pests.

4. The chemical screening program conducted at the Denver Laboratory by the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife be intensified to increase the present commendable and promising results in protecting the forest areas from rodents and other animal pests.

5. The authority and responsibility for forest pest control should be centered in the forestry departments of the several State and Provincial governments.

RESOLUTION 4

(Approved at 51st Western Forestry Conference, Victoria, British Columbia, December 9, 1960)

DUPLICATING NATURAL RESOURCE AGENCIES

Western Forestry and Conservation Association opposes the establishment of new bodies of Government with responsibilities which overlap and duplicate those of existing natural resource agencies as leading to conflict and confusion rather than to coordination of effort in the important field of conservation.

RESOLUTION 5

(Approved at 51st Western Forestry Conference, Victoria, British Columbia, December 9, 1960)

FIRE WEATHER FORECASTING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

In view of the dire need of more accurate and specific fire weather forecasting in British Columbia, Western Forestry and Conservation Association urgently requests the Department of Transport to fill as early as possible in 1961 the proposed position of Forest Meteorologist to work in conjunction with the present Government forecasting staff at the Vancouver Weather Office.

RESOLUTION 6

(Approved at 51st Western Forestry Conference, Victoria, British Columbia, December 9, 1960)

STRENGTHENING FIRE WEATHER SERVICE IN THE UNITED STATES

Western Forestry and Conservation Association reaffirms its active support and promotion of a strengthened fire weather program. In view of the catastrophic losses of the 1959 and 1960 fire seasons and the expanding need for increased fire weather support for fire control forces, the U.S. Weather Bureau and the Congress of the United States should implement the cooperatively developed fire weather forecasting and research program at the earliest possible opportunity.

HOOD RIVER VALLEY CITIZENS RECEIVE HONORS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. George Bartch, manager of the Hood River Chamber of Commerce, has directed my attention to the highlights of Hood River County's annual awards banquet. I am very grateful to him for this courtesy, since it permits me to share, with my colleagues on the delegation, our pride in the outstanding accomplishments of notable Oregonians. To each of the award winners, I present my congratulations upon this deserved recognition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by Mr. Bartch, together with a listing of the award recipients, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

To: Senator WAYNE MORSE.

Subject: Hood River Valley Citizens Take Honors.

Hood River Valley citizens took top honors at the Orchardist of the Year annual awards banquet at Hood River's Wy'East High School on Monday evening, February 6. Before a crowd of 500 persons that flooded the big Wy'East gymnasium, Sidney Babson was awarded 1960 "Orchardist of the Year," Rev. Albert Allen was awarded 1960 "Senior Citizen," and Dave Jensen was awarded "Junior Citizen," Miss Emma Handby 1960 "Woman of the Year," and Norman Hukari "Outstanding 1960 Young Farmer."

Dr. Harry Dillin, president of Linfield College, presented the banquet address which featured "pear 'n apple smorgasbord" dinner.

"Orchardist of the Year" award was accepted by Dr. S. Gorham Babson of the University of Oregon Medical School in the name of his father, Sidney Babson, of Parkdale, Oreg., who could not be present. Babson operates a 40-acre orchard which he developed from a raw tract in 1908. He is noted for his outstanding horticulture practice. He is credited for developing many orchard procedures now taken for granted in the industry.

A surprise citation was given to Walter Wells at the orchardist banquet for his unique family-based orchard marketing firm that he built as a pioneer valley grower.

"Senior Citizen," Rev. Albert Allen, rector of St. Mark's Episcopal Church, was cited for his all-around community services and his leadership in the Mid-Columbia Family Clinic.

"Junior Citizen" Dave Jensen is the father of five children who has been an active worker in county youth service and PTA affairs.

"Woman of the Year" Miss Emma Handby, county health nurse, has spearheaded health services and welfare work for the citizens of the county.

She developed the inoculation program for the county.

"Outstanding Young Farmer" Norman Hukari is a tireless community worker and civic leader, who in conjunction with his brother, has developed a 12-acre fruit farm into a 150-acre operation during the past 10 years.

The annual banquet awards dinner featured the famous Hood River pears and apples in many ways. All Oregon products were served, which included a unique pear pie, apple and pear salads, a number of relishes, apple desserts, apple breads and candy. All this was prepared by the women of Pine Grove Home Economics Club.

RESOLUTION OF OREGON STATE DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me containing a resolution adopted by the Oregon State Dental Association.

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

JANUARY 31, 1961.

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

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was passed at the January 21 meeting of the

executive council of the Oregon State Dental Association:

Resolved, That the Oregon State Dental Association go on record as approving, recommending, and actively supporting the American Dental Association's request to establish a category in the program of Federal grants-in-aid funds to States specifically earmarked for dental public health programs, such funds to be used to support and strengthen basic dental public health services at the State and local health department level and for special studies and investigations concerned with the dental health problem, and in establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of dental diseases, including grants for demonstrations and the training of personnel; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the American Dental Association; the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service; and to the Oregon elective officials to the Congress of the United States."

Yours very truly,

ALAN Y. CLARK, D.M.D.,
President.

AGRARIAN REFORM IN THE AMERICAS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD an address by David Hume before the Inter-American Bar Convention in Bogotá, Colombia, on January 28, entitled "Agrarian Reform in the Americas."

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

AGRARIAN REFORM IN THE AMERICAS

(An address by David Hume, before the Inter-American Bar Convention, Bogotá, Columbia, Jan. 28, 1961)

Agrarian reform, increasingly embodying one of the great problems of this age, is almost as difficult of definition as it is of solution.

Cursed and revered, damned and deified, declared both monster and savior, the redistribution of lands under this principle has challenged successfully the best of minds and the worst of intentions.

For many legal theorists, agrarian reform is simply an organized change in land tenure; for others it is a program to improve the relative position of small agricultural units in the economy; for those intent on establishing the best methods to finance it, the reform has been called a change in land tenure, organized and directed by the state, for the purpose of obtaining better distribution of land, followed by supplemental measures to increase agricultural production.[1]

It is the stuff of which dreams and nightmares are made. For the impoverished and landless farmer, it is hope; for the very rich absentee landlord, it is the devil's work, come to take by theft what is impossible to take by law.

HISTORY

The history of agrarian reform is the history of mankind extending throughout that period which we know and into the age where we can only guess. Thirty-five centuries before the wheel and the horse reached Egypt from Asia, we find the ancient Egyptian civilization with an agricultural system recognizable even today. In the golden age of the Pharoah, known in that arid land as "the giver of water to the earth," we find the system where by decree one-quarter of each harvest was shared amongst the inhabitants of the district which produced it, while the other three-quarters were set aside for the expenses of administration—in other words, for the salaries of the officials and for the cost of maintaining those relatively few citizens who dealt directly with the Pharoah himself.

The pyramids do not tell the story; and were it not for the advanced writings—I do not use the word civilization—of that time, the history of this ancient farmer would be still mute.

If the nomadic tribes who descended on the fat prizes of civilization met with less than a spirited resistance, the answer might well be found here.

Basically there was to be no change for thousands of years, down through the civilization of the Tigris and Euphrates and into the time of what we call modern civilization.

It is interesting to note that, under the code of Hammurabi some 20 centuries before Christ, landed proprietors were made responsible to the state for the upkeep of the canals on their land.

We sense even by this fragment of historical minutiae, that the land itself was beginning to suffer.

Somehow the conscience of kings lagged far behind the scientific ingenuity of the subjects. In the basin of the Yellow River, the Chinese farmers, not yet imprisoned in the servitude which was to be their lot, were fighting for survival by clearing and draining the land, providing it with a system of irrigation, pouring it with crops, and turning the great plain into a garden in which the first citrus fruits were developed. Thousands of miles away and hundreds of years later, we glimpse more clearly the great Greek culture and by the seventh century before Christ, we can hear the great Solon lashing out against a system which already found the Greek farmer in bondage, and setting a limit on the amount of land which could be held by any landowner.

Sparta appears just long enough for us to recognize her third-class citizens, the Helots, peasants attached to the land on which they worked, men whose life was held in such contempt that they could be killed with impunity.

The baton of world leadership passed from hand to hand, from the Greek to the Roman and almost unnoticed to the barbarian who was our immediate parent.

There were protests; there were laws, and there was frustration. The Caesar Maximian was to take his place on the podium of history as one who had suppressed the peasants of Gaul, who were, according to Gibbon, "confined to the soil either by the real weight of fetters or by the no less cruel and forcible restraint of the lords."

Almost unnoticed, too, at that time except by a handful of those who believed, was the proclamation of a new and thrilling concept that man was beneficiary of a soul given only by God and taken only by God. The farmer, the coloni partiarii, unprotected by the agricultural codes of the Egyptians and those who followed, was to find that, in religion at least, he was at long last a part of the brotherhood of man.

For many it was still a well-kept secret. For many it still is.

Adam Smith looking back on this period had this to say of the situation: "In the ancient state of Europe the occupiers of land were all tenants at will. They belonged more to the land than to the master. The people on the land could not marry without the consent of the lord; they could not acquire property except in unusual circumstances, and when they did, it was in the name of the master." As Smith was writing this in the latter part of the 18th century, he noted that the practice had not changed in "Russia, Poland, Hungary, Bohemia, Moravia and parts of Germany."

Pliny the Elder had looked into the future and said "Latifundia will be the ruin of Italy." He apparently spoke with good cause. As the Roman discipline broke down, the landless mobs assembled in Rome. In a classic example of attacking a symptom rather than a cause, the Caesars built for the increasingly unruly rabble vast coliseums and arranged the great spectacles to take their minds off their troubles. Whether this was considered cheaper in the long run than agrarian reform has been lost to us in the mists of time.

The beautiful land was obviously being wasted even faster by this time under the prevailing system and Pliny and Columella, with a sense of urgency felt even now, denounced agricultural slavery as wasteful and expensive. They openly mourned the death of incentive in the Roman farmer. The philosophers agreed: "Whatever work he does beyond what is sufficient to purchase his own maintenance can be squeezed out of him by violence only and not any interest of his own."

Long after Rome and concurrent with the Crusades, we can note in passing that at last, by the Assize of Jerusalem, exact evaluations had been placed on the men bound to the soil: 3 slaves equaled 12 oxen equaled 1 war horse equaled 300 pieces of gold.

In the common law nations which developed, the land tenure system was dominated by the metayers, or, as they were called in Scotland the "steel bow tenants" or as dignified by Blackstone the "bailiffs," those deserving subjects appointed by the feudal lords to collect the rents and taxes and to enforce their laws.

The Latin American pattern of land tenure was being developed in Spain and Portugal. As the Spanish drove the Moors back into the sea, they left the mark of their own brand of feudalistic tenure in their wake. For the farmer who had fought to free himself from his foreign master, we can only guess at his disappointment. For the land itself, the release from the conservation-minded Moor spelled disaster. The irreplaceable topsoil, which had taken 10,000 years per inch to create, bled unchecked into rivers and out to the sea.

Almost 18 centuries were to pass from the time of the birth of Christ before man could bring himself to begin an earnest application of those principles which would recognize that he need not die before he could claim a plot of land as his own. For the warrior who disdained the plow and grasped the sword of conquest, land was the incidental road to plunder. In a world dedicated to the law of violence, feudalism was both cause and result.

It was the explorer who was to change everything, albeit unwittingly, with the discovery of a new world. In the beginning the changes to come were hardly visible. Within 25 years, in 1513, of the first landing of Columbus, Charles V had issued a royal decree ordering the distribution of caballeria and peonia lands to his conquering troops. His careful distinction between caballeros and infantes would have been surprising only if it had not been made (over 300 years later in 1818 the Congress of Angostura of Venezuela carefully retained the spirit of the royal decree).

Along with the first European exports—science, religion, modern weapons of war, smallpox and venereal disease—came the feudal system of the civilized world which, insofar as the tiller of the soil was concerned, must have made the communal system already employed by the great ruling Indian tribes seem a veritable paradise.

Someone with an eye for administrative cleanliness decreed in Bolivia by 1572 that the individual tribute of the farmer was to

[1] I-A Ecosoc series, citing in part, Carrol, Thomas F., Bangkok, Thailand, December 1954, FAO.

be 8 pesos per person. It is hardly likely that an official eyebrow was raised.

Unseen, unnoticed, unexpectedly the seeds for agrarian reform, so long dormant, now began their germination. While the aristocracy concerned itself with immediate wealth waiting only to be transported to the homeland, the new arrivals who tilled the soil pushed deeper and deeper into the wilderness and farther and farther away from constituted authority. The inherent dignity that attaches to a man who has his own home, who tills his own soil, who stands as master of his own family unit, began to assert itself. The farmer and the priest alone did not seek a quick trip home.

As man suddenly found himself independent in the wilderness, while his former masters were busy with more important matters, the spirit created for his new found dignity continued to grow and by the latter part of the 18th century the whisperings of individual revolution burst into the roar of full war on the American Continents as the tillers of the soil from many lands turned on constituted authority from abroad.

In a world uniformly dedicated to the political principle of the divine right of kings, to an acceptance of governments which took for granted that the transfer of land included the transfer of human beings on that land, the trumpeting of the equality of man was echoed and reechoed. The peoples of the Americas almost as one rose to the words blazing across the horizon:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, * * *. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed * * *."

The magic words were not fulfillment, but the promise had been made.

There was hope.

It has been said that the Latin American wars of independence, unlike that in the United States of America, were fought by and for a ruling elite with the bulk of the population participating much as the vassals of the Middle Ages had fought for and with their feudal lords.

So long as the curse of slavery hung heavy on the lands of the New World, the distinction appears a fragile yardstick.

If it be possible to establish the moment in time for a concrete beginning to a new system of land tenure, the historian of today might well pause here.

The death rattle of slavery was beginning for the keen of hearing, although it took almost three-quarters of a century of agony and blood to finally kill it.

The vast armies of the landless were plunging toward the freedom they had sought so long. Slowly at first but ever gathering momentum, legislatures recognized the new status for men of the soil and new laws were placed on the statute books of the world. The executive and the judiciary were to complete the encirclement of the problem.

Desire and power were married at this auspicious moment.

LEGISLATION

By 1796 a land act was passed by the Congress of the United States of America, and by 1803 a congressional committee was sending questions to the Secretary of the Treasury—questions having to do with the size of the tracts, the methods of sales, the amount of interest to be charged, and the credit systems to be employed.[2]

By 1797 settlers along the great Ohio River, in what would have appeared sheer presumptuousness only a few years before, were asking for 400 acres per family, and by 1806 the pioneers who had ventured without authority to settle on Government land were asking the Government for title without pay. These were the squatters.

The North American squatter, whose counterpart was called agregado in Argentina, tolerado in Bolivia, precario in Chile, precarista in Cuba, or ocupante in still other nations, was no longer a villein. By a series of pre-emption laws enacted between 1800 and 1841, he began the purchase of lands in the public domain—land belonging to all the people and which he was to own in fee simple.

More than 1 billion acres of public lands were disposed of by the Federal Government of the United States under various programs, all directed to the consummation of the ancient dream that each man should have the opportunity to occupy a parcel of land, not his grave.

Not all the legislation in the United States was good; not all the statutes effected their avowed purpose, and there was no clear-cut delineation of effect. The recital of the legislative enactments cannot help, however, but carry a certain excitement to the student of this subject. There was the original Homestead Act of 1862 by which a man acquired title to 160 acres of land after building a habitable house, cultivating a part of the land, and residing on it for a period originally set at 5 years but later reduced to 3; the enlarged Homestead Act of 1909 which increased the acreage allowable to 320 acres for homesteaders in the arid West; the Stock Raising Homestead Act of 1916 which increased the acreage to some 640 acres.

On another front, irrigable lands in Federal reclamation projects were opened in 1902; lands within the national forests were opened in 1906.

The territory disappeared in vast chunks: 61 million acres to veterans; 11 million acres under the Timber Culture Act of 1873; 14 million acres under the Timber and Stone Act; and still another 10 million acres under the Desert Land Act of 1877 as modified in 1891.

The agencies necessary to assist in the great programs which then ensued included the Farm Credit Administration, established in 1916 to meet the need for long-term, low-interest loans for the purchases of the farm land, the establishment of Federal land banks and of National Farm Loan Associations.

As the United States of America was to discover, the battle for freedom for her citizens of the soil required constant attention. As a consequence, in the early 1930's with the great depression which paralyzed the economic world, it became necessary to establish credit cooperatives, to establish measures to alleviate the condition of those farmers who stood to lose what their immediate ancestors had gained. There was emergency legislation—a provision for operating loans; liberal mortgage laws; but most important, under the Farm Home Administration the provision of educational facilities by county supervisors to work with the farmers in preparing farm management plans, to set up and keep farm records on a scientific basis and to analyze and render advice on farm problems as they occurred.

Beginning with the Smith-Lever Act of 1941,[3] agricultural research was established through a system encompassing the major political subdivisions—the Federal Government, the States, the counties, and to some degree private organizations. Cooperatives were established and encouraged; marketing facilities were created and maintained.

It had taken the whole of man's history to accomplish, but the tiller of soil had found his opportunity.

Simultaneous with the efforts of the United States, the independent nations of Latin America faced the challenge and were well into the attainment of the goal before the ancient lands in Europe and Asia followed.

Simon Bolivar's Trujillo decree of 1825 had taken a deep cut at the feudal system in Bolivia by demanding cash payment to the laborers on large farms. It mattered little that the decree was unsuccessful; a beginning had been made. By successive acts in 1842, 1850, and 1863, the efforts were continued to raise the standard of living of the agricultural workers. There was no nation in Latin America that had not turned to the task.

The legislation in Latin America was in many instances even more directly pointed to the issue than that utilized by their neighbor to the North:

In Guatemala, decree No. 900 in 1952 establishing agrarian reform was based directly on the 1945 Constitution prohibiting Latifundia and requiring the land to be returned to the state. Decree No. 900 was repealed in 1954 and replaced by the Agrarian Statute in 1957.

The National Constitution of Paraguay adopted in 1940 provided in article 13:

"In no case will private interests prevail over the general interests of the Paraguayan nation. All citizens are obliged to lend their cooperation."

Article 21 of the National Constitution of Paraguay provided:

"The constitution guarantees private property, the content and limits thereof to be fixed by law, bearing in mind its social function. No one may be deprived of his property except by virtue of a judgment founded in law.

"The ownership of property of all kinds may be legally changed by expropriation for reasons of social interest defined by law, which shall also determine the manner in which compensation shall be made. The law may fix the maximum land area that a single individual or a legally constituted company may own, and any in excess of that amount shall be sold at public auction or be expropriated by the state for distribution."

Article 22 contained this dynamic language:

"Every Paraguayan home shall be situated on a piece of land belonging to the family."

Twenty-five years previously Mexico had established the law of agrarian reform as one of the bases for their revolution in 1910 and 2 years later had incorporated that law into the Constitution of the Republic.

The same basic understanding of the problem was mirrored in the laws of Uruguay in the series of statutes commencing in 1923 where we find the expropriation of lands based on "public utility."[4]

THE LAW

As law gradually replaced force in man's evolution, the strident voice of the warrior was muted by the softer but more compelling voice of the lawyer and the jurist. If those who still yearn for the limited comfort of the feudal system need a villain to receive their contempt, let them look for him amongst our professional ancestors. It was the lawyer and the jurist who more than any other were to saw through the fetters which bound his brothers to the soil.

For the lawyer interested in the affairs of the Americas, and particularly in the problem we now discuss, an examination of the principal legal theories which supplemented the actions of the executive and the legislature may be of interest.

Facts change, circumstances vary, the law reflects. When there is plenty of land and a relatively few people demanding a portion

[2] S. Doc. No. 56, 85th Cong., 1st sess.

[3] See "Survey of National Policies on Federal Land Ownership," S. Doc. No. 56, 85th Cong., 1st sess.

[4] The law of Sept. 20, 1939, and of Sept. 19, 1941.

which they insist is their birthright, the task of distributing the land is relatively simple—and at first blush it may appear that this was the case in my own country.

Let me suggest to you that we examine the legal doctrines applicable to determine if in fact there is not in our systems of jurisprudence adequate justification to distribute not only public but private land into the permanent tenure of private individuals—to have and to hold, to dispose of as they see fit, and to bestow as they desire.

Put another way: Can the state legally acquire any land, public or private, compensating the owner with public moneys, and then grant or sell this land to individuals who will become the new owners in fee simple? Let me submit not only that the question may be answered in the affirmative if applied to our past legal history but that it be answered in the affirmative for the future.

For reasons more of convenience than necessity, let us look then to the cases which deal with the element of the actual taking of land which pertains in some degree to all our nations represented here today. Generally known as expropriation or appropriation in England and the Latin American nations, the taking is known by the principle of eminent domain in the United States of America.

Eminent domain reduced to its minimum might be defined as the power of the sovereign to take property for public use without the owner's consent.[5] Although the name "eminent domain" is of comparatively recent origin, the power has been exercised probably since the days of the Romans.[6] Hugo Grotius is credited with originating the term "eminent domain" and is generally recognized as being responsible for the crystallization of the legal theorem upon which it is based.[7] By today's interpretation the theory of eminent domain, by whatever name, is nothing more or less than an inherent political right which is considered so vital to the very existence and safety of the Government[8] that the property right of the individual is subordinated to the welfare of the community.[9]

In the early history of our judicial ancestors, we know that all land was owned of right by the king, and that individual ownership was merely a holding by the king in return for performance of governmental functions. Under feudalistic tenure, the king as a consequence had a prerogative right, later recognized in common law, of entering upon private property, with the purpose of erecting defenses against a public enemy, or to protect the nation against the inroads of the sea.[10] The sovereign also had the prerogative right of performance and preemption—the right to seize provisions for the use of the royal household without the consent of the owner, and later, perhaps a little reluctantly, to pay for them at a fair valuation made by appraisers. The theory underlying these rights was the foetus of what was to become eminent domain. The characteristics of the power of eminent domain in England are summed up by Nichols,[11] as follows:

"The power of eminent domain was thus well established in England by the time of the American Revolution, and the obligation to make compensation had become a necessary incident to the exercise of the power.

"Besides, the public good is in nothing more essentially interested, than in the protection of every individual's private rights, as modeled by the municipal law. In this and similar cases the legislature alone can, and indeed frequently does, interpose, and compel the individual to acquiesce. But how does it interpose and compel? Not by absolutely stripping the subject of his property in an arbitrary manner; but by giving him a full indemnification and equivalent for the injury thereby sustained. The public is now considered as an individual, treating with an individual for an exchange. All that the legislature does is to oblige the owner to alienate his possessions for a reasonable price; and even this is an exertion of a power; which the legislature indulges with caution and which none but the legislature can perform."

Eminent domain was used in the American Colonies but the procedure of its use varied from colony to colony and ranged from a taking of private property without judicial process to the use of the old writ of ad quod damnum. The colonial period's use of the power is summed up by Nichols in section 1.22(14), as follows:

"It will thus be seen that the power of eminent domain was exercised in the American Colonies, and that the obligation to make compensation for land taken, although not treated as an absolute right, was recognized in all of the colonies except South Carolina as soon as property of that character had attained sufficient value to make the taking of it more than a nominal injury. On the other hand, the exercise of the power was not restricted to the public use, at least in the narrow sense in which that phrase is commonly used today, but eminent domain was used in behalf of mills, and of private roads and in a certain sense of private drainage, as freely as in the case of public highways. In short, the history of eminent domain in the American Colonies seems to sustain a doctrine that the power of eminent domain, as it exists untrammeled by constitutional limitations, extends to the taking of property within the jurisdiction of the State for the public good, subject only to the moral obligation of making compensation."

The original basis of the theory was to change so that today eminent domain is not considered a property right or an exercise by the State of ultimate ownership but more a part of the basic structure of State sovereignty. Thus today in the United States, the power of the Government to acquire and hold that land which is needed for the execution of many constitutional powers is unquestioned; and when that property cannot be taken by voluntary arrangement with the owner, the taking by the Government which follows is limited by the power of just compensation and the constitutional provision that no person shall be deprived of his property without due process of law. Let us examine for a moment how this power has been utilized since colonial days.

It has been used, of course, to acquire the necessary sites for public buildings,[12] as a protection to public health and safety,[13] for public libraries,[14] for purposes of education,[15] for public parks,[16] for the preservation of places of historical interest,[17] and even for the acquisition of public fisheries,[18] for public highways,[19] for railroads.[20]

A clear statement of the doctrine of eminent domain in the United States upon entering the 20th century is to be found in the Kohl case.[21] Mr. Justice Strong stated the position of the Court with a logic and a precision which precludes any ambiguity:

"It has not been seriously contended during the argument that the U.S. Government is without power to appropriate lands or other property within the States for its own uses, and to enable it to perform its proper functions. Such an authority is essential to its independent existence and perpetuity. These cannot be preserved if the obstinacy of a private person, or if any other authority, can prevent the acquisition of the means or instruments by which alone governmental functions can be performed. The powers vested by the Constitution in the General Government demand for their exercise the acquisition of land in all the States. These are needed for forts, armories and arsenals, for navy yards and lighthouses, for customhouses, post offices, and courthouses, and for other pub-

---

[5] *Scott* v. *Toledo*, 36 F. 385.

[6] "Annals of Tacitus," Bk. I, p. 75.

[7] See discussion, "De Jure Belli et Pacis," Lib. III, C. 20.

[8] *Sweet* v. *Rechel*, 159 U.S. 349, 379 (1895).

[9] See annotation, ibid., 40 F. Ed. 188; eminent domain, who may exercise; for what purpose; what may be taken; property devoted to public use; right acquired; what constitutes a taking; right to compensation; damage to easements; noise, smoke, bridges, and approaches.

[10] It is of interest to note at this point the laws passed since 1917 in the United States by the Congress on flood control alone:

Public Law 367, 64th Cong., 39 Stat. 948, Mar. 1, 1917.

Public Law 277, 66th Cong., 41 Stat. 1059, June 5, 1920.

Public Law 320, 66th Cong., 41 Stat. 1105, Feb. 27, 1921.

Public Law 372, 66th Cong., 41 Stat. 1354, Mar. 3, 1921.

Public Law 528, 67th Cong., 42 Stat. 1505, Mar. 4, 1923.

Public Law 892, 68th Cong., 43 Stat. 1000, Feb. 26, 1925.

Public Law 391, 70th Cong., 45 Stat. 534, May 15, 1928.

Public Law 775, 70th Cong., 45 Stat. 1228, Feb. 19, 1929.

Public Law 678, 74th Cong., 49 Stat. 1508, June 15, 1936.

Public Law 738, 74th Cong., 49 Stat. 1570, June 22, 1936.

Public Law 761, 75th Cong., 52 Stat. 1215, June 28, 1938.

Public Law 396, 76th Cong., 53 Stat. 1414, Aug. 11, 1939.

Public Law 228, 77th Cong., 55 Stat. 638, Aug. 18, 1941.

Public Law 534, 78th Cong., 58 Stat. 887, Dec. 22, 1944.

Public Law 526, 79th Cong., 60 Stat. 641, July 24, 1946.

Public Law 858, 80th Cong., 62 Stat. 1175, June 30, 1948.

Public Law 516, 81st Cong., 64 Stat. 170, May 17, 1950.

Public Law 202, 82d Cong., 65 Stat. 615, Oct. 24, 1951.

Public Law 566, 83d Cong., 68 Stat. 666, Aug. 4, 1954.

Public Law 780, 83d Cong., 68 Stat. 666, Aug. 4, 1954.

Public Law 99, 84th Cong., 69 Stat. 186, June 28, 1955.

Public Law 685, 84th Cong., 70 Stat. 522, July 11, 1956.

[11] Vol. I, sec. 1.2(5).

[12] *Kohl* v. *United States* (91 U.S. 367 (1876)).

[13] *New York City Housing Authority* v. *Muller* (270 N.Y. 333, 1 N.E. (2d) 153, 105).

[14] *Johnson* v. *Baltimore* (158 Md. 93, 148 Atl. 209, 66 A.L.R. 1488 (1930)).

[15] *Albright* v. *Sussex County Lake & Park Commission* (71 N.J.L. 303, 57 Atl. 398).

[16] *United States* v. *Gettysburg Electric R. Co.* (160 U.S. 668 (1896)); *Shoemaker* v. *United States* (147 U.S. 282 (1893)).

[17] *United States* v. *Gettysburg Electric R. Co.* (160 U.S. 668 (1896)).

[18] This included the acquisition of natural oyster beds and the use has been declared no less public under existing laws the use of the beds within the limits of the political subdivision known as the county was confined to the inhabitants of that county. *Cox v. Revelle* (125 Md. 579, 94 Atl. 203).

[19] *Rindge Co.* v. *Los Angeles County* (262 U.S. 700).

[20] *United States* v. *Joint-Traffic Association* (171 U.S. 505 (1898)); *Cherokee Nation* v. *Southern Kansas R. Co.* (135 U.S. 641 (1890)). (1890)).

[21] 91 U.S. 367 at p. 372.

lic uses. If the right to acquire property for such uses may be made a barren right by the unwillingness of property holders to sell, or by the action of a State prohibiting a sale to the Federal Government, the constitutional grants of power may be rendered nugatory, and the Government is dependent for its practical existence upon the will of a State, or even upon that of a private citizen. This cannot be. No one doubts the existence in the State governments of the right of eminent domain—a right distinct from and paramount to the right of ultimate ownership. It grows out of the necessities of their being, not out of the tenure by which lands are held. It may be exercised, though the lands are not held by grant from the Government, either mediately or immediately, and independent of the consideration whether they would escheat to the Government in case of a failure of heirs. The right is the offspring of political necessity; and it is inseparable from sovereignty, unless denied to it by its fundamental law" (Vatt. ch. 20, 34; Bynk. lib. 2, ch. 15; Kent, Com. 338–340; Cooley, Const. Lim. 584, et seq.).

THE PRECISE USE OF AGRICULTURE

At this point it is worthwhile to examine what might have been the position of the U.S. Government with respect to land reforms if our Nation had been confronted with the same set of basic facts that confronts a great many Latin American nations today. The first North American Conservation Conference held in February 1909, in Washington, D.C., had this to say in its declaration of principles in part dealing with the subject of lands:

"We recognize land as a fundamental resource, yielding the materials needed for sustaining population, and forming the basis of social organization. Increase in the productivity of the soil is a growing need, and the possession of the land by the men who live upon it not only promotes such productivity, but is also the best guarantee of good citizenship. In the interest of the homemaker we favor regulation of grazing on public land, the disposal of public lands to actual settlers in areas each sufficient to support a family, and the subdivision of excessive holdings of agricultural or grazing land, thereby preventing monopoly."

In 1930 the Natural Resources Board in a report by its Land Committee stated:

"Ownership of land by individuals in fee simple absolute was established early in the history of this country in spite of early attempts to establish a semimanorial system in some of the colonies.

"This system has become so firmly established in the United States that individual ownership of land has come to be considered widely, not as a privilege granted and protected by the State, but as the natural state of affairs.

"This attitude, strong in the early years of our national history, led to Federal and State programs to put public lands into private ownership as rapidly as possible. Public ownership was considered for the most part only as a step in the transfer of practically all of the lands into private hands." [22]

Thus it is now readily apparent that if it had been necessary to issue a policy declaration by the United States with regard to land reform, the question would be one of the degree of public benefit involved insofar as extension of the doctrine of eminent domain is concerned. More especially, the question becomes one of necessity for the development of the resources of a community or of a State. In *Clark* v. *Nash*,[23] it was pointed out that two lines of authority then existed, neither of which attempted to lay down a fixed rule as a guide in all cases. One line of authorities, in a general way, held that by public use is meant a use by the public or its agencies—i.e., the public must have the right to the actual use in some way of the property appropriated. The other line of decisions was to the effect that it is a public use within the meaning of the law when the taking is for a use that will promote the public interest and tends to develop the great natural resources of the commonwealth.[24]

The Federal Supreme Court, while emphasizing the great caution which must be exercised in the matter, has consistently recognized the inadequacy of use by the general public as a universal test; it has taken the view that there may be exceptional times and places in which the very foundations of public welfare cannot be laid without requiring the concessions from individuals to each other, upon due compensation, which under other circumstances would be left wholly to voluntary consent, and that the question is largely one of State policy.[25]

The doctrine that public benefit may be sufficient without a right of use on the part of the public, to justify a taking of property under eminent domain as for a public use, is recognized, however, in a leading case involving irrigation, decided by the Federal Supreme Court. The Court had this to say on the subject: [26]

"While the consideration that the work of irrigation must be abandoned if the use of the water may not be held to be or constitute a public use is not to be regarded as conclusive in favor of such use, yet that fact is in this case a most important consideration. Millions of acres of land otherwise cultivable must be left in their present arid and worthless condition, and an effectual obstacle will therefore remain in the way of the advance of a large portion of the State in material wealth and prosperity. To irrigate and thus to bring into possible cultivation these large masses of otherwise worthless lands would seem to be a public purpose and a matter of public interest, not confined to the landowners, or even to any one section of the State. The fact that the use of the water is limited to the landowner is not therefore a fatal objection to this legislation. It is not essential that the entire community, or even any considerable portion thereof, should directly enjoy or participate in an improvement in order to constitute a public use."

It may well be that the law itself and those intellectual processes which go into the formulation of the law were best stated by a judge of the South Dakota Supreme Court in 1921 in a case styled *Wheelon* v. *South Dakota Land Settlement Board, et al.* [27]

Faced with the determination of the constitutionality of a statute authorizing loans to war veterans to enable them to purchase land and in the course of the determination to decide whether the action amounted to a personal gratuity or donation forbidden by the Constitution, Justice Gates revealed himself as something more than a judge looking cold-bloodedly at the law of the land.

In the course of the opinion, the justice looked squarely at the problem and asked the question:

"Is, then, the promotion of land settlement a public purpose?" [28]

And by way of a partial answer he quoted from a Prof. Elwood Mead, the author of "Helping Men Own Farms": [29]

"We are only just beginning to realize that our future is likely to be determined primarily by the relation of the people to the land. The chaos of Russia has grown out of land hunger; no one fears for the safety of France, where nearly half the people are landowners. We have often stated, but little heeded, the facts that we are ceasing to be a landowning nation, and that the landborn are drifting to the cities. We have yet to learn what the older countries of the world already know—that keeping people on the land in the years to come must be one of the main endeavors of civilized nations. People cannot be kept on the land where nonresident ownership and tenantry prevail. Nothing sort [sic] of ownership of the land one toils over will suffice to overcome the lure of the city. At any sacrifice, at any cost, the people who farm the land must be enabled to own it. On such ownership the life of a modern nation may depend."

And he quoted from a Washington case which he felt was in point and this language is important: [30]

"Our problem, then, is reduced to this: Is the raising of funds by taxation, and the expenditure thereof for the purchase of land to the end that it be subdivided, improved, and disposed of as by the terms of this act provided, the exercise of the power of taxation and the expenditure of public funds for a public purpose? It may be well doubted that there has ever come to the American courts any more vexatious question than that of determining whether or not a particular purpose for which public funds were sought to be raised by taxation and expended is a public purpose, when the particular purpose in question lay within the twilight zone wherein the minds may reasonably differ as to such purpose being a public one; the bounds of which zone are ever changing with the passing of time, and within which new problems of public welfare always first appear. That such a question when arising in the courts has proven so vexatious is, we apprehend, because of its inherent nature, in that, in its last analysis, it is not one of exclusive legal logic, but is one more or less of policy and wisdom, properly determinable in the light of public welfare, present and future, in a broad sense, and hence is not a pure judicial law question, except in those cases clearly outside of the twilight zone we have alluded to."

And through the Washington court he reached out to another judge, thousands of miles away on the other side of our vast land and cited this language: [31]

"The courts have never attempted to lay down with minute detail an inexorable rule distinguishing public from private purposes, because it would be impossible to do so. Times change. The wants and necessities of the people change. The opportunity to satisfy those wants and necessities by individual effort may vary. What was clearly a public use a century ago may, because of changed conditions, have ceased to be such today. Thus, the Mill Act which came into being in the early days of our parent Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and was adopted by our own State, was upheld as constitutional because of the necessities of those primitive times. The courts in later days have strongly intimated that were it an original question it might be difficult to sustain it in view of present industrial conditions (*Murdock* v. *Stickney* (8 Cush. 113); *Salisbury Mills* v. *Forsaith* (57 N.H. 124); *Jordan* v. *Woodward* (40 Me. 317)). On the other hand, what could not be deemed a

[22] Report of the Land Committee to the National Resources Planning Board, Public Land, Acquisition in a National Land-Use Program; Pt. I: Rural Lands, Washington, 1940, p. 1.

[23] 198 U.S. 361, 49 L. Ed. 1085 (1905).

[24] *Nash* v. *Clark* (27 Utah 158, 75 P. 371).

[25] *Nash* v. *Clark* (198 U.S. 361 (1905) affirming case cited).

[26] *Fallbrook Irrigation District* v. *Bradley* (164 U.S. 112, at p. 161 (1896)).

[27] 181 N. W. 359; cited and annotated 14 A.L.R. 1145, et seq.

[28] Ibid, at p. 1148.

[29] On p. 10 of that work; ibid, at p. 1148.

[30] Ibid, p. 1149.

[31] Ibid., p. 1150.

public use a century ago may, because of changed economic and industrial conditions, be such today. Laws which were entirely adequate to secure public welfare then may be inadequate to accomplish the same results now."

"Is there not abundant room for arguing that the development of our unoccupied lands suitable for agriculture, by a land policy which would encourage the settlement thereon of homeowning farmers, will materially contribute to the welfare of our people as a whole? Can it not be argued with a fair show of reason that not only will such a policy ultimately lead to the enhancement of the material wealth of the State, but that it will also make for better citizenship, better notions of necessity for law and order, and a sounder and saner patriotism?"

And he quotes: [32]

"Whether or not the work contemplated by the act is strictly a work of internal improvement we do not need to determine because it clearly is a business enterprise which will tend to the development of the resources of the State. That does not admit of argument."

So much for the taking of the property. The measure of damages to the individual from whom land is taken has over the years been set forth with well-defined criteria and includes remote and speculative damages; [33] the loss of productive and rental value; [34] compensation for interference with the use of property; [35] for the obstruction of access; [36] for the expense of fencing; [37] for water supply damage; [38] for diversion of traffic; [39] and of course for court costs.[40]

But in a much broader sense, it is for us to determine the damages accruing to our countries from not taking any action at all, from fleeing before a controversy which demands solution, or from hoping wistfully that the problem itself will disappear.

The final answer to the problem of agrarian reform, when it comes, will have its origin in many areas—the social conscience, science, and mainly, the law and its interpretation.

Each nation shall decide.

Each of us, as lawyers and as jurists, must decide.

THE FUTURE

The future, empty for so many generations for men alined with the soil, is suddenly crowded with those who have the capacity and the desire to solve the problem of agrarian reform.

On the political front as each individual nation hammers away at the specific solutions for its own particular problems, we find the great international bodies, the United Nations and the Organization of American States, directing their vast energies to the development of research and other factual data necessary to intelligent solution.[41]

In the field of our political activity, we must recognize the tremendous impact of the act of Bogotá adopted by the Committee of 21 on September 13, of last year, which set forth an inter-American program for social development which should be directed to the carrying out of specific measures in the field of agrarian reform, as considered appropriate in each country. The words themselves and the thought behind the words are of such vital importance that we cannot help but examine them closely:

"A. Measures for the improvement of conditions of rural living and land use—

"1. The examination of existing legal and institutional systems with respect to:

"(a) Land tenure legislation and facilities with a view to insuring a wider and more equitable distribution of the ownership of land, in a manner consistent with the objectives of employment, productivity, and economic growth;

"(b) Agricultural credit institutions with a view to providing adequate financing to individual farmers or groups of farmers;

"(c) Tax systems and procedures and fiscal policies with a view to assuring equity of taxation and encouraging improved use of land, especially of privately owned land which is idle.

"2. The initiation or acceleration of appropriate programs to modernize and improve the existing legal and institutional framework to insure better conditions of land tenure, extend more adequate credit facilities, and provide increased incentives in the land tax structure.

"3. The acceleration of the preparation of projects and programs for:

"(a) Land reclamation and land settlement, with a view to promoting more widespread ownership and efficient use of land, particularly of unutilized or underutilized land;

"(b) The increase of the productivity of land already in use; and

"(c) The construction of farm-to-market and access roads.

"4. The adoption or acceleration of other government service programs designed particularly to assist the small farmer, such as new or improved marketing organizations; extension services; research and basic surveys; and demonstration, education, and training facilities."

While I would leave the field of ecclesiastical law to others more qualified, let me suggest that the student of this subject read the statement on agrarian reform by His Excellency Raul Zambrano Camader of our host country to ascertain the powerful voice which has been raised by those dedicated to the work of God.[42]

On quite another front we must recognize that the scientific developments of today, unthought of yesterday, are out of date tomorrow.

A few years ago we found ourselves calling the 20th century the atomic age and now it seems certain that the glib label was attached too soon. In the field of salt water conversion alone we find ourselves on the verge of a breakthrough which would enable us tc convert salt or brackish water into fresh water so that irrigation by this method will soon be economically feasible.[43] In those sections of the world where water has meant the difference between peace or war, feast or famine, plenty or poverty, life or death, the splitting of the atom cannot possibly mean as much as this one great development.

And from ourselves—from the lawyers and jurists of the Americas—we have a great intellectual reservoir available for the solution of not only this problem but the problems the future may bring. One may read with a bemused detachment now what one of our great national leaders once said of the Western United States:

"What do we want with this vast worthless area—this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts and those endless mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their base with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast, a coast of 3,000 miles, rock-bound, cheerless, and uninviting, and not a harbor on it?" [44]

It may come as a great shock to my own countrymen to know that this statement was made by the incomparable Daniel Webster. And I use it not by way of criticism of a man whose vision was limited by the shortcoming of his own time but as some indication that we must not, we cannot, lose confidence in what it is possible to do by men of vision and good faith.

The frontiers of our ancestors once lay along the boundaries of the sea. Ours lie beyond space. The spirit that reached one can reach the other.

YOUTH PEACE CORPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as my colleagues will recall, in the last Congress language was written into the Mutual Security Act to authorize a study to be made as to the advisability and practicability of a Youth Peace Corps under which young U.S. citizens would be trained and would serve abroad in programs of technical cooperation.

In accordance with this legislative authority such a study was undertaken by the Colorado State University Research Foundation under the direction of Maurice L. Albertson.

Having introduced legislation last year to establish such a Youth Peace Corps, S. 3675, I have been anxiously awaiting the issuance of a report by Maurice Albertson's group. This week a preliminary report was submitted and it is the definite opinion of the men who have been making this study that a Youth Peace Corps is both advisable and practicable and would serve the national interest.

Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the officers in the executive branch of the Government. I have discussed it with Mr. Schriver, who has been in charge of the preliminary activities on the part of the executive

---

[32] Ibid., p. 1150.

[33] *U.S.* v. *Chandler-Dunbar Water Power Co.* (229 U.S. (1913) 53).

[34] *Chicago* v. *Taylor* (125 U.S. 161 (1883)).

[35] *Bauman* v. *Ross* (167 U.S. 548 (1897)).

[36] *United States* v. *Welch* (217 U.S. 333 (1910)).

[37] *Tillamook County* v. *Johnson* (190 P. 159 (1920)).

[38] *United States* v. *Alexander*, 148 U.S. 186 (1893).

[39] *Jackson* v. *Chicago Ry. Co.*, 41 F. 656.

[40] *United States* v. *Intols*, 26 F. Cas. 482, F. Cas. No. 15441.

[41] I-A Ecosoc series, OEA/Ser. H/VI: Es-Cera-Doc. 21/60 Rev.; Es-Cera-Doc. 14 (English) Rev., 25 April 1960; Es-Cera-Doc. 12 (English), 1 June 1960; Es-Cera-Doc. 10 (English), Apr. 7, 1960; Es-Cera-doc. 13 (English), 19 April 1960; United Nations: Progress in Land Reform E/2526 (1954) United Nations: Progress in Land Reform, Second Report, E/2930, ST/ECA/42 (1956).

[42] His Excellency Raul Zambrano Camader cites as the basis for his position the following encyclical texts: Leo XIII, Rerun Nevarum (14); Quadragessimo anno, Nos. 45, 47, 48, 49; Pius XII: September 1944.

[43] "The Facts About Salt Water Conversion," Research and Education Committee for a Free World, Washington, D.C., April 1960; "Fresh Water From the Sea," Bureau of Business and Economic Research, University of Maryland, College Park, vol. 12, No. 3, December 1958; "Saline Water Conversion Report for 1958," U.S. Department of the Interior, January 1959; "Saline Water Conversion Report for 1959," U.S. Department of the Interior, January 1960; "Saline Water Conversion," water resources activities in the United States, Select Committee on National Water Resources, U.S. Senate, Committee Print No. 26, November 1959; the Department of State Bulletin, vol. XLII, No. 1118, Nov. 28, 1960; "Economic World," p. 7, January 1960.

[44] Reclamation: Accomplishments and Contributions, Committee Print No. 1, 86th Cong., 1st sess., p. 2.

branch, looking toward the establishment of a Youth Peace Corps. I am happy to say that definite progress is being made in the fulfillment of our objective, and I am looking forward anxiously to the establishment of such a program.

I have withheld introducing new proposed legislation this year until I could ascertain the desires of the executive branch. However, proposed legislation can and will be introduced at the appropriate time with the cooperation of the executive officers.

In view of the importance of this report and the wide interest which has been shown in this proposal, I ask unanimous consent that the report itself, along with a summary of its recommendations which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 27, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PRELIMINARY REPORT: A YOUTH CORPS FOR SERVICE ABROAD

(By Maurice L. Alberston, Pauline E. Birky, Andrew E. Rice, Colorado State University Research Foundation, Fort Collins, Colo., February 1961)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We of the Colorado State University Research Foundation express our appreciation to the many hundreds of experienced men and women in every field of endeavor in this country and abroad who have contributed their wisdom to this study. Without their unstinting help, this report would have been impossible to produce.

We are particularly grateful to Congressman HENRY S. REUSS (coauthor with the late Senator Richard Neuberger of the provision in the Mutual Security Act calling for the study) and to Glenn B. McClelland, special assistant to the Deputy Director for Management of the International Cooperation Administration, for their constant encouragement and help. Other ICA personnel have given assistance of great value, among them Karl F. Bode, Assistant Deputy Director for Planning, John J. Grady, Deputy Director for Management, and James P. Grant, Deputy Director for Program and Planning. The Peace Corps concept was described in a bill introduced by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY in 1960.

Dean Harlan Cleveland, of the Maxwell Graduate School at Syracuse University (now Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs), and Prof. Gilbert White, chairman of the department of geography at the University of Chicago, have served as members of a special advisory committee and have given valuable guidance in the study's development and progress.

The professional staff of Colorado State University who have been involved in this study are as follows: J. Stanley Ahmann, Maurice L. Alberston, Pauline E. Birky, Dean J. Bowman, Manuel Davenport, Rufus Hughes, Andrew Rice, William W. Sayre.

CHAPTER I. PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

The search for new and effective instruments to express our national purposes in today's world of both rapid change and persistent tension engages the imagination and brains of countless Americans in public and private life. New ideas emerge to meet evolving needs and in turn these ideas kindle public response and support. In a time of national crisis, this response is often expressed in a desire for personal participation in bringing to fruition a new concept.

Such has been the pattern with a proposal first officially put forward in the Congress of the United States early in 1960. In essence this proposal holds that there exists an untapped resource and an unmet need in our national life. The resource is the talents and the enthusiasm of young American citizens; the need is to share more quickly our skills and knowledge with the impatient peoples of the many nations seeking to move ahead rapidly toward a more productive society. Put in its simplest form, the idea is that the service of a citizen need not be restricted to the defense of his country by arms but should embrace as well constructive efforts to build the institutions of peace and freedom.

The roots of this concept lie deep in American democratic philosophy, religious faiths, and ethical value systems. For generations many of our church missionaries have set an example of dedicated service and sharing in foreign lands. A great American philosopher, William James, wrote at the turn of the century of the moral equivalent of war. In the deep depression of the 1930's the Civilian Conservation Corps demonstrated that young Americans could build both their country and themselves in a program of national service. And in the internationally minded United States of the post-World War II years, new and experimental programs of voluntary service at home and abroad have charted new ways of personal participation in programs of social progress.

But could there be an identifiably national program of service overseas by young Americans which would advance the interests of the United States both at home and abroad? It was to secure an answer to this question that the Congress, in the Mutual Security Act of 1960, provided that "the President shall arrange for a nongovernmental research group, university, or foundation to study the advisability and practicability of a program, to be known as the Point 4 Youth Corps, under which young U.S. citizens would be trained and serve abroad in programs of technical cooperation."

The preliminary report which follows is the first fruit of the study now being made pursuant to this provision of law by the Colorado State University Research Foundation, Fort Collins, Colo. A far more extensive final report will be completed by the end of April 1961.

Since this study was initiated, the American people have chosen a new President who in his campaign speeches and his Presidential addresses has given his endorsement to the idea of a "National Peace Corps, enlisting the services of all those with the desire and capacity to help foreign lands meet their urgent needs for trained personnel." It is in the spirit of President Kennedy's inaugural plea, "ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country," that this preliminary report is presented.

CHAPTER II. SCOPE AND METHODS OF STUDY

In planning the Youth Corps study, consideration was given to the legislative history of the Youth Corps idea to date and to the topics listed in the study guide prepared by the International Cooperation Administration.

A tentative outline was developed in the initial stage. This outline was then discussed in detail, both in personal interviews and in meetings, with more than 200 individuals in private organizations, Government agencies, and educational institutions.

Out of these discussions, various hypotheses were formulated and are being studied by the following methods:

1. Studies in the United States: Studies in the United States are being carried out by use of questionnaires, interviews, and surveys.

A. Questionnaires: In the questionnaires the following topics are being considered:

(a) Organizational structure, both in the United States and in the host country.

(b) Qualification and selection of youth.

(c) Qualification and selection of leaders.

(d) Types of projects in which corps members might participate.

(e) Orientation and training of youth and leaders.

(f) Relation to military service.

(g) Research and evaluation.

(h) Program implementation.

Questionnaires have been sent to the following groups:

	Approximate number sent
(a) Related (voluntary) agencies	50
(b) Former participants in 11 overseas programs	1,250
(c) Former employees of United Nations (administrative and operational)	48
(d) Former employees of ICA (administrative and operational)	74
(e) Senior students in 10 teachers colleges	1,000
(f) Foreign students now studying in the United States	700
(g) Young members of 6 labor unions (being conducted by personal interviews)	500
(h) Member colleges and universities of the American Council on Education	950
(i) Students in 10 universities and colleges	5,000
(j) Other persons experienced in international economic development	50

B. Interviews: Interviews have been held with Government officials and with representatives of private industry, labor, foundations, and agencies. They have been conducted individually and in small groups. To date, approximately 350 persons have been interviewed.

C. Surveys: A survey was taken of ICA office directors in Washington, in regard to work opportunities in host countries.

2. Studies abroad: Studies abroad were carried out by the use of interviews and surveys.

A. Interviews: A team of 3 researchers individually conducted studies of Youth Corps possibilities in 10 countries in Asia, Africa, and South America. These interviews were with the following types of individuals.

(a) Nationals of the host country, including high-level administrators, technical personnel, grassroots level administrators and technicians, educators, and representatives of industry, labor, religious groups, and the diplomatic service.

(b) U.S. nationals in the host country, including foreign service personnel, other government personnel, and representatives of private agencies, industry, educational institutions, and others.

(c) Nationals of other countries, including representatives of the United Nations, educational institutions, the diplomatic service, and others.

B. Surveys: At the request of the Colorado State University Research Foundation, a survey was made of USOM staff members in 11 countries, in regard to country work opportunities.

3. Special studies: Studies in depth are being carried out on several subjects by the use of interviews, existing documentation, small conferences, study groups, etc. The following are among the topics studied: (a) "Relationship to United Nations"; (b) "Selection, Orientation, and Training"; (c) "Other-Country Youth Programs"; (d) "Research and Evaluation"; (e) "Reciprocal Use of Young Foreigners in United States",

in terms of work opportunities; (f) "Organizational Structure"; (g) "Governmental and International Organizations in the Area of Youth Work, Both Existing and Former."

4. Position papers: During the course of the study, policy papers from both individuals and organizations are being consulted. These papers, both solicited and unsolicited, contain a large amount of valuable material.

For this report, it has not been possible to complete the assembly and analysis of the wealth of data from the questionnaires, the special studies, and the position papers. They will be utilized in detail in the final report in April 1961.

CHAPTER III. OBJECTIVES OF THE YOUTH CORPS

It is the widely shared conviction of virtually all those who have been consulted in this study, both in this country and abroad, that a properly designed Youth Corps can serve several purposes of national policy. The principal purpose of the corps as conceived in this report is to assist in the economic and social growth of the less developed areas. Promotion of intercultural understanding and opportunities for American young people to gain experience in oversea work are viewed as important but secondary objectives. A well formulated program will produce substantial supplementary benefits to the peoples of the United States and the host country.

A summary of the corps' major purposes follows:

1. The primary objective of the Youth Corps is to assist in accelerating the process of economic and social development in the less developed areas of the world. To this end, young American adults will transmit, through actual operational participation, technical information and skills from higher policy and technical levels to the level of practical application in those developing countries which lack an adequate corps of young men and women trained in technical and professional skills, while at the same time assisting in creating the institutions which will further hasten economic and social modernization on a sound and lasting basis.

2. By their service abroad in such joint efforts of development, these young Americans will foster a mutual understanding and appreciation of the culture, motivations, attitudes, and problems of the United States and of the country in which they are working.

3. Service in such a program will also enlarge the reservoir of American citizens who have a personal knowledge of other areas of the world and will thus assist in raising the general level of U.S. citizen understanding of, and interest in, world affairs.

4. Such service will create as well a carefully selected pool of talented young citizens for further public and private service abroad.

5. The Youth Corps will provide young U.S. adults with an opportunity for personal fulfillment by applying their ideals of democracy, of the brotherhood of man, and of the dignity of labor in a program which stresses personal contact with people in the developing countries.

CHAPTER IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE YOUTH CORPS

As of the date of this preliminary report, the consensus regarding the characteristics of a Youth Corps is listed below. This consensus has come from information obtained from personal interviews, country studies, and similar sources. It must be emphasized that the bulk of the information contained in questionnaires and interviews has not yet been tabulated and analyzed.

1. Each corpsman must have some skill or ability which is in short supply and is needed in the host country.

2. The Youth Corps must be organized and implemented in such a manner as to insure that it will be a people-to-people program. This means that corpsmen for the most part will be operational-level workers rather than advisory-level technicians or experts.

3. Corpsmen must be provided subsistence plus a modest spending allowance. The total will be enough for maintenance of health, vitality, morale, but not enough to live in a manner greatly inconsistent with the host country people with whom they are working. In addition, adequate medical facilities should be available to corps members.

4. Service in a Youth Corps will not be an alternative to military service under the Selective Service Act, but should be reason for deferment.

5. The education of a corpsman will be at least through high school. Beyond this he normally should have formal education, special education or training, or experience which has given him a skill or ability in short supply and needed in the host country.

6. The Youth Corps will consist of both men and women. There will be work opportunities for a limited number of married couples, provided they each have a needed skill or ability.

7. The approximate age range of corps members will be between 20–30 years of age, but a certain flexibility should be built into the program that will permit some deviation as to age range.

8. Length of service will generally be 2 years, in addition to the orientation and training period, but the organizational structure must be flexible enough to permit the inclusion of a small number of short-term projects.

9. An element of reciprocity must be built into the program as soon as possible so that young citizens of other countries can come to the United States to participate in service projects on a basis similar to that of young Americans abroad.

CHAPTER V. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND OPERATING METHODS

By far the greatest divergence of opinion and the strongest feelings have been expressed with regard to organizational structure and operating methods. It is difficult to set forth now a single plan which will meet all needs, in view of the differing problems of each country and the uncertainty regarding the future shape of the combined aid program with which the Youth Corps must be closely associated.

With these conditions in mind, however, the following organizational structure and operating methods are proposed:

1. In the United States:

A. A Youth Corps agency shall be established, headed by a high-level administrator, appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and responsible directly to the head of the new combined aid program.

B. A high-level advisory board representing various segments of the general public, as well as operating agencies, shall be appointed by the President to advise the administrator.

C. It shall be a general principle of the Youth Corps that operating agencies (private and Government) shall have a voice in policy and program decisions.

D. The administrator shall establish as small a staff as possible for proper planning and administration of the program, using wherever appropriate, staff and facilities of other Government agencies (such as ICA) for technical guidance and administrative services.

E. The principal substantive divisions of the agency will be: program planning and execution; selection, orientation and training; and research and evaluation.

(1) Program planning and execution: This division will be responsible for long-range planning, coordination with other U.S. Government oversea programs, etc. Except in unusual cases, the agency will not itself undertake direct operations overseas. Instead it will utilize the services of private organizations, universities, other Government agencies and international agencies by means of:

(a) Grants: normally to be made to experienced private organizations or universities to carry out projects which they design and over which they have a wide range of discretionary control;

(b) Contracts: normally to be made with private organizations, industries, and educational institutions to carry out programs initiated by the agency;

(c) Detailing Youth Corps members: normally to other U.S. Government agencies (such as ICA) or to the United Nations, its specialized and relief agencies and other multilateral organizations.

(2) Selection, orientation, and training: This division will establish standards and criteria, and arrange by contract or direct operations for the selection, orientation, and training described in chapter VI below.

(3) Research and evaluation: This staff, directly or by contract, will continually review all ongoing projects. Since the Youth Corps is a new program the constant assessment of its operations is of vital importance to its success.

F. The United States should urge that the United Nations establish its own Youth Corps program and pledge its pro rata share of financial support.

2. In the host country:

A. All projects will be considered within the context of the total program planning and institution building of the host country, must be approved by the host country government, and should be closely coordinated with all other technical assistance, food for peace, and other bilateral and multilateral aid programs. If adequate country planning has not already been done, efforts shall be made to do the proper planning prior to implementation of the Youth Corps project. Only in exceptional cases and for carefully considered reasons will projects be implemented without this prior planning.

B. A binational board will be established in the host country (unless the program is too small or the situation does not justify it). This board will have representatives of government, industry, and private and voluntary agencies from both the host country and the U.S. activities in the host country. Its responsibilities and authority will be to: (a) Set policy and approve projects for that country within the framework and context of the total plan for the country; (b) employ a staff to do necessary planning and administration; (c) submit its program to Washington, D.C., for approval and help in locating contractors if needed.

C. Maximum autonomy must be given the binational board, with only general guidelines being stipulated in an overall binational agreement to be signed initially between the United States and the host country.

D. Whenever consistent with Youth Corps objectives, use should be made of existing voluntary agencies, Government agencies, and private and nonprofit organizations and foundations already operating successfully in the country, to be responsible for the various projects.

E. Whenever possible, the contractor or grantee should provide the leadership, technical supervision, and logistical support required for a given project.

F. Whenever possible, the staff and facilities of already existing agencies (such as ICA and USIS) should be utilized for technical supervision and logistical support if the contractor or grantee cannot logically or efficiently provide them.

G. Nationals of the host country should serve together with U.S. Youth Corps men as much as possible in all parts of the pro-

gram. Furthermore, whenever possible the host country should contribute material and personal resources in order to emphasize the binational nature of the program.

H. Pilot projects must be used initially and care must be taken to obtain research data from these which will serve as a reliable guide for continuation, expansion, or reduction of activities.

CHAPTER VI. SELECTION, ORIENTATION, AND TRAINING

The selection, orientation, and training of personnel are interrelated in many ways. A youth who is being considered for admission to the Youth Corps already has a background of orientation and training in the broad sense which are responsible for his present qualifications for selection. The orientation and training programs which are discussed herein are those in which a corpsman will participate following his initial selection. These programs will also provide opportunity for additional selection before he is actually assigned to the field.

Great emphasis must be placed upon the necessity for applying equally high standards of selection to the youth leaders, the administrators, and others associated with the program. In the long run, this kind of program is a chain of interrelated personnel and activities and can be no stronger than its weakest link.

1. Selection: There is general agreement that certain personal qualities are essential for participants and leaders in a Youth Corps. Indeed, the process of selection is probably the most critical factor in determining the success of the corps.

Although terminology differs, the qualities which are generally identified with successful performance abroad include such characteristics as: technical skill, adaptability, cultural empathy, maturity, physical and mental health, initiative and creativity, and ability to communicate.

Proper motivation is one of the most significant determinants. It should be recognized that young adults' motivations for volunteering to serve might quite legitimately be of several kinds. A humanitarian desire to serve others and a pioneering spirit of adventure must certainly be present, but in addition the desire to increase one's own level of education and experience, and a preference for civilian rather than military service to one's country might be legitimate supplementary motivations. Since it is intended that the program as proposed herein will have no financial incentives, there should be no reason at any time for a monetary motivation.

It becomes apparent that the methods of selection to meet these criteria, although of utmost importance, will be difficult to establish. Among the methods that have been suggested are the use of language aptitude tests, careful investigation of previous performance in work and study situations, personal interviews by personnel specialists, and psychological and intelligence tests. It has also been widely recommended that the final selection should be made during the training period, especially in field situations.

The final report of this study will contain a much more detailed examination of the entire selection process.

2. Orientation and training: Broadly speaking the orientation program is intended to orient the corpsman with respect to various cultural, economic, social, political, religious, and other aspects of the United States, the host country, and other organizations and groups with which the corpsman may come into contact either directly or indirectly. The training program is intended to provide or improve the various skills or special abilities which the corpsman must have for his work.

A. Program content: The content of an orientation and training program for Youth Corps members will need continuous study and planning to insure the success of the program. In fact considerable experimentation needs to be conducted as a part of the initial programs to be established. It is the general opinion that orientation and training programs should be highly flexible and that organizations charged with responsibility for such programs should be prepared to tailor them to meet individual and country needs.

The general content of the orientation program, as suggested by individuals and study groups consulted to date, includes the following general subject areas:

(a) Cross-cultural relationships;

(b) Problems of social, psychological and physical adjustments;

(c) Economic and social development and change;

(d) Country and area studies—government, institutional framework, culture and customs, and other important factors concerning the country in which they will work;

(e) American civilization, in the context of the United States as a developing country;

(f) Strategy, tactics, and operations of nondemocratic ideologies and governments;

(g) Youth Corps program and objectives and their relation to U.S. foreign policy.

The training program for the Youth Corps must include (a) training in the local language; (b) relating and communicating technical knowledge, skills, and attitudes in local situations; (c) individual technical skills.

B. Length of orientation and training period: Suggestions made as to the appropriate length of the period of orientation and training from 2 weeks to 1 year, for the total program. The current opinion in general concerning the desired length of orientation and training in the United States is 3 months or less, and the range in the host country is from 3 to 6 months—some of which may be on the job.

C. Location: There is considerable agreement among those consulted that orientation and training of Youth Corps members should be carried out in two stages, one in the United States and the other in the host country.

D. Training staff: There seems to be an agreement that nationals of the host country should be utilized in orientation and training programs, wherever possible.

CHAPTER VII. AVAILABILITY OF AMERICANS FOR THE YOUTH CORPS

Are there young Americans who are capable, ready and willing to serve, to fulfill the opportunity which the Youth Corps presents?

The answer is clearly "Yes." Preliminary data collected by this study in a poll of college campuses and trade unions, the widespread endorsement of the corps idea by youth organizations, letters and petitions of young adults to Congress and the White House, the creation of Peace Corps study groups, and the holding of student conferences (as at Princeton on November 11 and 12 and in Washington from March 29 to 31) all testify to the enthusiastic response which the Youth Corps idea has received.

Younger citizens are not alone in their enthusiasm; a poll by the American Institute of Public Opinion reported on January 31 that 66 percent of its respondents had answered "yes" to the question, "If you had a son who was qualified, would you like to have him participate in such a program?"

A rough calculation will indicate the general order of magnitude of the number of would-be corpsmen. Each year more than 500,000 Americans graduate from college, finish technical school or otherwise become potential candidates for corps service. Assuming that only 10 percent of these express an interest in serving in the corps—an assumption which appears conservative on the basis of the response thus far exhibited—and assuming that only 10 percent of these are able to meet the rigid and very high quality selection standards, there exists a minimum annual supply of some 5,000 corps members. This number on an annual basis would have 10,000 in the field at all times—not to mention those who would choose to stay longer than 2 years.

CHAPTER VIII. HOST COUNTRY INTEREST

A research team of three individually visited Nigeria and Gabon in Africa; Thailand, India, Pakistan, and the Philippines in south and southeast Asia; Colombia, Mexico, Chile, and Haiti in Latin America.

1. Receptivity toward Youth Corps program: In general, it can be stated that there was a high degree of receptivity to the idea of a Youth Corps in all of the countries visited, both on the part of the host country nationals and of the U.S. nationals in the country. This receptivity was almost always tempered by caution regarding the careful selection and training of the participants, and the need for their careful placement and supervision in the country in relation to overall development plans.

2. Size of corps: The consensus regarding the size of the corps in the majority of the countries visited was that the corps should be initiated in the country in terms of pilot projects, with limited numbers of participants. This number varied from 50 to 500, depending upon the size of the country, the needs, and various other factors.

3. Projects most needed: The greatest specified needs, as evidenced by the country studies, is for Youth Corps members in:

A. Education (especially teaching English, science, literacy, adult education, and vocational training);

B. Community and rural development (agriculture programs, problems of the home, building schools and roads, cottage industries, adult and youth clubs, etc.);

C. Health and sanitation (nursing, technical assistants, mother and child care, sanitation, etc.).

4. Other project needs: Other needs pointed out during the country surveys are as follows:

A. Agriculture: Livestock improvement, improved garden and field crops, irrigation, tool care and maintenance, 4-H clubs, cooperatives, marketing, grain storage;

B. Engineering: Irrigation, community water supply, flood control, roads, surveying, bridges;

C. Building and industrial trades: Masonry, carpentry, electricians, machinists;

D. Home demonstration: Nutrition, food handling and preparation, sewing, food preservation;

E. Home industries: Weaving, handicrafts, pottery;

F. Public administration and industrial management: Government interns, administrative assistants, statisticians, accountants;

G. Secretarial: Clerical, office organization;

H. Social welfare: Orphanages, welfare agencies, community centers;

I. Recreation and leisure time activities: Youth organizations (such as Boy Scouts and 4-H), physical fitness, sports training;

J. Fisheries: Marketing and handling of fish;

K. Forestry: Reforestation, forest management;

L. Surveys and research: Social and economic, community, geological, hydrologic, industrial;

M. Planning: Municipal government, urban;

N. Community planning and development: Schools, living units, community centers, developing water supplies;

O. Nursing: Practical nursing, midwifery, first aid, nurses aids;

P. Sanitation: Wells, latrines, malaria control, disease prevention.

5. Ease of implementation: There is considerable variation, among the countries visited, as to the ease of implementation of Youth Corps projects. These variations were based upon the following factors:

A. Attitude of both government and country nationals toward Youth Corps program;

B. Development of broad planning for the country:

C. Government stability;

D. Language requirements;

E. Existing country organizations or institutions;

F. Living conditions available;

G. Availability of counterparts;

H. Health conditions.

6. Contribution by host government: Possible methods by which the host governments could aid or contribute to a Youth Corps program were investigated during the surveys. In some countries, it seems to be apparent that almost no governmental assistance will be possible. In others, offers were made to assist with orientation and training, housing, and even, in a few instances, with partial financial assistance.

CHAPTER IX. COST

The evidence thus far gathered indicates that the overall cost to the U.S. Government of the kind of Youth Corps described in this report would lie somewhere between $5,000 and $15,000 annually for each corps member, including the expenses of recruitment and selection, training and orientation, travel, pay and allowances, leadership, logistical and administrative support in the United States and abroad.

The size of the corps, the type of project, the choice of operational method, the availability of local currency reserves overseas, and the willingness of the host government to meet part of the costs, all would influence the actual budget. In round numbers, however, a $50 million annual investment should be able to support a 5,000-man corps in operation.

Fifty million dollars is only 1⅓ percent of the total foreign aid appropriations for fiscal year 1961 and is considerably less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our total Federal budget for the current fiscal year. It amounts to about 2½ cents a month per U.S. citizen.

CHAPTER X. SUMMARY

This report contains the preliminary findings of a study of "* * * the advisability and practicability of a program * * * under which young U.S. citizens would be trained and serve abroad in programs of technical cooperation."

The study was undertaken by the Colorado State University Research Foundation in accordance with this provision of the Mutual Security Act of 1960.

To carry out its research, the staff, after extensive interviews with qualified consultants, designed a series of hypotheses regarding the major issues to be examined in the study. These hypotheses were then tested through continuing interviews, questionnaires to several thousand individuals, field trips to 10 countries abroad, and depth studies of key problems. The data from all these sources is now being analyzed and will be published in the final report of this study at the end of April.

The evidence to date indicates that a Youth Corps could serve the national interest in several ways, although primarily as an effective instrument of assistance to economic progress in the world's less developed areas. It is not what we give but what we share and learn that is at the heart of the Youth Corps concept.

The fundamental characteristics of the Youth Corps are that—

1. Its members will undertake operational assignments requiring their special skill or ability at the grassroots level, working wherever possible with the host country counterparts, in carefully planned development programs;

2. It will be open to both men and women (including a few married couples), roughly from ages 20 to 30, qualified by education and/or experience, usually for 2-year terms, and without draft exemption;

3. As much as possible, its members will be reimbursed at the same rate, and will live under the same conditions, as do nationals of the host country in similar occupations, although with adequate safeguards for protection of health, vitality, and morale.

In the U.S. Government, the program will be administered by an agency established within the framework of the overall aid program, with appropriate advisory committees at policy and operational levels. Operations normally will not be carried out directly by this agency but rather through grants to, and agreements or contracts with, private organizations, foundations, universities, and other government agencies, as well as through the United Nations and other multilateral organizations. A major part of the Youth Corps activity will consist of a continuing review and evaluation of all aspects of its program and operations.

Abroad, the corps' activities in most cases will be determined by a binational board operating within an agreed-upon country development program, representative of all major operating groups, and largely autonomous within the general policy established by bilateral agreement.

There is a vast number of ways in which Youth Corps members can be used. All the countries surveyed indicated either a willingness or a strong desire to utilize corpsmen, particularly in such projects as (a) education (especially teaching English, science, literacy, adult education, and vocational education); (a) community and rural development (agriculture programs, home programs, cottage industries, building schools and roads, and adult and youth clubs); (c) health and sanitation (nursing, technical assistants, mother and child care, and sanitation).

American young people have demonstrated a keen interest in serving in the corps. The selection, orientation, and training of corps members is perhaps the most critical problem in determining the program's success; in general, a corpsman must have a special skill, unusual personal qualities, a thorough orientation, and language training before he can participate.

The total annual investment in the program would probably range from $5,000 to $15,000 a year for each member of the corps.

Is a Youth Corps advisable and practical? The results of the study thus far show clearly that the answer is "Yes."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 27, 1961]

YOUTH CORPS NEEDS OUTLINED

(By Julius Duscha)

President Kennedy was urged yesterday to set up a Youth Corps that would furnish skilled workers as well as teachers and nurses to underdeveloped countries.

The recommendations were in a report submitted by three professors following surveys in 10 Asian, African, and Latin American countries.

A White House adviser said that the report parallels the administration's thinking.

SPECIAL MESSAGE LIKELY

Mr. Kennedy is eager to establish an International Youth Corps and may send Congress a special message this week outlining his plans.

The President's advisers believe that the program should be started quickly but on a relatively small scale to avoid mistakes that could discredit the Youth Corps idea.

The report, prepared by Maurice L. Albertson, Pauline E. Birky, and Andrew E. Rice, of Colorado State University, also stresses caution.

The professors made no recommendations on the size of the program, but they did note that a Youth Corps of 5,000 would probably cost $50 million a year.

After visiting Nigeria and Gabon in Africa; Thailand, India, Pakistan, and the Philippines in Asia; and Colombia, Mexico, Chile, and Haiti in Latin America, the survey team concluded that the corps would be welcomed in all 10 of the countries.

GREATEST NEEDS LISTED

The greatest needs which the Youth Corps could fulfill, the report said, were education, including vocational training as well as the teaching of reading and writing; development projects involving agriculture, industry, schools, and roads; and the improvement of health through nursing and sanitation programs.

Other possible projects mentioned in the report include irrigation and flood control programs, secretarial training, forestry and fisheries management, and assistance in the development of such home industries as weaving, handicrafts, and pottery.

Youths would be selected for the corps largely on the basis of their technical skills and would be trained in the language of the area where they would serve.

A training period of about 6 months would be required, with half of the schooling probably in this country and the other half abroad.

The corps would accept persons from 20 to 30 years old who would be willing to spend at least 2 years abroad. A limited number of married couples would be included, but both the husband and wife would have to have skills needed in a country.

Wherever possible, corps members would be used to help carry out such existing programs as food-for-peace and other economic assistance. Efforts also would be made to have members work with voluntary agencies in the underdeveloped countries.

Members of the corps would be paid little more than a subsistence allowance and would be, the report noted, "operational-level workers rather than advisory-level technicians or experts."

BASIS FOR DEFERMENT

Service in the corps, which is expected to be headed by R. Sargent Schriver, Mr. Kennedy's brother-in-law, would not be an alternative for military service but would be sufficient reason for a draft deferment.

The President supported the Youth Corps idea in the campaign last fall. The proposal was previously made by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

Yesterday's report was part of a study authorized by Congress last year and carried out under the direction of the International Cooperation Administration. Several members of the Colorado State faculty have been investigating the idea for some time.

In January a Youth Corps task force headed by Prof. Max F. Millikan, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, also recommended to Mr. Kennedy that the program be developed cautiously.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for many years I have been deeply interested in legislation to conserve our precious wilderness areas. Some 5 years ago it was my privilege to introduce proposed legislation which would establish

a national wilderness preservation system. Therefore, I am most pleased at the prompt action which is being taken by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in considering the so-called wilderness bill, S. 174, as introduced by the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], of which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

I have discussed this proposed legislation with many of the groups interested in wilderness area legislation. I have also discussed it in considerable detail with the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I feel that if we can enact the proposal introduced by the Senator from New Mexico we shall have made a significant advance in the protection and the preservation of some of the great recreational areas so vitally needed in a country which has a growing population.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my able friend yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to my associate in this endeavor, the distinguished Senator from California, who has been a valiant and consistent supporter of wilderness preservation areas.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend, and I let the RECORD show that I acknowledge the able senior Senator from Minnesota as the leader in the cause of wilderness preservation legislation during the years I have had the honor of serving in the Senate.

I say to the Senator, as a member of the committee which is holding hearings on the bill and as a coauthor with him in this endeavor, I have every reason to believe that this year the proposed wilderness legislation—carefully, properly, and reasonably drawn, as my friend and I know it has been—will come to the Senate and can pass, as it ought to, with, I think, a greater opportunity of receiving House of Representatives approval than ever before.

We had hearings yesterday and again today. I think it has been pretty clearly demonstrated that the rule of reason has been followed in the drafting of the bill and that there is no sound or solid ground upon which people should oppose its passage. In my judgment, we have now, I say to my able friend the majority whip, an opportunity to do that which he has desired to do for many years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator, my colleague from California, the minority whip.

Mr. President, I add that the proposal which is now before the committee is a product of several years of careful study and refinement. We have come a long way during these years of controversy, discussion, and hearings in perfecting the bill, which I believe, as the Senator from California has said, meets every requirement of sound legislation and ought not provoke any major opposition, because it is a reasonable, a fair, and a judicious approach to this very serious and at times controversial problem.

Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to commend the junior Senator from New Mexico for the leadership which he is giving toward the enactment of this important conservation measure.

It is my hope that the history books will record that one of the great achievements of the 87th Congress was the passage of this proposed legislation to preserve our national wilderness areas. The time is ripe for such action, and I am confident that this Congress will recognize the need of acting at this time.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in support of this wilderness bill, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 23, be printed at this point in the RECORD, along with a statement which I have presented in support of this legislation to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1961]

PRESERVING THE WILDERNESS

Each year more people, more houses, and more industry encroach on the remaining open land in the United States. Only diligent conservation will preserve for future generations the wilderness areas which were the mark of frontier America and which are an important part of the Nation's patrimony. Once again Congress has a chance, at very little cost to the taxpayer, to secure this heritage of forest, river, and wildlife by a speedy enactment of the national wilderness protection bill now reintroduced by Senator ANDERSON.

As Mr. ANDERSON noted in presenting the measure, it has been 5 years since the first wilderness bill was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY; through two Congresses and four printed volumes of testimony the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has considered such a bill. "Objections, eliminations * * * and the inclusion of various special provisions." There should be no responsible opposition to the Senator's new bill.

The measure is not a sweeping change. It envisages no reorganization of present land agencies; no new bureaus would be created. It merely sets aside certain wilderness areas, unspoiled by manmade changes, in perpetuity. There are ample safeguards for cattle grazing and industrial interests and provision for periodic review of the wilderness tracts.

Indeed, all the lands that could be dedicated to wilderness use and protection are already within established national forests, parks, or refuges. They make up only 5 percent of the Federal lands. This bill is, in reality, only the beginning of what is needed for the future, but it is the necessary first step. Unless lawmakers act soon much of the opportunity for preservation of these natural havens and retreats will be forever lost.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, IN SUPPORT OF S. 174, TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM, FEBRUARY 28, 1961

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I thank you very much for this privilege of testifying in support of the wilderness bill, S. 174, and I commend especially Senator ANDERSON for his leadership in developing this legislation and advancing its consideration. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important measure.

This is an excellent measure, one that should make sure that some parts of America may always remain unspoiled and beautiful in their own natural way, untrammeled by men and unmarred by machinery. I am happy to be among its cosponsors. It is a measure that gives expression to a policy which has long been a reality in the minds and hearts of the American people but has never yet been embodied in legislation. If these hearings lead—as I believe they should and trust they will—to the enactment of this congressional charter for wilderness, this occasion will long be looked upon as one with historic significance.

After the conference on northwest wilderness held in Portland, Oreg., in April of 1956, when we were developing a wilderness bill in draft form for the first time and submitting it for criticism and suggestions—2 months before its first introduction—one of the participants in the conference wrote me a letter and said: "The proposal to establish a national wilderness preservation system, in which your role is so prominent, was presented to us and talked about in great detail at the conference banquet—its first unveiling before the general public. Then, and all the following day," said this letter, "there was something that made us sense that we were participating in an event of special significance."

Mr. Chairman, I think we feel that way here today. After a decade of earnest study on the part of organizations and individuals devoted to the public interest in preserving some of the remnants of primeval America that are still within our keeping as citizens, we undertook some 5 years ago to formulate a legislative program that would accomplish our preservation purposes without damaging any other public program or sacrificing any other existing interests. For 4 years, through two Congresses, this measure has been subected to hearings, criticisms, revisions, and reintroductions. We now have in Senator ANDERSON'S S. 174 the culmination of all this that has gone before, and I want to commend this bill heartily and urge that it be promptly and favorably reported to the Senate.

The consideration that you, Mr. Chairman, and your colleagues are now so earnestly giving this proposal is a significant contribution to the conservation history of this country, and I do indeed feel it a privilege to be a participant.

IN THE NICK OF TIME

Four years ago when I addressed the first hearing on this measure, I had the feeling that we were approaching this undertaking just in the nick of time. I was convinced then that the chance to provide for wilderness preservation without interfering with other programs will not last very long. Four years later I feel this even more strongly and consider it fortunate that our opportunity is still as good as it is. We should indeed act promptly.

Our conservation situation becomes constantly more difficult. Those of us in the Congress who are vitally interested are indeed worried, and with good cause. We see the pressure that is coming, and, as elected representatives, we see our duty to do something before all the horses have been driven out of all our barns. There seems to be a crisis every day in the world which we live, and the only way we are going to change this is by looking ahead and taking timely action.

That is what this wilderness bill proposes to do. Instead of waiting until the crisis has engulfed us, we can, through this legislation, make secure the preservation of these areas that do now, in effect, constitute our national wilderness system—the areas that are now, in fact, handled as wilderness, even though they serve other and consistent purposes, also. Doing that now means providing security for what we already have, perpetuating the multiple-purpose programs we now

have on those areas, and making sure that multiple purpose on these lands always includes wilderness preservation.

OUR REMARKABLE OPPORTUNITY

Let me hasten to emphasize that the situation which puts us under such a pressing obligation to provide wilderness protection also still presents us a remarkably rich opportunity.

It is indeed fortunate that, after the centuries we have spent in developing this continent, we do still have some large areas of wilderness. It is doubly fortunate that many of these areas are federally owned and are also included in parks, forests, or refuges, or other kinds of reservations within which the wilderness has so far been preserved in keeping with the purposes of the reservations.

Some 48 or so national parks and monuments have within them unspoiled areas large enough to be called wilderness. I estimate that some 20 or so of the national wildlife refuges and ranges do, too. Within the national forests there are some 82 areas that have been designated by the Forest Service for protection as wilderness.

Putting all these together, we have 150 or so areas of wilderness in Federal ownership that are also inside areas within which wilderness can be preserved consistently with other purposes, as part of what might be called a multipurpose wilderness preservation program.

PROTECTION BY LAW NEEDED

At present, however, there is no law of Congress which protects these areas of wilderness as wilderness, although the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act passed last year does make plain that the preservation of wilderness within the national forests has congressional endorsement, and wilderness preservation is indeed an assumed purpose of our national parks.

Even in the national parks and monuments, however, the pressures for roads and nonwilderness recreational and tourist developments threaten in many places to destroy the primeval back-country wilderness. In the national forests, the wilderness, wild, primitive, and canoe areas have been set up administratively and could be abolished or greatly reduced by a future Secretary of Agriculture. In fact, none of our Federal wilderness has the protection which Congress could give by providing for wilderness preservation as a national policy applied to a definite system of areas.

PART OF AN OVERALL PROGRAM

This wilderness bill will provide this needed protection, and in such a way as to be integrated without violence into the land-management policies and programs that have already been so carefully developed. This bill shows how we still can preserve in America an adequate system of wilderness areas without sacrificing any other program. But there will not long be any such areas unless we do deliberately preserve them as wilderness. So I consider this program both readily feasible and also urgent.

It appears to me to be as easy to accomplish as it is important. It will be part of an overall land-management program that encompasses also our other needs.

There need be no essential conflict. No area now devoted to any economic purpose, or to any other development program, is withdrawn from its use by this legislation. The proposed legislation, rather, is based on the understanding that we in America still have the opportunity for preserving wilderness while at the same time meeting, outside our wilderness reserves, all our needs for commodities and for developed recreation areas. It is, for example, in no sense in conflict with, or in competition with, forestry for timber and other economic products. On the contrary, foresters are among those upon whom our wilderness program is, in reality, dependent for its success.

If ever the American people come to the borders of our wilderness areas with a need for timber that cannot be met elsewhere, then our wilderness areas will be doomed.

Thus, it is to the foresters of America, and to their effective programs for sustained yield cutting on their production forests, that we must look for success in wilderness preservation.

We recognize this, and we face our program in a spirit of cooperation and with a feeling of dependence on the intelligent foresters of America for support.

Similarly, we contemplate cooperation and integration with other enterprises that may likewise be inconsistent within a wilderness and yet thoroughly consistent with the preservation of wilderness as a part of an overall program.

IMPORTANCE OF OTHER PROGRAMS RESPECTED

Not only in a general or overall sense, but also, specifically, with regard to each area involved, this proposal is one that respects the importance of other programs. It is a multiple-purpose wilderness program. Every area included in the proposed national wilderness preservation system is now serving some other purpose, or purposes, consistent with the continued protection of the area as wilderness. Under this legislation, these areas will continue to serve these purposes, and they will be administered by the same agencies that now handle them.

The central concept of this measure, as I see it, is that our present areas of wilderness can be preserved within the existing land-management pattern if the preservation purpose is made a matter of fundamental policy.

Rather than upsetting the multiple-use program of the Forest Service, for example, this legislation should help prevent the upset that would result if the wilderness areas are not protected from the uses that would destroy them as wilderness.

As to national park and monument areas to be included, the bill gives added protection as wilderness for the portions not needed for roads and accommodations, and yet sets no limitation on the portions that may be designated for such use, as needed. Park areas will continue to serve park purposes, just as forest areas will continue to serve forest purposes.

The areas in national wildlife refuges and ranges to be included will continue to serve their wildlife purposes. Some wilderness is essential for the preservation of our native species of wilderness wildlife. This measure, accordingly, will help insure our having a few areas devoted primarily to the preservation of wildlife through the protection of their wilderness environment.

Thus for every area to be included in this system, wilderness preservation will be an aspect of its management for some other concurrent purpose.

NO SPECIAL-USE PRIVILEGES

I might also emphasize this in the negative, by pointing out that the bill does not establish any special-use privilege, nor does it provide for any special users. Rather than being concerned with any special use or user, it relates instead to the character of the areas involved. Hunting, for example, although it is not mentioned in the bill, will continue to be a major recreation within many national forest units of the system and will be prohibited in national parks. Wherever there is hunting, it will be wilderness hunting. That is the force of this measure.

Uses of all the various kinds of lands involved will continue to vary. The common concern is that wilderness conditions will persist, whatever the uses.

A WILDERNESS POLICY

The first achievement of this bill, in my opinion, will be its establishment of a clear cut national policy for preserving, for both the present and the future, some of what remains of our resource of wilderness. In line with such a policy, the Congress as I read the bill, gives sanction to the policies and programs of the Agriculture and Interior Departments under whose wise administration our great resource of wilderness has so far been preserved. And the measure provides a way whereby this policy and this sanction can take effect in a practical program.

THE SYSTEM

I view as of central importance in this program the establishment of the national wilderness preservation system, to be made up of areas of primeval America that are still wilderness and in Federal ownership and capable of being kept that way without interfering with other present purposes now being served by these lands. This will not mean any transfer of areas from one agency of government to another, nor any change of jurisdiction. No new land-administering agency will be created.

The fact should be emphasized that this national wilderness preservation system will be made up of areas that are already in Federal ownership and are already within parks, forests, or refuges.

Each such area will remain as at present, park, forest, or refuge, as it is now administered. It will continue to serve the multiple purposes it now serves and under the jurisdiction of the same agency that now protects it. The difference will lie on the fact that from now on the agency having jurisdiction over any areas within this system will have the sanction and encouragement of Congress and the legal responsibility for preserving the area's wilderness character. It will have the responsibility for seeing that other purposes continue to be served in such a way as to prevent damage to the wilderness.

Each such area will thus come under special protection as part of the Nation's still unspoiled heritage of the primeval.

PROPER USE

Besides giving expression to a national policy and providing for the establishment of a wilderness preservation system, this bill also describes and provides for the proper use of the areas of wilderness it is designed to preserve.

In this connection, I should like to emphasize again that this proposal is not one for any special-use or special-privilege legislation.

The first and topic sentence of the section of this bill that relates to uses of the areas within this system (sec. 6) expresses a key concept in this proposal. It states firmly that "nothing in this act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purposes stated in the establishment of, or pertaining to, any national park or monument or other unit of the national park system, or any forest, wildlife refuge, game range, or other area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the wilderness system shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purposes as also to preserve its wilderness character."

Under this proposal, for example, the parts of the national forests involved would continue under the same kind of administration they now have. Grazing permits, for instance, could be continued as at present. The basic multiple purposes of the national forests would be maintained.

National parks, national wildlife refuges, and any other areas would also, as already pointed out, continue to serve their own distinctive purposes.

No use privileges of any kind will be created by this proposed law. The only added responsibility of each administering agency will be to see that the areas in the system under its jurisdiction remains wilderness—as they now are. I reiterate, this bill deals only with preserving wilderness as such in connection with various other land uses and does not create any "special privilege," or provide for only special users.

CONCLUSION

Our civilization moves fast. Our population pressures are growing. The time when we still have the opportunity to provide for the preservation of wilderness without having to interfere with other programs will not be with us long. I urge prompt and sympathetic consideration of this bill.

This is a far-reaching, carefully thought-out proposal. It deserves and requires the consideration of all who are concerned with the values that we place on our wilderness.

At the 1954 annual meeting of the Society of American Foresters, Dr. James P. Gilligan, then a member of the forestry department of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, speaking on wilderness preservation, commented as follows:

"Wilderness supporters have been chiefly defense minded, rushing to prevent developments that may have been carefully drawn and justified. The majority of areas now called wilderness exist because recreational or industrial development have not, as yet, been economically feasible. If there were well-defined purposes and plans for a national wilderness system which could generate common support, the wilderness movement might well be irrepressible. As it is, the disagreement among wilderness proponents is a highly important deterrent to wilderness preservation in this country."

Here is a bill which I trust can generate common support and firmly establish a sound wilderness preservation policy and program.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I commend the Senate for its action in regard to the Office of International Travel, the legislation sponsored by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. President, in a recent message to Congress, the President stated foreign travel to the United States represents a large potential market which is virtually untapped.

Facts made available by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee show that Americans spent $1.2 billion more abroad last year than foreign visitors spent in the United States.

It is my hope Congress will pass legislation establishing an Office of International Travel under the Commerce Department which will be designed to promote and advertise America as well as launch a program to relax restrictions on requirements for visas. We must make it attractive and easier for international travelers to come to America. The Senate has acted to implement this program.

In keeping with the President's urgent efforts to bring foreign tourist spending to America, I want to commend the Civil Aeronautics Board for its recent proposed policy which will permit certificated and otherwise qualified supplemental air carriers to exploit the international charter market without undue delays and preflight board consideration and approval.

According to the supplemental Airline Trade Association, the Supplemental Air Carrier Conference, these certificated carriers have already started plans to stimulate and promote air charters from foreign cities to the United States.

The establishment of travel offices by the Commerce Department in major foreign cities will become a vital factor in keeping a brisk flow of tourists coming to our country. Such offices will also represent a key impetus for return flights for American charter carriers, as well as our regular flag carriers.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO THE QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the 81st Congress and in every succeeding Congress I have introduced for several other Senators and myself a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment regarding the qualifications of electors participating in the election of elective Federal officials, including electors for President and Vice President, Senators and Representatives in Congress. This resolution, in substance, has proposed that the Constitution be amended to prohibit the imposition of a poll tax or other tax or any property qualification as a prerequisite for qualifying to vote for elected Federal officials. The control of State and local elections would be left to the States.

Hearings were held on this resolution by subcommittees of the Senate Judiciary Committee in the 81st, 83d, 84th, and 86th Congresses. In 1956 and 1959 such subcommittees recommended that it be favorably reported by the full Judiciary Committee. On February 2, 1960, the Senate, by a vote of 72 to 16, incorporated this proposal into Senate Joint Resolution 39, then pending, relating to House vacancies, and passed the amended resolution by a vote of 70 to 18. For tactical reasons, the House Judiciary Committee deleted the poll tax provision from the resolution. However, Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, in a statement on the House floor, reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 10, pages 12556–12557, pledged his full support for this amendment during this the 87th Congress.

I am glad to announce that in reintroducing this joint resolution today, I am joined by the following distinguished Senators as cosponsors: Senators KEFAUVER, LONG of Louisiana, SMATHERS, YARBOROUGH, and HUMPHREY.

We sponsors of this joint resolution strongly believe that the proposed constitutional amendment should be speedily submitted by this Congress to the States for ratification, and, if so submitted, we believe it will be quickly ratified by at least the required 38 States. Because we are so sure that the requisite number of States would speedily ratify the proposed amendment, we are quite agreeable to any reasonable time limit for its consideration and ratification by the various States.

The poll tax requirement, now limited to five States, namely Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia, has been accorded far greater importance than it deserves. The fact of the matter is that the amount of poll tax now required to be paid in the several States is so small as to impose only a slight economic obstacle for any citizen who desires to qualify to cast a ballot. This requirement operates, of course, equally on citizens of all races and colors and is generally subject to important exemptions which limit its application, such as the exemption of veterans, of women, and of citizens beyond a certain age. Nevertheless the question has remained a vexing one.

Many good citizens have indicated their feeling that this subject matter should be dealt with by the passage of a Federal statute rather than through the adoption of a Federal constitutional amendment. Many Senators, of whom I am one, feel very strongly that the Federal Government is without any authority whatsoever to deal with this subject matter except by the submission for ratification of a Federal constitutional amendment. Our position is concurred in by many able constitutional lawyers from every section of the Nation, who believe and contend that the only legal way to deal with this question, other than through action by the States themselves, is by Federal constitutional amendment, and that action through Federal statute would clearly violate the provisions of article I, section 2 and of the 17th amendment of the Constitution, both of which state that electors for Federal officials in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The introducers of the proposed amendment are exceedingly anxious that it be acted upon speedily and favorably by the Congress so that this subject matter, which has been the source of such long controversy and fruitless debate, may be quickly submitted to the jury of the States, where we believe that it will be promptly ratified. We feel that such a conclusion of this long-standing controversy is decidedly in the interest of sound democratic government and stronger unity among all of the people of our Nation.

For myself and on behalf of the other Senators whom I have named, I now introduce a joint resolution proposing the said constitutional amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks, and that the joint

resolution lie on the desk until March 6, in order to give an opportunity for other Senators to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Florida.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 58) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE ——

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualification.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this article shall be construed to invalidate any provision of law denying the right to vote to paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions.

"SEC. 3. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropropriate legislation."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution lie on the table for the remainder of this week, until the session of Monday of next week, to give any Senators who may wish to become cosponsors of the joint resolution the opportunity to indicate that desire.

Those of us who sponsor the proposed constitutional amendment will welcome the added sponsorship of any additional Senators whose convictions are in accord with ours in this matter.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I gladly yield to my distinguished friend from Texas, and I wish to express here on the floor of the Senate my appreciation for his cooperation in joining as one of the cosponsors in the introduction of the joint resolution, which I think is important.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his words.

As a cosponsor of the joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to abolish the poll tax in Federal elections, I want to associate myself with the remarks on this subject made by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida and to commend him for his long and tireless work to remove restrictions on voting for all Americans.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly appreciate the kind comment of the Senator from Texas. I gladly yield the floor to him.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is no mere coincidence that in the 1960 presidential election that five of the seven States which had the lowest percentage of citizens voting are States which still require purchase of a poll tax as a ticket to the voting booth.

The 1960 Election Score Board, a highly informative booklet prepared by the American Heritage Foundation, shows that my own home State of Texas ranked down in 44th place among the States with only 43.3 percent of civilians of voting age casting a ballot. Other States where payment of a poll tax is a prerequisite for qualifying to vote ranked low also.

That is true despite the fact that there was the highest interest in my State that ever obtained in any presidential election. The Democratic nominees received the highest number of popular votes that any Democratic nominee had ever received in my State. The Republican nominees, likewise, received the highest number of votes that any Republican nominee had ever received in my State. The Republican nominees in 1960 received a larger popular vote than President Eisenhower had received in the previous election, in spite of the fact that, among other things, he had been born in my State. However, only 43.3 percent of the civilians of voting age in my State cast a ballot, despite the high interest in my State, particularly due to the fact that a native son was on the ballot.

This is not to say that the poll tax is by any means entirely responsible for the lamentable failure of many to participate in our incomparable system of government by consent of the governed. But it is to point out the undeniable fact that the poll tax is one of the several barriers to voting, and it should be removed.

There are those who scoff at the idea that having to pay $1.50 or $1.75 for a poll tax in January keeps people from the polls in July or November. But let us consider this matter. If you were head of one of the thousands of low income families in Texas, with weekly pay of $30 or $40 or less, what week would you feel like you could spend $1.75, or $3.50 for yourself and your wife, for poll taxes? You know, $3.50 will buy meat and potatoes and beans for several meals for a family that is barely getting along. Right now we have too many families in Texas and America who cannot find the jobs they need even to earn the necessities of life.

Those who contend the poll tax is no barrier to voting generally admit that it may keep a few people from the polls, but they say it is no serious deterrent. I disagree. Like most Americans, I consider the privilege of voting to be our most precious heritage. The fact that a poll tax keeps even a small percentage of people from participation in their free government is sufficient grounds for its abolition, so far as I am concerned.

The joint resolution, which I am cosponsoring, under leadership of the junior Senator from Florida, would abolish the poll tax in Federal elections by sound constitutional process. The matter would be submitted to each of the 50 States for ratification. It is the consensus that once Congress acts in this field, that the State legislatures soon will move to eliminate the poll tax in State elections.

Over many years, both here and at the State level, I have worked for elimination of the poll tax, and I once again assure all concerned that I will cooperate with any responsible group at the State level to remove this voting limitation in State elections as well as for other sound election law reforms.

It is my hope that with many Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, supporting this proposal that it will receive prompt action.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish again to express my appreciation to the Senator from Texas. He is completely right in his feeling that the vote in his own State would show a great increase following the removal of this handicap, the poll tax. I say that on the basis of our experience in the State which I represent in part.

In 1937, as a member of the State senate, I participated in the repeal of the poll tax requirement for all voting, just as the distinguished Senator from Texas has stated the hope that his State may do. Immediately, in my State, participation in elections at all levels was stepped up. It was shown clearly that this was not a racial matter—because the increased voter participation occurred both with respect to our white citizens and our colored citizens. There was an immediate increase in both the number of participants and the percentage of participants.

What was even better, there was an immediate disappearance of certain bad practices in connection with control of votes by the payment of poll taxes, which had been prevalent in only a few counties in our State.

I believe that every observer in our State since that time has joined in the statement that not only has there been greater participation in our elections, but that they have also been cleaner and freer from any thought of control by any group.

I thank my distinguished friend from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The statement just made by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida with reference to the actual experience in another State following the abolition of the poll tax, strengthens my determination to support the proposed constitutional amendment. I shall support efforts, as I have in the past, to amend our own Constitution to eliminate poll taxes in our State elections. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the efforts of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Texas with respect to the constitutional amendment to eliminate poll taxes in Federal elections. This is a constructive, responsible approach to a very serious problem. The Senator from Florida has for many years pursued this course, at a time when the Senator

from Minnesota was pursuing a course related to the legislative approach. I may well still prefer the legislative approach, but I do feel that any doubt as to constitutionality, if there is such doubt, would be resolved by the constitutional amendment approach.

The Senator from Texas has indicated the importance of the proposed legislation in reference to the exercise of the franchise and the integrity of our democratic processes. I am happy to join both Senators.

Mr. HOLLAND. I warmly thank the Senator from Minnesota for joining in our effort. I appreciate his joinder, and I am certain that it will be most helpful.

On the second point the Senator has made, I wish to call attention to what is a practical point of view; namely, last year it was demonstrated that this measure can be brought to a vote in the Senate and passed overwhelmingly by much more than the required two-thirds vote.

We have found, from previous experiences when we discussed the statutory handling of this problem, that in no instance was it possible to bring the matter to a vote on the floor of the Senate. Here is a measure at which nobody can cavil as to its constitutionality, and where the problem, once submitted to the States, is left to the "jury of the States," which our Founding Fathers thought should be the last word of authority on a question of such importance as to be included within the Constitution.

I certainly am happy that the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota has joined as a cosponsor. I welcome his association, and I welcome the joint sponsorship of any other Senator on either side of the aisle.

I should say that at this stage I have made no attempt to gain joint sponsorships on the other side of the aisle, simply because I had not expected to have other joiners than the little group of us from the South; and the Senator from Minnesota, when he found we were about to introduce the joint resolution, came forward as a volunteer. I appreciate that, and I welcome him just as warmly as it is possible for me to welcome him, because I know what a doughty fighter he is when he becomes interested in a cause, as he is in this one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Florida. Many of us who have been so-called advocates of civil rights have, I believe, a responsibility, when a practical proposal such as this has been presented and is before us, to support it. It may not meet all the requirements of some of the advocates, but I know that if we can pass it, we will have done everything we have been talking about.

Frankly, I think the time for talk on the subject of eliminating poll taxes is over. I think we need action. I compliment the distinguished Senator from Florida for his perseverance and for what I believe to be his excellent performance in this matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. In the field of civil rights and equal treatment under the law, I have cast my votes for bills under the legislative process to attain those ends. Also, on a number of occasions I have told the distinguished Senator from Florida that I enthusiastically supported the proposal which he offered. I simply want him to know that I shall be delighted, once again, to do what I can to speed the proposal of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on its way; and if, under the circumstances which obtain at this moment, my name might indicate a bipartisan approach to this matter, I should be happy to be listed as a cosponsor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Not only do I welcome the Senator; I welcome him warmly. I say to him and to the Nation that when we can get California and Florida to pull together, something is apt to have to give.

Mr. KUCHEL. I agree with the Senator from Florida. That goes for my friend, his able colleague from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and also, I must say, for those grapefruit which I am very much pleased to eat from time to time when I am unable to get any of the citrus which my own State is able to produce.

Mr. HOLLAND. Again I compliment the Senator from California upon the excellent judgment he has shown.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say that Minnesota will be glad to accept citrus from either State. [Laughter.]

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE WALTER M. MUMMA, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a resolution coming over from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair) laid before the Senate a resolution (H. Res. 188) coming over from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S., *February 27, 1961.*

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable WALTER M. MUMMA, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of twenty-nine Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT], I submit a resolution which I ask to have read, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 100) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Honorable WALTER M. MUMMA, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the second resolving clause of the resolution, the Chair appoints the two Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT] as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative MUMMA.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late distinguished Representative from Pennsylvania, WALTER M. MUMMA, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative MUMMA, adjourned until Thursday, March 2, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, February 28, 1961:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.
Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York.
Charles W. Yost, of New York.
Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York.
Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York.
John Howard Morrow, of New Jersey.
Charles P. Noyes, of New York.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

William B. Macomber, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

Clifton R. Wharton, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Philip H. Coombs, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

UNITED NATIONS

Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and a deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

William Lucius Cary, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1961.

J. Allen Frear, of Delaware, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1965.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Charles M. Meriwether, of Alabama, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Frank W. McCulloch, of Illinois, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 27, 1965.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Joseph P. McMurray, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1961.

GOVERNOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Ralphael M. Paiewonsky, of the Virgin Islands, to be Governor of the Virgin Islands.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Ramsey Clark, of Texas, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Perry W. Morton, resigned.

Herbert J. Miller, Jr., of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Malcolm R. Wilkey, resigned.

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

William Lucius Cary, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 5, 1966.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Joseph P. McMurray, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1965.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306, and 3307.

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Thomas Jahn Sands, O17521, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Carson Bullock, O17635, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Francis Regis Seitz, O17734, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Barksdale Hamlett, O18143, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Hugh Mackintosh, O17716, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Orlando Collette Troxel, Jr., O18487, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert John Fleming, Jr., O17095, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, O18072, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Edward Beauchamp, O18238, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Hiram Dudley Ives, O29509, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Frederick Cassidy, O18354, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. August Schomburg, O18422, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Breckinridge Duff, O18438, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Earle Fremont Cook, O18450, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be major general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Carl Willard Tempel, O18284, Medical Corps (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. John Joseph Davis, O18530, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Tabb Snodgrass, O29670, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Wilson Power, O18691, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harrison Alan Gerhardt, O18697, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ashton Herbert Manhart, O18773, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Ramsey Pugh, O18790, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles John Timmes, O29777, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Irvin Louis Allen, O29810, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alden Kingsland Sibley, O18964, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, O18968, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Thomas Honeycutt, O18975, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Gardner Shinkle, O18979, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alvin Charles Welling, O18983, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. David Warren Gray, O18988, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Francis Joseph McNorrow, O18995, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Theodore John Conway, O19015, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Chester Arthur Dahlen, O19020, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig Gen. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Henry Chase, O19095, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edgar Collins Doleman, O19131, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frederick Robert Zierath, O19211, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Graydon Casper Essman, O19242, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Ralph Yancey, O42256, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Gines Perez, O30126, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, O19402, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frank Willoughby Moorman, O19444, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., O19479, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Louis Alfred Walsh, Jr., O19567, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Alexander Cunningham 3d, O19579, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Achilles Lacy Tynes, O18916, Medical Corps (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Chaplain

Chaplain (brigadier general) William Joseph Moran, O29195, U.S. Army (colonel, Chaplain, U.S. Army).

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 28, 1961:

COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Walter N. Tobriner, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 28, 1961:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Arthur Alden Kimball, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years, expiring August 27, 1965, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Daniel 9: 4: *I prayed unto the Lord my God, and made my confession.*

Almighty God, inspire us now with an awareness of Thy presence that there may come into our hearts a sense of peace and power transcending all our restlessness and weakness.

We humbly acknowledge that we are again and again bewildered by the confusion in the world which surrounds us and are tempted to become cynical and despondent.

Impart unto us a new spirit that will enable us to carry on bravely when the winds are contrary and the gathering clouds of adversity obscure our vision of Thy purposes.

Grant that daily it may become increasingly clear that we cannot meet