persons—to determine the necessary steps to provide protection for domestic industries. Also the committee would see what could be done by enterprising exploration and official negotiations to improve the opportunity for new markets in other countries.

After the recess, I believe that Congress should take speedy action to set up this committee. In the interests of the overall economy, we cannot too long endure losses by domestic firms—which affects not only firms but our workers and the overall economy.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is a brief review of a few of the problems involved in further strengthening our economy.

Again, I want to stress that, as one sector advances, the whole economy is benefited; conversely, as any segment suffers, so does the whole economy—not only in terms of loss of business and industrial activity, but in jobs for the workers of the country.

Needed: New Study To Expand Trade and Commerce Through St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 9, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the St. Lawrence Seaway—completed in 1959—offers new, untested opportunity for expanded trade and commerce. The challenge now is to take full advantage of the great potential.

As a sponsor of the original Seaway law, Public Law 358, of the 83d Congress, I am particularly concerned with assuring that (a) the Seaway fulfills its full potential in terms of market opportunity for Wisconsin, and the great agricultural-industrial complex of the upper Midwest; and (b) that it pays off the costs of operation and construction—a $140 million investment by the American people.

A comprehensive review, and exploitation of, the potential is absolutely essential—if the Seaway is to fulfill these objectives.

Recently, I contacted the Secretary of Commerce to urge that a comprehensive study be undertaken by the Department of Commerce aiming toward improving and expanding trade and commerce through the St. Lawrence Seaway. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my letter to Secretary Mueller urging such a study printed in the RECORD.

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

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to respectfully urge that a comprehensive study be undertaken by the Department of Commerce, aimed toward improving and expanding trade and commerce through the St. Lawrence Seaway.

As you well appreciate, the Seaway, completed in 1959, offers new commercial opportunities for the agricultural-industrial complex of the upper Midwest—the greatest in the world and the whole Nation.

The challenge, now, is to take full advantage of these new opportunities.

We recognize, of course, that the search for markets, rerouting of trade, changing of trade patterns—these, and other complex innovations—cannot be done overnight.

However, I believe that a comprehensive study—covering the whole scope of possibilities for expanding trade, commerce, and tourist traffic, through the Seaway, would help tremendously in benefiting the economy, providing new opportunities for the farms and factories of America to transport their products to new markets; strengthen and improve trade relations with other countries; assure that tolls from the operation of the Seaway—as provided by law—will support the costs of operation, as well as pay off the debt of construction.

Naturally, you are in the best position to determine the scope of such a study. In my humble opinion, however, I believe that any such survey should cover such fields as: A review of potential markets for U.S.-produced products, transportable through the Seaway; providing information on the Seaway to foreign and domestic shippers; encouraging a greater flow of tourists, to, and through, the Seaway; explore for new ways and means to increase interest in utilizing the Seaway by shippers and producers, as well as consumers abroad and elsewhere in the United States.

As we recall, the Grace Line recently received permission from the Maritime Board to withdraw its vessels from the Great Lakes-Caribbean service route. Generally, I believe this marks a setback for Seaway traffic—at a time when it should be expanding in an uninterrupted way.

In carrying out such a study, it would appear that the services of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, itself, as well as your own Department—could make invaluable contributions to providing data and information—and perhaps new trade policy recommendations—to assure maximum utilization of the potential of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I sincerely hope, therefore, that you will find it possible to initiate such a study in the near future.

Sincerely,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 10, 1960

(Legislative day of Tuesday, August 9, 1960)

The Senate met in executive session at 9:30 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Gordon Powell, M.A., B.D., minister, St. Stephen's Presbyterian Church, Sydney, Australia, offered the following prayer:

So long Thy power hath blessed us, sure it still will lead us on, O God.

Remembering that our decisions this day could affect the lives of millions of people right round the world, we turn to Thee for wisdom to know what is right, courage to do it, and perseverance to continue to the end.

Take from our souls the strain and stress, and let our ordered lives confess the beauty of Thy peace.

Help us to pray more and worry less, to remember that worry paralyzes thinking and consumes our resources. Set us free from fear that distorts the truth, warps the judgment, and weakens the will.

In a moment of silent prayer we would pause to realize Thy presence, and hand over to Thee our burdens of spirit, mind, and body—all anxiety and sorrow, all sin and guilt and fear, all tension. We relax in the Lord, we let go and let God.

We thank Thee for Thy peace, O God; for this inner spiritual peace and for freedom from war.

We thank Thee, our Father, for the small nations which in days of war were preserved by the strength and sacrifice of the United States, and we thank Thee for all the nations which have been given hope and courage through the difficult years.

May this great Nation ever be the champion of the weak and the oppressed, holding aloft the beacon of liberty and faith, ever finding true greatness not in the selfish use of power and possessions, but in the dedication of its power and possessions to the building of a better world for all.

When days are dark, steady us with the faith that the Lord reigneth. This is Thy universe and Thou art working Thy purpose out. May Thy kingdom come because of us and not in spite of us.

So, O God, we thank Thee for the opportunity to serve Thee in this place. We believe Thou wilt grant the grace that is sufficient for our every need; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 9, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480, 83D CONGRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the 12th semiannual report on activities carried

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period January 1 through June 30, 1960.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1960.*

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in legislative session, there be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I have the attention of the minority leader?

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry. In the event that the request is agreed to unanimously by the Senate and we adopt this program for the morning hour, if a bill were introduced and a motion were made to instruct a committee with reference to that bill, would debate on that motion be limited to 3 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion would not be in order until the bill had been read the second time.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would not be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion would not be in order until the bill had been read the second time.

Mr. RUSSELL. So that no motion to instruct the committee could be made in the morning hour if proper objection were made to the second reading of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. The only motion that would be in order at this time would be for the first reading of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, with that ruling of the Chair, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and morning business is in order.

A REPORT ENTITLED "THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY—AVIATION, OCEAN MARINE, AND STATE REGULATION" (S. REPT. NO. 1834)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 238, I submit a report entitled "The Insurance Industry—Aviation, Ocean Marine, and State Regulation," together with the individual views of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the individual views, be printed, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

The following bill was introduced, and read the first time by its title:

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 3829. A bill to provide for the enforcement of civil rights, and for other purposes.

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

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

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 3830. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Monument; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 3831. A bill for the relief of Ling Ah Tay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 358) amending the cloture rule of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

END RADIO-TV PAYOLA TO CONGRESSMEN—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in June of this year the Federal Communications Commission disclosed that an examiner had justified the award of a television channel in Albany, N.Y., in part on the grounds that it cannot be ignored that some of the stockholders are Members of the House of Representatives. This was found to give the firm an edge in the area of civic participation, one of the yardsticks used by the FCC in deciding contested cases.

On June 20 I said on the floor of the Senate that this policy is as morally wrong as it can be, that it sets up a firm pattern for predictable corruption, because it means that Congressmen who pass on all appropriations, including those for the salaries and expenses of members of the Federal Communications Commission, who determine every aspect of the basic law under which they are given the charter to operate and who, in the Senate, confirm or reject the appointment of all Commissioners—enjoy a special compensation when it comes time for the Commissioners to hand out these enormously valuable radio and television franchises worth in some cases millions of dollars. This is political payola at its worst.

The following day the Chairman of the FCC, Mr. Ford, phoned me to ask for an appointment. He came to my office to see me, and while he denied that in the Albany case the presence of Congressmen among the stockholders of the successful applicant was a deciding factor, he said that in his judgment it was not decisive because the Congressmen owned only a relatively insignificant fraction of the applicant's stock. Chairman Ford conceded that if the ownership by Congressmen is substantial, then indeed such congressional ownership is a favorable factor in the civic participation criterion. Incidentally, Chairman Ford explained that he had disqualified himself from this particular case and therefore was not discussing it ex parte.

Mr. President, since I protested this favoritism for those of us in Congress who have such decisive influence over every aspect of the FCC and the identity of the men who make it up, I have received a large number of letters and personal calls from all over the country from people in the television and radio industry who wholeheartedly agree that Congress should end this self-serving payola promptly. The only objections I have heard have been based on the misapprehension that I would prohibit Members of Congress from owning any interest in radio or television, which is, of course, untrue.

Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious that the Federal Communications Commission, especially in view of the clearly expressed attitude of its Chairman, is not going to change this policy by itself, or on the basis of a few protesting voices raised in Congress. We in Congress benefit from this immoral, payola policy of our own creature, the FCC. It is up to us to end it. We know in fact that unless we act it will not be ended. Can any Senator imagine the FCC, dependent as it is on this body, changing this policy so favorable to Senators and Congressmen in the absence of action by the Congress? Of course not. Silence by the Congress means the Congress is insisting on continuing the payola payoff to itself in enjoying this favored, privileged advantage in the award of rich radio and TV franchises.

For this reason, Mr. President, I submit at this time amendments to prohibit the FCC from considering as a favorable criterion in awarding radio or TV franchises, membership in Congress by any of the stockholders of an applicant.

Mr. President, I am offering this proposal as an amendment to an appropriate and pertinent bill now on the calendar, dealing with hearings before the FCC, S. 1734.

Mr. President, I ask that this amendment be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1960—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3758) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. FREAR) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3758, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. STENNIS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3758, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RELIEF OF DOMESTIC CARPET INDUSTRY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 2, 1960, the name of Mr. SCOTT was added as an additional cosponsor of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 113) expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry, submitted by Mr. THURMOND on July 2, 1960.

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. WILEY:

Excerpts of address delivered by him over radio station WIND, Chicago, Ill.

SENATOR JOHNSON'S ESCHEWING OF SECTIONAL APPEAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Monday, August 8, there appeared an article in the Washington Evening Star entitled "JOHNSON'S 'Kickoff' at Nashville," written by Mr. Ralph McGill, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

No more bold or intellectually honest statement will be made in the presidential campaign than that by LYNDON JOHNSON in what was described as his "kickoff speech" at Nashville, Tenn.

In that speech the distinguished majority leader said:

I am not here as a Texan speaking to Tennesseans. I come as an American—to speak to my fellow Americans.

That is a point that I want to make unmistakably clear.

Wherever I go, I will never speak as a southerner to southerners or as a Protestant to Protestants or as a white to whites.

I will speak only as an American to Americans—whatever their region or their religion or their race.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. McGill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

JOHNSON'S "KICKOFF" AT NASHVILLE—SENATOR APPLAUDED FOR ESCHEWING SECTIONAL APPEAL, EMPHASIZING UNION

No more bold or intellectually honest statement will be made in the presidential campaign than that by LYNDON JOHNSON in what was described as his "kickoff speech" at Nashville, Tenn.

He was in the South. He was in a State ravaged by a campaign in which racial demagogs were in full cry. He knows there are some who strongly dislike the civil rights plank in the Democratic platform. He is aware others are withdrawn because Senator KENNEDY is a member of the Roman Communion of the Christian Church. Some 8,000 persons were before him, perhaps a fourth of them hostile.

For a moment at least, the devil may have taken him high on the mountain top of expediency and suggested the rewards of temporizing. If so, that devil was pushed firmly aside. Senator JOHNSON said:

"I am not here as a Texan speaking to Tennesseans. I come as an American—to speak to my fellow Americans.

"That is a point that I want to make unmistakably clear.

"Wherever I go, I will never speak as a southerner to southerners or as a Protestant to Protestants or as a white to whites.

"I will speak only as an American to Americans—whatever their region or their religion or their race."

Here was a clear, honest appeal to all those in the South who are reluctant or embittered to lay aside its bitterness and rejoin the Union in spirit. He spoke to them in the words of Andrew Jackson, whose stately home, the Hermitage, stands only 10 miles from where the Senator spoke and whose name and integrity are a part of Tennessee's heritage:

"Without union, our independence and liberty would never have been achieved; without union, they can never be maintained."

Senator JOHNSON went as directly to the issue of KENNEDY's religious faith. "He (KENNEDY) wears no man's collar," he said, with deliberate, slow emphasis. "He will represent all the people."

It is important that, first of all, we see each other as Americans, since, until we do that, we cannot speak to one another as citizens of our endangered Nation.

This country guarantees freedom of religion and speech. But it is certainly not an American practice to condemn a man such as Senator KENNEDY, who has answered every question put to him on the subject of what conflict there would be between his religion and his oath. He has said there would be none; that his oath to defend all that is in the Constitution would be kept. Let us admit that it is just as damaging to the country to speak as Protestant to Protestant as it is Catholic to Catholic.

Senator JOHNSON was speaking, also, to those northern liberals who cynically said, after Los Angeles, that he would speak softly from one side of the platform while Senator KENNEDY stood on it. They would, the cynics predicted, work both sides of the street. Senator JOHNSON effectively has killed that charge.

He was saying, too, that the South must somehow provide its trapped leaders, even though they are largely responsible for their own predicament, with opinions which will enable them to lead the South into the national purpose.

Surely we know now we cannot abolish education, and thus deprive them of an equal chance in life. Surely we know that our waning political strength is not enough. Five or six States cannot dominate 45 or 44. We cannot live apart. We cannot any more defend discrimination than the southerners could defend slavery.

Old Hickory's text is true as gospel.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of August 8, relating to the same subject.

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

AS AN AMERICAN TO AMERICANS

The opening campaign speech of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democratic candidate for Vice President, has attracted increasing attention and praise. Not the attacks on the Republicans, adequately noted at the time, but the somewhat ignored "declaration of principle."

Ralph McGill, Atlanta, Ga., publisher and columnist, has said that "no more bold or intellectually honest statement will be made in the campaign." Columnist William S. White has called it "a clear challenge flung into the teeth of regional conservatives and ultraconservatives everywhere below the Potomac."

The setting was Nashville, in Tennessee, a border State where southern sentiments run strong. The State was torn at the moment by a torrid senatorial campaign in which reaction and racism had joined forces against Senator ESTES KEFAUVER. JOHNSON faced an audience, part of which strongly disliked the 1960 Democratic platform and its civil rights plank, part of which was not happy about the Catholic religion of the party's presidential candidate, Senator KENNEDY.

It would have been simple for Senator JOHNSON to temporize, to hide the divisive issues with platitudes, to take the path of expediency, as northern liberals predicted he would do after Los Angeles. They joked that JOHNSON would speak softly from one side of the Democratic platform while Senator KENNEDY stood on it.

JOHNSON declared that he stood squarely on the Democratic platform, civil rights planks, liberal planks and all. He said that a man's religion had no place in an American political campaign.

He said, deliberately and firmly:

"I am not here as a Texan speaking to Tennesseans. I come as an American—to speak to my fellow Americans. That is a point I want to make unmistakably clear. Wherever I go, I will never speak as a southerner to southerners or as a Protestant to Protestants or as a white to whites. I will speak only as an American to Americans—whatever their region or their religion or their race."

It was a clear, honest call, as McGill wrote, to "all those in the South who are reluctant or embittered to lay aside their bitterness and rejoin the Union in spirit." JOHNSON quoted to his Tennessee audience the words of Andrew Jackson, whose home, the Hermitage, stood but 10 miles away:

"Without union, our independence and liberty would never have been achieved; without union, they can never be maintained."

FEDERAL COURT AT SALINA, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Bar Association of Northwest Kansas at their recent meeting adopted a resolution urging the construction of Federal court facilities at Salina, Kans.

The Salina Junior Chamber of Commerce at their board meeting on July 27, 1960, adopted a resolution in this regard, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

SALINA, KANS., JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RESOLUTION

Whereas there are more than a quarter of a million people living in northwest Kansas who are not served by any Federal court facility nearer than Topeka, Kans., or Wichita, Kans.; and

Whereas the laws of the United States provide for a term of Federal court to be held at Salina, Kans., but Salina has remained without any Federal court facilities; and

Whereas the lack of a Federal court in Salina, Kans., subjects the people of northwest Kansas to undue, unfair, and burdensome expenses in the handling of their affairs in Federal court; and

Whereas the need for Federal court facilities at Salina, Kans., is continuously growing more acute; and

Whereas Salina is the most rapidly growing city in the State of Kansas of comparable size, and is now the fourth largest city in Kansas; and

Whereas the post office building at Salina, Kans., was originally designed to carry additional floors, in which Federal court facilities could be constructed; and

Whereas the Bar Association of Northwest Kansas, at its annual meetings in 1958 and in 1960, adopted resolutions to urge the immediate creation and establishment of Federal court facilities at Salina, Kans.; and

Whereas the amount of litigation in the U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas has increased to the point where the two Federal district judges in Kansas are unnecessarily burdened; and

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States legislation for the creation of a third Federal judgeship for the district of Kansas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Salina Junior Chamber of Commerce, Salina, Kans., in its regular meeting assembled this 27th day of July 1960:

1. This board urges each of the U.S. Senators and U.S. Congressmen for the State of Kansas, and the Federal district judges for the district of Kansas, to do all in their power to cause appropriations to be made, plans to be prepared and construction to be accomplished for the establishment of Federal court facilities at Salina, Kans., and for the holding of regular terms of Federal court at Salina, Kans.

2. This board urges each of the U.S. Senators and U.S. Congressmen for the State of Kansas, and the Federal district judges for the district of Kansas, to do all in their power to cause adoption of legislation for the creation of a third Federal judgeship for the State of Kansas.

3. Each member of the Salina Junior Chamber of Commerce and every citizen of Salina, Kans., and of the northwest quarter of Kansas, is hereby urged to lend his full support and assistance to our Senators, Representatives, and Federal judges to accomplish the matters set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 hereof.

It is hereby further resolved, That a copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to each of the U.S. Senators, Representatives, and Federal judges of the State of Kansas, and to each civic organization in the city of Salina, and to each junior chamber of commerce in the northwest quarter of Kansas.

SOCIAL SECURITY RECIPIENT CANNOT MEET MEDICAL BILL EVEN WITH ADDITIONAL INCOME

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a wonderful letter from a man on social security. In the little work he has done in the past few years, he has had opportunity to talk to many of the elderly people of the State. He was so moved by these people that he wrote to tell of one of their greatest desires: The passage of a comprehensive medical care program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I am on social security and I can realize how impossible it is for one to afford good medical care out of social security insurance. Although I receive social security payments, I work right along when I can get it. Even with this additional income, I cannot afford good medical care. A hospital room here costs $19 per day for room and three meals. I can get fine hotel accommodations here for $6, and I know very well I would not eat $11 worth of food a day.

I have been doing some advertising research which took me to a section of the city that seemed to be all old folks on pension, and their surrounding conditions were intolerable, both for Negroes and whites. I talked with them about medical care, and their hope was that the Forand bill would be passed when Congress returned to Washington in August.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

TAX MONEY WILL BE SAVED BY CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL PARK BILL THIS YEAR

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the interest of economy in Government, I strongly urge early action—both in committee and here on the Senate floor—on my proposal to establish a national seashore park on Padre Island.

The administration has gone on record favoring this project, and so have key Democratic leaders, including the distinguished Senate majority leader, my senior colleague, LYNDON JOHNSON, who has stated his wholehearted support of the plan.

Secretary of the Interior Seaton has recommended that this legislation be adopted at this session, and has promised to earmark $8 million for expenditures on the development within the next 5 years, if Congress will enact the bill at this session.

With the overwhelming support lined up for the project, a plan to preserve 88 miles of America's longest, southernmost open beach for public use it seems certain that a national recreation area will ultimately be set up on Padre Island. But there is a tendency in some quarters to put it off until next year. This is, in my judgment, a costly attitude and one which will inevitably result in the park costing more money than is necessary.

Each passing year, with private development of portions of the island, the remaining property which we need for public recreation facilities becomes more valuable. Consequently, it will cost more for the Government to secure it. I urge the Congress to act to establish the park on Padre Island this year so we can get this property while the price is relatively low.

I have already mentioned the fact that corporations are buying up large tracts of land on the island. Salesmen are going out across the country selling lots from these large tracts. All of this will mean that the price of the land will go up tremendously if the project is long delayed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a feature story concerning Padre Island, published in the Houston Post of July 24, 1960.

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

PADRE ISLAND IS GREAT NATURAL PLAYGROUND OF BEACH AND DUNES

Padre Island, one of a series of sandbars which parallel the Texas coast, stretches from the southernmost tip of Texas almost to Corpus Christi Bay, where it joins Mustang to make the world's longest island.

Here is one of America's great natural playgrounds—131 miles of surf and sand, beach, and dune, which—except for the three county parks and the fishing pier near the causeway—hardly bears the marks of civilization.

Only a few miles down the island, the visitor finds a scene of sky and sea and blowing grasses that seems hardly to have changed during the 25,000 years of the island's existence. Yet the peaceful beauty of Padre is deceptive, for during the past 400 years the island has been the scene of some of the most dramatic episodes of southwestern history. Gold-seeking Conquistadores and soul-seeking priests, rumrunners, blockade runners, slave-smugglers, and cowboys * * * pirates and soldiers * * * shipwrecked sailors and pioneer homesteaders—these and many more have lived, and often died, on the white sands of Padre Island.

The island itself is in a state of constant change, with the wind and the tides endlessly changing the topography of the sandbar, and with violent storms obliterating landmarks, and often uncovering an older page of its colorful history.

Even the island's name has changed many times. It was first charted as Isla Blanca, by early navigators in the gulf, and was variously called Isla de Corpus Christi, Isla de Santiago, and Isla de Malaguitas, before a Spanish priest Padre Nicolas Balli, took title to it in the early 19th century.

A persistent legend of buried treasure attaches itself to any island, and Padre is no exception, but the legend is reinforced from time to time when storms uncover ancient coins or other evidence of hidden treasures.

During the great years of her New World conquest, the Spaniards annually sent a great flotilla, loaded with treasure, back to the mother country, and, as their sailings often coincided with the hurricane season, millions of dollars worth of gold and jewels disappeared into the gulf. During the 1800's, authentic records tell of dozens of ships which went down in the vicinity of the island, many loaded with coins, bullion, and jewels.

For many years, Padre Island was the headquarters of smugglers, freebooters, and "sand pirates," who lured ships to their doom by showing false lights along the shore; but in

the years before the Civil War, a more civilized form of endeavor found its place in the island history.

The original owner, Padre Niccolas Balli, founded a ranch and began cattle operations, and island cattle grew fat on the beach grass. In 1847, a three-masted schooner broke to pieces in the surf of southern Padre, and cast ashore an amazing family—Capt. John Singer and his wife, Johanna. From the wreckage of their ship, the Singers established a home, and there they lived, raised six children, established Las Cruces Ranch, and grew so prosperous that when they left the island in 1861, they buried a fortune of $62,000.

The island was occupied by Federal troops during the Civil War, and when the Singers returned after the war to recover their treasure, they found all markings wiped out by a storm. Only $2,000 of the Singer money has ever been found, but treasure seekers today are still looking for it.

During the 1870's a number of families lived and ranched on the northern part of the island, and a beef-packing factory operated near the pass for some years. It eventually was abandoned, and by 1900 the settlement had disappeared.

The "Duke of Padre Island," was Pat Dunn, who went to Padre in 1884 and established "El Rancho de Don Patricio." Although he sold his claim to the island in recent years, as he began to feel civilization moving in on him, he lived there until his death in 1935.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the article points out that in 1847 a schooner broke up on the southern end of Padre Island and cast ashore an amazing family—Capt. John Singer, and his wife, Johanna. John Singer was the nephew of the man who invented the Singer sewing machine. They built a ranch there and became quite wealthy. When the Civil War broke out they buried $62,000 in gold on the island, which they had accumulated from their ranching operations up to 1861.

Subsequent hurricanes removed all but traces of the sizable buildings Singer had built, including a blacksmith shop. There are no buildings there now, except for a few which have been built in recent years, at each end of the island.

This is only one of the many historic events which have occurred on that island.

About $2,000 of the original $62,000 in gold hurriedly buried by the Singers have been dug up. Some vacationists might find the other $60,000, if we will only hurry and get the park established, and give persons a chance to roam around down there.

THE GRANTING OF PASSPORTS TO COMMUNISTS

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion for a moment?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There has been considerable discussion of what business should be taken up in this short session, and what subjects should not be taken up. I should like to express my view about certain bills pending before us which, in my opinion, are indispensable and essential for the security of our country, but upon which action has not been taken.

I speak specifically of bills which have been introduced to place in the Secretary of State adequate power to deny avowed Communists the right to travel from our country into Soviet countries.

Under the present status of the law, the Secretary of State is completely helpless in denying passports regardless of information he may have concerning Communist activities of those who seek passports. These bills have been pending for 2 years. They are now before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

One year ago hearings were conducted, and there was no opposition to the bills except from three groups. One of these groups was the Communist Party of the United States. Their representative stated at the hearing that these bills, which would give the Secretary of State the power to limit the issuance of passports to Communists, should not be passed.

The head of the Communists appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations and stated that it would be an infringement upon the liberties which should be enjoyed by all Americans if our Government denied a Communist a passport to go to the Soviet Union.

In that same hearing another group appeared. That was a group of veterans, represented by one man. The organization has its principal office in New York. I probed that witness, to find out the number of members the organization had, the dues that were paid, the length of time of the existence of the organization, and so forth. There was a paucity of answers in regard to a showing that they were a group of veterans interested in the security of the United States.

In that same hearing, on the same morning, there appeared another agency. That one I will not identify at this time. It was unfortunate that these three organizations were grouped together. At any rate, the three organizations opposed the adoption of a bill which would give the Secretary of State the power to limit the issuance of passports.

Why do I raise this question today? Powers will be tried in the Soviet Union. Our country will be charged with practices of espionage which are improper. The Soviet Union will attempt to make it appear that it has conducted its inteligence activities in a manner which is described as proper. We are sending spies to the Soviet because of the absence of a law which I believe should be advocated.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator means, I am sure, Soviet spies are being returned to the Soviet Union.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; they are Communists, and every one of them is a potential spy. I will not stand idly by while we argue whether bill A or proposition B or subject C must be passed at this session, and while we slothfully and indifferently allow this condition on the issuance of passports to exist.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is the Senator from Ohio aware that there is pending at present on the calendar a bill dealing with the issuance of passports and the writing into the law—if the bill shall be enacted—of restrictions, power, and authority, in the hands of the Secretary of State, for the very purpose about which the Senator is speaking?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Which bill is it? What does it provide?

Mr. HRUSKA. It is a bill reported, not by the Committee on Foreign Relations, but by the Committee on the Judiciary. The Committee on the Judiciary deferred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for month after month after month; but in the absence of any action by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and in the closing days of the adjourned session, a bill, S. 2652, was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. It is Calendar Order No. 1811. That bill contains the provisions to which the Senator from Ohio has referred as being highly desirable and long overdue.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not know of that. I know of several bills which are pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I know of a bill, substantially watered down, which was passed by the House, but which has not had the approval of our committee.

In any event, the Senator from Nebraska subscribes to the views which I am expressing, and I am glad to know that the Committee on the Judiciary is attempting to do something about the matter.

However, that still leaves a rather peculiar condition in existence, namely, that the Committee on the Judiciary has acted upon the matter, but the Committee on Foreign Relations has not.

Mr. HRUSKA. Two years ago, the Committee on the Judiciary sought to act on this matter. Nothing came of that action.

When the bill was introduced earlier at this session, it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. A bill was also referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The Committee on the Judiciary deferred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, hoping that that committee would take action. It failed to do so. So the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, has reported the bill to which I have referred.

There is ample time in which to act on the bill. It should be acted upon. I associate myself with every bit of the thought and vigor which the Senator from Ohio has expressed on this subject. It is my hope that the bill will be taken up at this session.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in my contemplation about a bill, I have completely in mind the necessity of conforming it to the declarations—right or wrong—made by the Supreme Court. I know of the disputes which exist as to whether the right to travel is an inherent, unalienable right which cannot be affected by Congress. However, a bill can be drawn which will remedy this indefensible situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to associate myself with the Senator from

Ohio in urging action on this proposal. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I join in expressing regret that our committee has not acted prior to this time on this question. I do not believe it is too important which committee reports the bill. The Committee on the Judiciary has acted. I join with the Senator from Ohio in urging the leadership to bring this bill up, in order that the Senate may deal with this problem before we adjourn. Moreover, we should deal with it in time, since it is a Senate bill, so as to allow time for it to be considered by the House and receive favorable action in that body. There is no more important matter which can come before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to express surprise that the distinguished Senator from Ohio should express any view as to the power of a sovereign nation to protect itself against proceedings of the kind he has outlined. The Senator from Ohio seemed to have some doubt about the power of Congress to legislate in this field. If there is anything fundamental in any government, it is that it has the power to take whatever steps are necessary to protect itself either from internal subversion or from attack from abroad.

I realize it is highly desirable that adequate standards and safeguards be provided to deal with the rights of American citizens to travel about the globe freely, wherever they might desire. But I do not accept the thesis that any American citizen has any inherent right, constitutional or otherwise, to undermine and overthrow this Government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What I had in mind was the declaration by the Supreme Court, which might have been predicated upon the proposition that adequate standards were not contained in the law, under which, the Court held, the Secretary of State could not act; in other words, that Congress did not establish the latitude within which the Secretary of State could act by establishing a ceiling and a floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Ohio. I wish also to associate myself with his expressed interest in legislation in this area. I cannot conceive of any more important matter to which the Senate should address itself than to closing this loophole which permits Communist agents to travel freely from this country to Russia, and return. They can take with them in their minds any information which otherwise they might not be able to transmit, to convey to the Soviet Government. They can travel to Russia to receive instructions which they probably could not receive in any other way than by going to Moscow and sitting at the feet of Mr. Khrushchev's agents.

It is inexplicable to me that Congress should delay for more than one day the taking of steps to rectify this situation.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. It might interest the Senator from Georgia to know that in the testimony it was contended by many witnesses, during the course of the hearings, that there should be really no restriction on the constitutional and inherent right of American citizens to travel abroad. It is a far-fetched thesis. It is something which is not consistent with the history of passports and with the history of the American Government to control the travel of its citizens abroad, in view of the fact that when they do so, they are covered by the power, the majesty, and the protection of the American Government wherever they go.

In addition, of course, to the field of internal security, which is involved in that regard, the Committee on the Judiciary took jurisdiction of this matter.

It was contended by the Supreme Court, in its decision, that there were not sufficient guide lines; therefore, the bill was introduced incorporating not only the suggestions of the Department of State, but also, at the urging of the Department of Justice, particularly the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the bill provides guide lines. It provides for review by Congress, if anyone feels he has been shortchanged by reason of being denied a passport, when he has been charged with being associated with or being affiliated with the Communist Party, or knowingly has been engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement.

So the bill is in accordance with the views expressed by the Senator from Ohio. It remains only to be placed on the agenda and to be acted upon by the Senate itself.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield to no one in my purpose to protect the liberties of United States citizens, liberties guaranteed by the Constitution. However, I shall not subscribe to a course of twisting those constitutional guarantees to the thin position where we shall endanger the security of our country.

It may be argued during the next month which bills are indispensable for passage. This item has not been mentioned. To me, this subject is as grave as any subject pending before the Senate. It is for that reason that I urge the Senate to take action on it at this session.

INVESTIGATORY SUBAGENCY FOR U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the United Nations, since its birth in 1945, has, I believe, established a commendable record of service in the interests of peace among nations.

In a fast-changing world, we recognize that as times and conditions change there will need to be modifications or refinements of the structure of the U.N. The purpose would be to deal more effectively with the variety of problems that are arising around the world.

Particularly, the Soviet Union's flagrant attempt to use the U.N. as a forum for propaganda to the world demands, I believe, the serious consideration of all people who do not want to see the U.N. so abused; and who are deeply concerned with further improvements of this international agency to enable it to deal with trouble spots that develop around the globe.

The false, ill-founded charges by the Soviet Union on the recent flight of the RB-47 plane and the attack upon it by the Soviet Union is a prime example—and probably a forerunner of further efforts of the Communists to use the U.N. to carry on its propoganda offensives.

Fortunately, on the RB-47 flight investigation, the United States came out far ahead. The deceptive tactics of the Soviet Union boomeranged—backing that nation into a corner of guilt from which there was no escape.

As a U.S. defense counsel, Ambassador Lodge did a beautiful job.

In the light of the stepped-up Soviet offensive of false charges, however, we can expect that there will be successive attempts—including other cases of outright lying—to attack the acts, policies, or prestige of the United States or other nations of the free world.

However, there is serious question as to whether the U.N.—faced with a great many serious world problems—should find it necessary to be "tied up" periodically by trumped-up charges.

Personally, I feel that the Security Council of the U.N. has more important things to do than act as a "clearinghouse" for wild, reckless provocations by the Soviet Union.

The establishment of an impartial, investigatory subagency of the Security Council to conduct preliminary hearings such as held in the U.S. judicial system to determine whether this is adequate prima facie evidence to go ahead with a case, would handicap the efforts of the Soviet bloc to openly abuse the United Nations as a forum for their propagandizing; lessen the burden on the Security Council; enable the Council to direct its attention to more important and significant matters; eliminate, by preliminary, impartial investigation, the possibility of the United States, or any other nation, being subject to—and having to defend itself against—trumped-up charges in this world forum.

Even though the Soviet's refusal to submit to impartial investigation of the RB-47 case branded its charges as reckless, irresponsible, and outright lying, there is serious question as to whether rebuttal—no matter how effective—can really supplant, in the world's mind, the impact of the initial charge.

Overall, I believe that a "preliminary hearing" agency would serve to weed out the superficial, invalid charges brought to the U.N. Security Council, and enable that body to more constructively, effectively, and without unnecessary interruptions, carry on its more important objectives of attempting to establish order and peace in the world.

DEATH OF LELAND OLDS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last week the people of the United States lost a real champion and friend. I refer to the death of Leland Olds, who for a generation was, in truth, a public rights defender.

Mr. Olds held many public positions, first in the State of New York and next as a member and Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. He served the people of the Nation well throughout all those years.

He was one of the prime shapers of the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development. He supported expansion of rural electrification into the unserved areas of the Nation. He supported municipal power development. Because of his foresight and crusading efforts, the people of the United States have been assured of a more adequate supply of electric energy and a more equitable distribution of that energy and a more reasonable cost for that energy than they otherwise would have had. He always urged, and tried to impress upon the Nation, that this country requires a constantly increasing supply of electric power. Largely through his efforts, that necessary increase in our supply of power was developed.

He had his enemies, Mr. President. One of the charges they mentioned against him was that he was leading the country to socialism, through his support of public power, municipal power, and cooperative power. Mr. President, it is my opinion that through his efforts, exactly the opposite result was obtained, because through his efforts he was able to provide a degree of competition in the utility field, he actually slowed the trend toward Government ownership or Federal ownership of power distribution in the United States. Had it not been for his efforts in behalf of rural electrification and municipal power development, I am satisfied that the country would be farther along the road toward Government ownership and control of the electric utility business than it is today.

So, Mr. President, I wish to state on the floor of the Senate that I believe we owe to Leland Olds a debt of gratitude which was not paid, and may never be paid, but which I wish to acknowledge at this time.

To Mrs. Olds and family I extend my sincere sympathy and to the people of this country my regrets for the loss of an able and dedicated defender.

ENFORCEMENT OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I introduce a bill to provide for the enforcement of civil rights, and for other purposes, which carries out—as I stated I would introduce it—the platform pledges of the Republican Party adopted at Chicago in 1960.

I ask that the bill lie at the desk, for additional sponsors, until Friday morning; and I ask that the second reading be deferred until Friday morning.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator's introducing the bill, and I have no objection to its lying at the desk, for additional sponsors. But I would not agree, and could not agree, to any unanimous consent request which might imply that permission was given for the second reading on a day when there might not be an occasion for a second reading of the bill. We may not have a morning hour on Friday.

Although I have no objection to having the bill lie at the desk, for additional sponsors, I cannot consent to the unanimous-consent request in the form in which it has been presented at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent only that the bill lie at the desk until Friday morning, for additional sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill will be read the first time by its title.

The bill (S. 3829) to provide for the enforcement of civil rights, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I gather that there is no objection to that request.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I have no objection to having the bill lie at the desk, for additional sponsors, for as long as the Senator from New York may desire.

Mr. JAVITS. Until Friday morning.

Mr. RUSSELL. But it probably will make some difference as to whether we have a morning hour on Friday, in light of the request which has been made.

Of course the Senator is wholly within his rights. But it seems that we are very likely to confine this adjourned session to the subject of civil rights, which did not loom very large in the picture at the time when the Senate recessed in July. I can see that that is a very sure way to kill any legislation in any other area. I am not enamored of some of the bills that are to be considered—the situs picketing bill, and so forth; and there are some of the provisions of the minimum wage bill to which I am opposed. But I think those bills are entitled to one little trial run in the Senate, before we tie up the Senate over an issue which occupied all our time and attention for some 9 weeks earlier in the year.

I serve notice again, Mr. President, that if this session is to be dedicated to the spuriously named political idol that so many persons call civil rights, some of us here stand ready, able, and willing to do our part to see to it that the Congress of the United States will have a right to consider legislation in areas other than this one.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I now send to the desk a resolution to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate; the resolution is also a part of the Republican Party's 1960 platform. I submit the resolution on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and request its appropriate reference. In this case I make the point that I request the appropriate reference of the resolution to a committee.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 358) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That subsection 3 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule II or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the fifteenth calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays), he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

ENFORCEMENT OF CIVIL RIGHTS—AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may proceed for 5 minutes in addition to the normal 3 minutes or 6 minutes, on these matters.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask whether the Senator intends to make any unanimous-consent requests in connection with his remarks or in connection with proposed legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. My purpose is solely to submit additional data.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then I have no objection, and would give the Senator all the time he wishes. I am a great believer in free and unlimited debate. I merely wish to know whether it is necessary for me to remain here in order to be able to object to any unanimous-consent request the Senator might propound.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think so. I wish to talk with the Senator about my reason for deferring the second reading. But I shall do that later on.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. JAVITS. I can only hope that my dear friends and colleagues who are opposed to civil rights legislation will limit their remarks in accordance with the time limitation I have just undertaken. In that event, we would not have so many problems.

Mr. President, the bill I have introduced today would, first, extend Federal financial assistance and technical aid to school districts and States seeking to desegregate their schools; second, establish a permanent Commission on Equal Job Opportunity among Government contractors; third, give the U.S. Attorney General the authority to bring actions for desegregation of schools in cases where physical or economic coercion is being used to deprive an individual of the constitutional right to attend a desegregated school; and, fourth, provide that completion of the sixth primary school grade is sufficient proof of literacy for voting purposes in Federal elections.

Also, I have submitted, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], a resolution to modify Senate rule XXII. The need for such an amendment of that rule is recognized and called for in the Republican Party's 1960 platform, but is not specified in that plank in such detail that I could ask other Members of my party to join me in sponsoring the resolution in direct implemention of the platform.

The fact that 52 Democratic Senators yesterday voted against taking up even the two very moderate civil rights proposals requested in the President's message last Monday, and which are in both the 1960 Democratic and Republican Party platforms, when they were introduced by the Senate minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], does not mean that civil rights is a dead issue at this session of the Congress. I believe that there should be and will be other opportunities for Members of the Senate to endeavor to implement at least some portion of both parties' civil rights planks prior to adjournment this year.

Mr. President, whatever may be the charges and countercharges of the moment, I still believe that successful action on civil rights legislation is so deeply tied up with bipartisan sponsorship, that bipartisanship will yet reassert itself on this issue before we adjourn this year. It is my hope that that will be done.

It was my hope, even until yesterday, that some Democratic Senators who traditionally have joined Republican Senators in bipartisan action to bring about the enactment of meaningful civil rights legislation would join in sponsoring the bill I introduced this morning. Indeed, I introduced it as part of the Republican Party's 1960 platform. Therefore, I hope that other Republican Senators will join in sponsoring the bill. That is my reason for allowing the bill to remain upon the desk for 2 days, as a gesture of good faith, and with full respect for my colleagues, whatever may be our differences.

My reasons for introducing this bill implementing our platform at this time are these: First, the need for specifying in legislative form appropriate for enactment into law the platform of my party; second, to focus the attention of the country on the fact that what is blocking action on even moderate civil rights legislation is the filibuster, actual or threatened, which is made possible by the self-imposed restrictions placed upon the Senate's ability to control its own debate by rule XXII; third, that civil rights is now an issue of such magnitude, in terms of domestic tranquillity and the peace leadership of the United States, that it should be accorded equal priority with the other major measures dealing with health care for the aged, Federal aid for schools, housing, and minimum wage which are before us; and, fourth, that we are ready to act and a majority truly wants to act upon certain of these measures. I state that the urgency of action manifests itself by the deep feeling shown at home in the sit-in demonstrations in the South and abroad by the tremendous ferment of Africa now highlighted by the crisis over the Congo Republic.

I therefore suggested, in my analysis of the situation on Monday, that the Senate should at this short session enact the two civil rights items specified in the President's message—a statutory base for a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity on Government Contracts, and Federal financial and technical assistance to school districts seeking to desegregate—together with authority to the Attorney General to bring civil actions in representative school desegregation cases as the most moderate common denominator on this point in both platforms. Indeed, just about what was suggested by the leadership conference on civil rights.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of that conference may be made a part of my remarks at this point, together with a list of the conferees, representing some of the outstanding civic organizations of this country.

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

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS,

New York, N.Y., August 8, 1960.

STATEMENT ON CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION IN THE AUGUST SESSION OF CONGRESS

As organizations dedicated to the advancement of civil rights in America, we call upon both political parties for assistance in the enactment of civil rights legislation at the reconvened August session of Congress.

Both parties have adopted strong civil rights planks with substantial areas of agreement between them. We ask both parties for an August downpayment on these planks as an earnest of their intention to execute the planks in full during the next administration.

While we shall press to obtain civil rights legislation at this session of Congress, we are equally determined to do everything possible to see that such legislation does not become a political football.

Civil rights bills must be handled sincerely on their own merits and not in such a way as to constitute a body block to consideration of other legislation before the Congress, as, for example, medical aid for the aged, housing, school construction, and minimum wages.

To the end that civil rights legislation may become a reality rather than a political pawn, we call upon Vice President NIXON and Senator KENNEDY to take this issue out of the partisan arena by agreeing upon a measure or measures which both parties can push to enactment along with other legislation at this short session.

We suggest that a basis for such an agreement lies in legislation proposed by both platforms upon which hearings have already been held by the Congress. As possible examples of such legislation, we suggest legislation which would—

1. Facilitate compliance with the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions by extending Federal aid and technical assistance to schools which in good faith attempt to desegregate.

2. Authorize the Attorney General to bring actions in Federal courts to protect constitutional rights.

3. Establish a statutory body to protect equal job opportunities on Government contracts.

It has been established over the years that neither party alone can deliver on civil rights promises. What is vital now is that the two candidates agree upon legislation which both will support actively in accordance with the pledges of their respective platforms.

We are confident that the necessary two-thirds can be mustered for cloture in the Senate if Vice President NIXON is determined to obtain the support of two-thirds of the Republicans and if Senator KENNEDY is determined to obtain the support of two-thirds of the Democrats (Southern Democrats represent substantially less than one-third of the total number of Senate Democrats).

As far as the House is concerned, the Rules Committee could hardly be a stumbling block if Speaker RAYBURN, acting for Senator KENNEDY, and Minority Leader HALLECK, acting for Vice President NIXON, jointly seek committee action.

On this road lies the possibility, even the probability, of civil rights legislation at this session of Congress and this can be accomplished without the excuse that to so act would hold up full consideration of other pending and needed legislation. A test of the good faith of the parties and of the presidential candidates will lie in their willingness to avoid partisan bickering over civil rights and to unite in the enactment of vitally needed civil rights legislation now.

MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

A.M.E. Zion Church.
Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity.
American Civil Liberties Union.
American Council on Human Rights.
American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.
American Jewish Committee.
American Jewish Congress.
American Veterans Committee.
Americans for Democratic Action.
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.
Catholic Inter-Racial Council.
Colored Methodist Episcopal Church.
Congress of Racial Equality.
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority.
Hotel, Restaurant and Bartenders International Union of America.
Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World.
International Ladies' Garment Workers Union.
International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers.
Japanese-American Citizens League.
Jewish Labor Committee.
Jewish War Veterans.
National Alliance of Postal Employees.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

National Association of Colored Women, Inc.
National Baptist Convention, U.S.A.
National Bar Association.
National Catholic Committee on Race Relations.
National Community Relations Advisory Council.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Frontiers Club.
National Negro Business League.
National Newspaper Publishers Association.
National Religion and Labor Foundation.
Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity.
Phi Delta Kappa Sorority.
Pioneer Women.
Textile Workers Union.
The American Ethical Union.
The Workmen's Circle.
Transport Workers Union of America.
Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.
United Automobile Workers of America.
United Hebrew Trades.
United Rubber Workers.
United Steelworkers of America.
United Transport Service Employees of America.
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.
Workers Defense League.

Mr. JAVITS. As to other civil rights items, I suggested that we again—as in 1959—fix a date, so far as we are able to do so, at which they may be considered in the new Congress. I point out we did exactly that in 1959, and we went into extended debate on civil rights legislation on February 15, 1960.

The charge of politics has been leveled at those of us who seek some civil rights action at this session on the ground that it would block consideration of the other needed legislation I have specified. I yield to no one in my conviction that we should have legislation at this short session on these other items, but I point out also that the theory that they will be blocked by any civil rights bill only bears out the argument that we are wavering here under the threat of filibuster, expressed or implied, and that, notwithstanding the assurances of January 1959 of the majority leader, it is rule XXII which remains the real roadblock to civil rights legislation. And what we are seeing—and I say this advisedly, and I hope it will be answered—is, in effect, a confession by the majority, notwithstanding its topheavy number, that it cannot vote cloture under the existing rule XXII.

I would rather be accused of politics than of political cynicism, because I would not even try to do in civil rights what I sincerely believe is required by the national interest.

The Republican platform in its civil rights plank pledges "legislation to provide that the completion of six primary grades in a State-accredited school is conclusive evidence of literacy for voting purposes." Section 4 of my bill would carry out that pledge. The evidence that voting registrars have misused the literacy requirement to keep Negroes from voting in the South is abundant. Only recently, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down a decision, in the case of United States against Raines, which revealed the ridiculous extremes to which discriminatory voting practices can be carried. In finding for the plaintiff, its order should lead to the restoration on the voting rolls in an Alabama community of the names of several Negro teachers in Alabama schools, who graduated from Alabama colleges. These individuals had been declared unqualified to vote on the grounds that they could not meet the local literacy test.

In discussing this section of my bill, I would like to point out that its enactment would reduce the voting requirements in my own State of New York, where the completion of eight grades of schooling is a substitute for the literacy test. In other words, because I believe that the overall national interest would be served by such a provision—although it has a direct bearing on New York State—I shall do my utmost to seek its enactment, along with the other provisions in the bill. In 1950, the U.S. census reports that, out of nearly 88 million in the U.S. population over 25 years of age, an estimated 80 percent had finished 6 or more years of schooling. In 16 Southern States, 61 percent, or nearly 16 million people, aged 25 and over, could meet the literacy requirement for voting as outlined in this bill, according to 1950 census figures. Yet we all know that voting in Southern States is down to 20 percent or 25 percent of the population.

I should also like to emphasize that the provision I am submitting giving the Attorney General authority to start civil injunction suits is limited in the sense that it is directed to representative school desegregation cases. I have in the past, and will in the future, press for giving the Attorney General authority to bring suits or intervene in a case being brought by individuals charging denial of any constitutionally guaranteed right. However, this more limited provision is in my party's platform, and therefore should be accurately drawn in this bill to implement my party's civil rights plank, which is my purpose here. I have pressed for much broader authority than called for by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, but this is certainly the most common denominator in both platforms, and hence I have offered in that way, in all good faith, to carry out the platform as written.

I am also introducing today, along with Senator CASE of New Jersey, the modification to rule XXII, heretofore cosponsored by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, myself, and many other Democrats and Republicans, to prevent the filibuster or the threat of a filibuster from blocking civil rights or other appropriate legislation. It would give authority to the majority of the Senate to invoke cloture on the 16th day after filing of a cloture petition by 16 Senators, and would allow 100 hours of debate thereafter. Because the Republican platform called for a change in rule XXII, but did not specify it in more detail, Senator CASE of New Jersey and I have not sought widespread cosponsorship for this resolution among my Republican colleagues at this time.

However, this issue must again be raised at the opening of the session of the new Congress in 1961, which will occur a few weeks prior to the inauguration of a new administration. The revision of present rule XXII, which requires that cloture can be invoked only if two-thirds of those present and voting favor it—the modification presented by the majority leader as a compromise step in January 1959—is demanded now. It is demanded, as I have shown, by the fact that filibuster still remains the gun pointed at the heads of Senators who wish to vote for civil rights legislation, but who are equally interested in other legislation they consider vital to our Nation.

I emphasize again it is an admission that notwithstanding the topheavy number of the majority, with the addition of those on this side who are prepared to vote for cloture, and will, that they cannot or will not vote cloture which would enable us to enact even minimal civil rights legislation in this session.

I conclude by stating that the platform adopted in 1960 was described by a very distinguished newspaper as being a realistic program and, indeed, somewhat to be preferred over the Democratic Party platform.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial of July 28, 1960, on that subject may be made a part of my remarks.

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

THE CIVIL RIGHTS PLANKS

The one plank that really caused a major battle at both conventions was the plank on civil rights; and in both cases the results have made history. It is a mark of the advance already achieved in public thinking about this question that both parties have so seriously addressed themselves to it and have felt it necessary at the cost of much bitter internal disagreement to come up with unmistakable commitments to carry out the spirit of the Constitution and to implement the moral basis of democratic government.

The Democrats adopted their civil rights plank in the teeth of intense opposition from their traditional stronghold in the South; the Republicans adopted theirs only at the insistence of Vice President NIXON—with Governor Rockefeller prominently in the background—and in the face of a real revolt. Of course, political calculations played a great part in the decision taken by both parties; but the fact that they made a politically expedient decision does not lessen the fact that it was also morally right.

The two planks bear a general resemblance to each other, but the Republican is on balance somewhat more realistic and more specific. Each stresses the need for equal opportunity to all Americans; each denounces discrimination; each supports enforcement of decisions of the Supreme Court; each emphasizes the importance of guaranteeing the right to vote, of desegregating the schools, of eliminating discrimination in employment and in federally financed public housing; each would extend Federal aid to school districts undertaking integration; each implicitly—though not explicitly—endorses the "sit-in" movement; each underlines the need for Federal leadership in the attack on racial bias.

But there are differences between the two planks, and some are important. On voting, the Democrats urge an end to literacy tests and vaguely propose further powers for the Attorney General if necessary. But the Republicans flatly advocate legislation to make 6 years of schooling "conclusive evidence of literacy for voting purposes," a more practicable suggestion.

On education, the Democrats ask for a desegregation plan from every affected school district by 1963, while the Republicans reject such a target date as a delaying tactic. The GOP would give the Attorney General power to initiate suits for school desegregation, while the Democrats would go further and extend the power to the whole field of civil rights. At present the Government can act initially only in voting cases.

On job opportunities in general it is the Republican platform that vaguely talks about eliminating discrimination, while the Democrats advocate a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission. However, the Republicans make the important proposal (ignored by the Democrats) for legislation to end anti-Negro discrimination in labor unions "unless such practices are eradicated promptly by the labor unions themselves." The Republicans also oppose use of Federal funds "for the construction of segregated community facilities," a point the Democrats avoid.

Finally, the Democrats make no mention at all of the Senate rule that permits filibuster, which is the traditional device employed to block, retard, or defeat civil rights legislation. The Republicans pledge their best efforts to change the present rule and other congressional procedures that "often make unattainable proper legislative implementation of constitutional guarantees." If in the next Congress the Republicans actually throw in their strength with that of the Democratic liberals who have long been fighting to modify rule XXII, a major advance may yet be made in orderly and democratic government.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have been glad to join in sponsoring this bill as an earnest of our determination to press for effective legislation in this field whenever possible.

It has been said that consideration of any civil rights legislation jeopardizes action on other important issues which require action at this session. But the fact is that, as the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights pointed out in its recent statement, action is possible if Members of both parties will put aside partisan considerations and work together for the enactment of measures to which both parties are pledged.

This fact is pointed up in the enclosed editorial from the New York Post of August 3. Fittingly the editorial commends Senator JAVITS for his unwavering efforts in behalf of civil rights. Over the years, first in the House, and now in the Senate, JACK JAVITS and I have worked together to assure equal treatment of all our citizens regardless of race or color. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial referred to be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE TEST IS BIPARTISAN

Senator JAVITS (Republican, New York) has rendered a conspicuous service by announcing that he will introduce legislation embodying key points of the Republican civil rights plank when the Senate reconvenes next week. His declaration gains added weight from his pledge to seek a Democratic cosponsor for his bills.

JAVITS is not simply proposing a partisan formula for embarrassing the Democrats with a futile gesture. He is presenting a challenge to the leaders and candidates of both parties.

The precise details of the course JAVITS has chosen are open to review and debate if and when he finds a Democratic partner. We should like to see someone like Senator HUMPHREY as his associate; we believe their joint sponsorship of civil rights measures would set the stage for a momentous congressional drama.

What is most noteworthy at this stage is the widespread lack of enthusiasm for JAVITS' move manifested by dignitaries of both parties. Republican Senate Leader DIRKSEN quickly disparaged the effort, asserting that southern Democrats would surely throttle any such legislation in the brief session ahead. There is overwhelming silence on the Democratic side.

But neither evasion nor muteness will fool most of the people in this moral trial.

JAVITS' stand provides assurance that all the key characters in our 1960 political play will have to stand up and be counted.

The incontestable fact is that an authentic alliance of northern Republicans and liberal Democrats can secure the enactment of new civil rights bills this month. At the very least it can pass legislation giving U.S. aid to school districts which comply with the school desegregation order and augmenting the powers of the Attorney General to initiate prosecutions for violations of civil rights.

These planks are common to the platforms of both parties. By attaching them to such pending legislation as the housing bill, the coalition could force a quick vote on cloture and settle very early in the session—without obstructing other vital legislation—how many Senators are prepared to carry out their pious convention pledges.

Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. NIXON can obtain the required votes if they make a resolute effort. Will either or both rise to the occasion?

The test is clear.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with S. 3829, which I introduced this morning, I made a request for a second reading tomorrow.

I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I make the unanimous-consent request that no proceedings be taken on S. 3829 on tomorrow.

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

THE POLARIS SUBMARINE PROGRAM

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a ballistic missile fired with range and accuracy from a nuclear submarine without even coming to the surface is reminiscent of the science fiction stories of other days. Now it is a reality. By the end of the year it will be a part of American seapower, on the move.

To me, the high point in the President's special message to Congress on Monday was his report:

Extraordinary progress has been made in testing one of America's most important weapons systems—the Polaris ballistic missile submarine.

I can hardly express what it meant to me to hear the President go on to declare that the time is now right to step up the Polaris program. Perhaps I have seemed to have a phobia about the Polaris submarine. More than 2½ years ago I spoke in the Senate for an all-out drive to develop this weapons system. My heart was in that speech and I have been clamoring on this subject ever since.

A weapon which packs the destructive power of all the conventional bombs dropped by both sides in World War II, which has 140 million square miles of ocean area in which to move, which cannot be discovered and knocked out by surprise attack, which is comparatively inexpensive and does not require flotillas of escort ships, which does not require bases within the area and sovereignty of other nations from which to strike, is, in my opinion, the ultimate weapon of our generation.

The whole development of Polaris from conception to completion in less than 5 years is one of the triumphs of our time. We owe a debt of gratitude to the President, to the Navy, to the Congress, and to the 3,000 business firms who contributed to its success.

However, as the President said Monday, this is no time to rest on our oars. With two Polaris submarines on the firing line, five new ones already assigned to shipyards for construction and advance planning, and procurement for five more to be built next year, we are on the way.

We must have more, and with the longer range version which the President calls for.

Mr. President, no other nation on earth has developed such a weapon. The Nation which has it today is not second best to anyone. Rapid production of Polaris submarines in sufficient quantity spells real security.

THE STABILITY OF THE DOLLAR AND THE GOVERNMENT'S RECORD ON TAXATION, THE BUDGET, AND DEBT MANAGEMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], is the author of a recent study on the stability of the dollar and the Government's record on taxation, the budget, and debt management.

This study deals with vital areas, providing an excellent history of recent happenings—and it does so concisely and in most usable form.

For these reasons, I commend it to my colleagues—especially those on this side of the aisle. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE STABILITY OF THE DOLLAR; THE TAX REDUCTION RECORD; THE BUDGET AND DEBT MANAGEMENT RECORD; AND THE ADVANCES MADE BY THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT DURING THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, senior Republican member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee)

STABILITY OF THE DOLLAR

When the Republican administration took office in January 1953 it found that the dollar had lost almost half of its purchasing power since 1939.

The consumer's dollar in January 1953 was worth only 52 cents in terms of the food,

clothing, shelter, and other items it would buy compared to 1939.

During the past 7 years the value of the dollar has decreased by about 5 cents as contrasted with the 48-cent loss in the preceding 14 years. Furthermore, there has been no appreciable change in the value of the dollar during the last year.

Inflation acts like a special tax which hits hardest widows and orphans, retired persons, and working people with fixed incomes.

The relative stabilization of the purchasing power of the dollar during the Republican administration has, in effect, saved these groups from such a special tax. Financial stability has been achieved simultaneously with record high levels of personal income and consumer spending. The highest standard of living in American history has thus been reached.

TAX REDUCTION

The 1954 tax reduction during the Republican administration, amounting to $7.4 billion was the largest tax cut in history.

The largest item in the tax reduction program was a cut of $3 billion in individual income taxes.

Individuals also shared in the savings from the excise tax reductions and in the benefits provided in the tax revision law of 1954. Of the $7.4 billion returned to taxpayers, tax savings of approximately $4.6 billion went to individuals and $2.8 billion to corporations.

Individuals received:	
Individual income tax savings	$3,000,000,000
Savings in excise tax cuts	800,000,000
Tax revision law savings	800,000,000
Corporations received:	
Excess profits tax termination	2,000,000,000
Share in excise tax cuts	200,000,000
Tax revision law savings	600,000,000

The percentage distribution of the $7.4 billion was 62.2 percent to individuals and 37.8 percent to corporations.

The reduction in individual income taxes was about 10 percent for the lowest and middle income brackets. It was only slightly more than 1 percent in the top brackets.

Subsequent to 1954, the administration opposed revenue-losing measures because of the need of revenue to balance the budget.

However, as part of the farm program, provision was made for refund of the excise tax on gasoline used on a farm.

These refunds amounted to $74 million in the fiscal year 1958 and $79 million in the fiscal year 1959.

In addition, between 1955 and 1960, a number of excise tax changes were enacted which in the aggregate reduced excises by about $700 million. Most of this reduction, over $500 million, resulted from repeal in 1958 of the excises on transportation of property and oil by pipeline. Revisions in the admissions tax in 1956 and 1958 reduced revenues by approximately $80 million, and a reduction of the cabaret tax in 1960 decreased revenues by $20 million.

A BALANCED BUDGET

The Government has continually directed its efforts toward balancing the Federal budget.

This is an accomplishment to which the Republican administration has been pledged from the beginning.

For the individual it is linked directly with stability in the cost of living, in employment, and in earnings.

It puts a sound floor under the Nation's economy.

It inspires the public confidence that is essential to continued economic expansion and sustained prosperity.

It is a convincing demonstration to those nations of the world who have a growing stake in a continuing sound American economy that we are conducting our fiscal affairs in a responsible manner.

Budget surpluses have been achieved in 3 of the last 6 fiscal years and despite the recession engendered deficits of 1958 and 1959, a surplus of $1.1 billion was realized in the fiscal year 1960, and a surplus of $4.2 billion is projected for fiscal 1961 under the President's program.

TAX REVISION

The tax revision law enacted in 1954 provided benefits for every American by removing hardships on millions of individual taxpayers, effecting the simplification and clarification of our earlier tax laws, closing some loopholes, and reducing some unnecessary restraints on business.

Tax pressures and injustices were eased by the new code for such groups as working mothers, parents of children who are helping pay their way through schools, retired people, families with heavy medical expenses, farmers in need of new equipment, people with sick and accident policies, persons with nonrelative dependents, farmers engaged in soil and water conservation, and many others.

The code rearranged the tax burdens so as to make it easier for the economy to move forward. The goal was to improve the laws so as to help the economy to grow and so create more and better jobs and better living for everyone. Provisions for more liberal depreciation allowances, and in a small measure offering relief from the double taxation of dividends, helped accomplish this.

An important development pushed by Republicans was the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-859, approved September 2, 1958).

This measure strengthened the revenue system by closing loopholes and by foreclosing unintended benefits, most of which were the result of carrying over provisions of the 1939 code into the 1954 code.

This act also removed hardships which had previously existed in the tax law.

In addition, the Small Business Tax Revision Act of 1958, which was incorporated in Public Law 85-859, provided substantial tax relief for small business.

Among the provisions aiding small business were: More liberal loss deductions in certain cases involving small business corporations, extension of the net operating loss carryback, more liberal depreciation allowances, more time to pay estate taxes attributable to investment in closely held business enterprises, and an increase in the amount of earnings that a small business may accumulate without being subject to the tax on improper accumulation of surplus.

Besides these broad tax acts there have been a number of specific adjustments in the tax law to correct inequities and provide limited relief. For example, in 1960 the 3-percent limitation was removed with respect to medical expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the care of a dependent parent who is 65 years of age or over, thus allowing the deduction of the first dollar of these expenses.

Further progress was made toward tax simplification. The card return form 1040A was revised in 1958 to permit its use by employees with less than $10,000 of income (rather than $5,000). As a result of this and other changes, as many as 31 million individuals can now qualify to use this simple tax return as compared with 14 million who filed it for 1957. A new income tax return form 1040W, was introduced in 1959 to serve the needs of individual income-tax payers not eligible to use punch-card form 1040A, but whose affairs do not require all the detail specified on regular form 1040. The new form may be used by taxpayers whose incomes consist of salaries and wages regardless of amount, and not more than $200 of dividends and interest, and no other items of income.

A concerted effort was made to expedite the completion of regulations to simplify and increase understanding of the tax law. In this connection, a new regulation on travel expenses was developed which relieves employees who account to their employer for their business travel expenses from reporting such expenses in their individual tax returns. Another regulation permits teachers to deduct educational expenses if their purpose is to update and expand knowledge of the subject taught, to learn improved teaching methods, or otherwise improve teaching effectiveness.

The Excise Tax Technical Changes Act of 1958 revised many excise provisions. Because of lack of time, excises were not given full consideration during the development of the new Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The 1958 act was designed to correct inequities and disparities of a technical nature and was not concerned with the general question of excise-tax rates. Major revisions were made in the terminology of the taxes on communications, the method of computing the stamp taxes on stocks, the statutes relating to distilled spirits, and the provisions relating to credits and refunds.

In recognition of the need for a permanent and equitable method of taxation of life insurance companies, the Secretary of the Treasury, in April 1958, sent to the House Ways and Means Committee suggested approaches to the long-range solution of this problem. These suggestions were incorporated in the Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959, signed into law by the President on June 25, 1960.

To strengthen our Federal system of Government, the Republican administration recommended the enactment of proposals made by the joint Federal-State action committee which called for the transfer of responsibility for certain functions from the Federal Government to the States and the relinquishment of a portion of certain Federal taxes to assist the States in financing these responsibilities.

As the budget permits, additional reforms will be undertaken to increase the fairness of the tax system, to reduce the tax restraints on incentives to work and invest, and wherever feasible to simplify the tax laws. The Treasury Department is making a study of various possible tax adjustments and is cooperating with the House Ways and Means Committee in developing plans for an inquiry into the opportunities for constructive reform of the Federal tax system.

ENROLLMENT TO PRACTICE BEFORE THE REVENUE SERVICE

New Treasury programs have been instituted to assist taxpayers in their dealings with the Revenue Service. The almost exclusionary type of examination required for applicants for enrollment to practice before the Revenue Service who were not lawyers, certified public accountants, or former Service employees was abandoned and a new realistic examination prepared.

Another change will permit the many small taxpayers who have their returns prepared by people who are not lawyers or CPA's to have the preparer represent the taxpayer before examining officers and revenue agents.

These changes will make available to taxpayers a greater number of well-qualified people to represent them at any level of the Service and will also permit the preparers of returns to assist taxpayers in resolving their usually minor problems with the Service.

DEBT MANAGEMENT

Debt management policies of the Treasury Department under the Republicans have

been keyed to the administration's objective of promoting high employment, rising production, and a stable dollar.

Financings have been designed to tie in with Federal Reserve System actions to keep the supply of money and credit in line with the needs of the country. In addition, the administration has sought by numerous means to distribute the debt more widely among the people.

Since January of 1953 about $50 billion of marketable bonds running 5 years or more to maturity have been sold, in contrast to only $5 billion in the previous 6 years. This has prevented a further erosion in the average length of the debt.

The Treasury has instituted a number of technical improvements designed to facilitate its financing operations. The pricing of new issues at a slight premium or discount has enabled the Treasury to attune its offerings more closely to the market and consequently to get the best deal at the cheapest cost to the Government, consistent with other debt management objectives.

The Treasury has extended the auction method of selling securities to include 6-month bills, and has extended this principle to 1-year bills maturing on a regular basis four times a year. The auction method puts the burden of pricing on those who participate in the bidding and reduces the uncertainty and unsettlement in the market that tends to arise when the Treasury sells issues at a fixed price.

The Treasury has also taken steps to "routinize" its other short-term debt operations by concentrating these short-term maturities as much as possible in mid-February, May, August, and November, and to even up, as far as possible, the short-term debt coming due during each of these four dates. This is helping to assure a smoother operation in rolling over these maturities. These technical improvements in the short-term area will also be helpful in setting the stage for longer term financing.

In the 85th session of Congress the Treasury requested legislation which would have provided:

1. Removal of the 3.26-percent interest ceiling on savings bonds which, together with other changes, would permit the Treasury to go forward with a reinvigorated savings bond program.

2. Removal of the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on new Treasury bond issues—an imperative need to enable the Treasury to avoid an excess of short-term financing.

3. Technical amendments designed to improve the management of the public debt, foremost being a provision for the deferral of tax gains or losses by participants in advance refunding operations in which holders of Treasury securities (in advance of maturity) are offered securities with longer maturities in exchange.

The legislation in its final form enabled the Treasury to increase the yields on series E and H savings bonds to 3¾ percent retroactive to June 1, 1959. As a result the savings bond sales and redemption picture has improved measurably, easing the problem of maintaining a widespread distribution of an important segment of the public debt in the hands of millions of small savers.

The provision for deferral of tax gains and losses in advance refunding operations was granted by Congress and in June 1960, the Treasury offered holders of the 2½ percent bonds of 1961 an opportunity to exchange a portion of their holdings for a 4-year note or an 8-year bond. Over $4 billion of the $11 billion outstanding 2½ percent bonds were exchanged for the new securities, mostly for the 4-year note. This, of course, significantly reduces the future problem of refunding the large 2½ percent bond in November 1961 and is an additional step toward the objective of improving the maturity structure of the marketable public debt.

It is most unfortunate that the Democratic-controlled Congress failed to take action on the requested removal of the 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on new Treasury bond issues, and continuation of this arbitrary restriction is unjustifiable. The Treasury will continue to press for the flexibility necessary to handle the Government's financial affairs in a sound manner.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

The Secretary of the Treasury is Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, which coordinates the policies and operations of the U.S. representatives on international financial institutions and the international financial policies and operations of U.S. Government agencies, including the Export-Import Bank, the International Cooperation Administration, the Development Loan Fund and other agencies involved in foreign lending. The Secretary of the Treasury is also U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Finance Corporation.

The Treasury Department played the major role in carrying out the President's recommendation that the resources of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund be increased by substantial amounts.

The purpose of the increases is to enable the two institutions to continue to carry forward in the years ahead the constructive policies that they have pursued during the first 13 years of their existence.

In June 1959, the President signed the legislation authorizing U.S. participation in the increases, and the Treasury Department promptly took steps to make the required payments. By September 1959, a sufficient number of countries had signified their approval of the increases to meet the minimum amounts required under the terms of the proposal. This forward-looking step in the international field thus has become a reality.

The Treasury has taken part in major financial negotiations and consultations with a number of countries, including the United Kingdom at the time of the Suez crisis in 1956 and the establishment of nonresident convertibility in 1958. Other discussions were held with the Federal Republic of Germany, France on various occasions, Turkey, Argentina, Brazil, India, and several others.

The Treasury Department of the Republican administration took a leading part in developing a plan for, and played a major role in, negotiations for the establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank with the 21 American Republics as members. The charter for the proposed Bank was initiated in April 1959, and the Treasury Department bore the main responsibility for obtaining legislation providing for U.S. membership. The President signed the required legislation on September 1, 1959.

All American Republics except Cuba have taken similar steps and accepted membership. The Bank has elected a president, directors, and principal officers and will begin operations on October 1, 1960.

The existence of the Bank will further affirm the deep interest of the United States in its economic relations with the Republics of the Western Hemisphere.

The Treasury has made and renewed exchange agreements with a number of Latin American countries to assist them in keeping their currencies in orderly relations with the dollar and in maintaining their exchange systems free from restrictions, generally in cooperation with the International Monetary Fund.

Most recently, the Secretary of the Treasury has vigorously pressed forward the proposal to create a new multilateral lending organization, to be known as the International Development Association.

This organization would be an affiliate of the International Bank and would be authorized to make loans for the economic development of less developed areas on terms more flexible than those which the International Bank can provide.

The institution will provide for the cooperative association of the industrial countries of the free world with the United States in an institution devoted to development lending on flexible terms. In addition, the International Development Association may provide an opportunity for the utilization of some of the foreign currencies derived from oversea programs of the United States. The National Advisory Council, in August 1959, reported favorably to the Congress on the establishment of such an organization. At the annual meeting of the Governors of the International Bank, in September 1959, the Secretary, as U.S. Governor, proposed a resolution calling upon the Executive Directors of the International Bank to formulate Articles of Agreement for an International Development Association. This resolution was unanimously adopted by the Board of Governors, and legislation providing for U.S. membership is being considered in the Congress.

Through the measures noted above the United States has again demonstrated a high degree of effective leadership in the international financial field.

MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS

Constant attention to ways in which the Treasury's work can be performed more efficiently and economically has made it possible to reduce the number of civilian personnel in the Department from 87,800 in January 1953 to 74,200 in January 1960, a reduction of 13,600 employees, or 16 percent. At the same time, workload figures in most bureaus have increased significantly. For example, the number of checks issued has increased by 50 percent, the number of checks paid by 30 percent, the number of persons clearing customs by 25 percent, the number of regular Treasury securities issued by over 100 percent, the number of carriers entering the United States by 35 percent, and the number of coins manufactured by 55 percent.

During the first full fiscal year after the Republican administration took office, almost $21 million was saved as a result of immediate economy measures taken. When initial economy efforts lagged, the Secretary gave personal leadership to a search for economies throughout the Department which gave impetus to the Department's regular efforts to improve management. The Department's management improvement efforts under the present administration have resulted in total tangible annual savings of $74.5 million.

Many of the economies resulted in direct improvements in services to the public, such as the following:

1. Goods in world trade move through the American customs with less difficulty and less delay. A huge backlog of unliquidated entries has been substantially reduced. Red-tape has been cut on merchandise classification and duty rate determination. Prompt determination of duties on imports has been made possible, with the determinations based on current prices in our foreign trade.

2. Customs declaration forms for the individual passenger have been greatly simplified and continued improvements have been made in income tax forms.

3. Tax administration has been greatly improved by prompt settlement of tax disputes.

Internal operations have been greatly simplified and speeded up by organizational realinements and the decentralization of functions, by the continued modernization and

mechanization of procedures, and by increased attention to the recruitment and training of personnel of the highest type. A few examples of these improvements follow:

1. The number of supervisory regional offices of the Internal Revenue Service was reduced from 17 to 9.

2. The use of electronic equipment for paying and reconciling Government checks, and for processing the redemption of savings bonds will save approximately $4 million on a Government-wide basis.

3. Widespread technological improvements have been made in the manufacture of currency and coins, such as the installation of eight new sheet-fed rotary intaglio presses to print currency at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing with savings of $1.8 million.

4. Improved audit and collection procedures in the Internal Revenue Service have resulted in increased revenue collections.

5. The Internal Revenue Service is collecting Federal liquor and tobacco taxes by means of returns instead of by sale of tax stamps with expected annual savings of $1.2 million.

6. The Federal Boating Act of 1958 is designed to promote boating safety in the United States. It requires the numbering for identification of all motor propelled boats and gives the U.S. Coast Guard civil penalty authority in addition to its present criminal penalty authority for reckless operation of motorboats. Cost of the program is expected to be met by fees to be paid for numbering certificates to be issued to boatowners. The number of pleasure boats in operation is estimated to be increasing by about 500,000 a year since 1947 to a total of over 8 million in 1959.

As the senior Republican Member in the Senate I am proud of the great progress and advancement made on behalf of the American people by the Treasury Department under the Republican administration.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, which has performed a great service throughout the years on behalf of the promotion of human equality for all our citizens, on Monday of this week issued a statement calling upon the Congress to enact civil rights legislation in this August session.

As usual, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights has made a positive, constructive, sincere and moderate proposal.

It goes without saying that I share their hope that such legislation can be considered and enacted into law before we adjourn sine die. The proposals which they set forth are ones which I have offered myself and which I have voted for in the present Congress.

I was pleased to note the Leadership Conference's determination to do everything possible to see that civil rights legislation does not become a political football, and its hope that civil rights bills will not be offered as a roadblock to other important legislation such as medical aid for the aged, housing, school construction and minimum wages. May I suggest to my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle that they take these words to heart. Civil rights legislation must not be made into a political football or offered to block social legislation which this Congress is determined to enact into law at this session.

My thoughts on this subject are expressed in a joint statement which the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I prepared yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that our statement and the statement by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATORS HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DEMOCRAT, OF MINNESOTA, AND JOSEPH S. CLARK, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION, AUGUST 9, 1960

We stand firmly on the civil rights plank of the Democratic Party adopted at Los Angeles; but to interject an extended civil rights debate into the present Senate session at this time would be to obstruct passage of any legislation at all.

We came back to Washington to help complete unfinished business, namely:

1. Ratify the Antarctic Treaty.
2. Pass the vitally needed appropriations measures including mutual security now pending in the Congress.
3. Pass a Federal aid to education bill to assist in providing adequate classrooms and decent pay for teachers.
4. Provide medical care for the elderly.
5. Enact a good housing bill; and
6. Raise the minimum wage and extend its coverage.

These last four measures implement important human rights for large groups in our population now denied these rights. Each of these four measures is a specific commitment in the 1960 Democratic platform.

Our first job is to pass this legislation and do it as promptly as possible.

If the time remains to attempt to pass meaningful civil rights legislation, we will be in the forefront of an effort to do so. Whether we will have enough time depends on how long the Republicans delay enactment of the unfinished business.

The maneuvering of the Republicans in the Senate yesterday and today makes clear that their objective is to prevent the enactment of the legislation listed above and exploit the civil rights issue for political purposes only.

We do not mean to be parties to any such effort.

STATEMENT ON CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION IN AUGUST SESSION OF CONGRESS BY LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS, ROY WILKINS, CHAIRMAN, ARNOLD ARONSON, SECRETARY, AUGUST 8, 1960

As organizations dedicated to the advancement of civil rights in America, we call upon both political parties for assistance in the enactment of civil rights legislation at the reconvened August session of Congress.

Both parties have adopted strong civil rights planks with substantial areas of agreement between them. We ask both parties for an August downpayment on these planks as an earnest of their intention to execute the planks in full during the next administration.

While we shall press to obtain civil rights legislation at this session of Congress, we are equally determined to do everything possible to see that such legislation does not become a political football.

Civil rights bills must be handled sincerely on their own merits and not in such a way as to constitute a body block to consideration of other legislation before the Congress, as, for example, medical aid for the aged, housing, school construction, and minimum wages.

To the end that civil rights legislation may become a reality rather than a political pawn, we call upon Vice President NIXON and Senator KENNEDY to take this issue out of the partisan arena by agreeing upon a measure or measures which both parties can push to enactment along with other legislation at this short session.

We suggest that a basis for such an agreement lies in legislation proposed by both platforms upon which hearings have already been held by the Congress. As possible examples of such legislation, we suggest legislation which would:

1. Facilitate compliance with the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions by extending Federal aid and technical assistance to schools which in good faith attempt to desegregate.
2. Authorize the Attorney General to bring actions in Federal courts to protect constitutional rights.
3. Establish a statutory body to protect equal job opportunities on Government contracts.

It has been established over the years that neither party alone can deliver on civil rights promises. What is vital now is that the two candidates agree upon legislation which both will support actively in accordance with the pledges of their respective platforms.

We are confident that the necessary two-thirds can be mustered for cloture in the Senate if Vice President NIXON is determined to obtain the support of two-thirds of the Republicans and if Senator KENNEDY is determined to obtain the support of two-thirds of the Democrats (southern Democrats represent substantially less than one-third of the total number of Senate Democrats).

As far as the House is concerned, the Rules Committee could hardly be a stumbling block if Speaker RAYBURN, acting for Senator KENNEDY, and Minority Leader HALLECK, acting for Vice President NIXON, jointly seek committee action.

On this road lies the possibility, even the probability, of civil rights legislation at this session of Congress and this can be accomplished without the excuse that to so act would hold up full consideration of other pending and needed legislation. A test of the good faith of the parties and of the Presidential candidates will lie in their willingness to avoid partisan bickering over civil rights and to unite in the enactment of vitally needed civil rights legislation now.

EXCESSES AGAINST AMERICANS IN CUBA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, last March in an extended address to this body, I warned against entertaining any further illusions as to the Communist character of the Castro regime in Cuba. I also warned that any inaction on our part would merely encourage Castro and his associates, posing as a "government," to engage in further excesses against Americans, our national dignity and honor, and American rights and interests in Cuba.

Castro's seizure of all American property in Cuba without even the empty mockery of pretending to pay for any of it with worthless paper at some future date has more than vindicated my warnings in the past.

The current August issue of the American Legion magazine carries an excellent article on Castro, his background, and what we may expect from him. The article is entitled "Castro Can Be Stopped Without Bullets" and was written by Edward Tomlinson, a well-known authority on Latin America. Mr. Tomlinson served as a newspaperman in South America for more than 30

years and has also lectured on this subject for many years.

In his article Mr. Tomlinson notes that many of the liberals who stanchly supported Castro in the beginning and for a year or more after he seized power continued to give him the benefit of the doubt, hoping he would finally display some degree of sanity and responsibility, "have lost hope and now admit publicly that Cuba is a Communist bridgehead in the Americas and a mortal threat to the security of the United States and the whole hemisphere."

Mr. Tomlinson warns:

Although there is no longer any doubt on the part of most of our Government officials that the Castro dictatorship is communistic and a stiletto at our jugular vein, some of them shrink from any firm and decisive steps to prevent it from spreading to other less advanced American Republics.

I commend the article to all Senators and others interested in gaining a better understanding of and promoting better relations with the other American Republics. I ask unanimous consent that the American Legion magazine article, "Castro Can Be Stopped Without Bullets," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

CASTRO CAN BE STOPPED WITHOUT BULLETS

(The time has come to remove the props that support a rabble-rouser who, at every turn, plays the Communist game.)

(By Edward Tomlinson)

There no longer can be any doubt that Fidel Castro and his henchmen have established a communistic, if not a Moscow-dominated, regime in Cuba. Nor can there be much question that if left to flourish, its deadly contagion will spread to other Latin American countries.

Even if it is not Russian-inspired, or Kremlin-dominated, the political, economic, and social policies it has proclaimed and the methods it employs to carry them out are an unmistakable facsimile of those practiced in the Soviet Union.

As in all Communist countries, the Castro government is a dictatorship of the cruelest type under which every citizen is subject to the whims of its rulers.

Among its motley entourage are any number of men, including Castro himself, who not only were delinquent from their youth up, but who had lurid records of Communist association and indoctrination long before they ever dreamed of taking over the sugar-rich island.

Like all Communist rulers, they came to power by force and bloodshed and are maintaining themselves by the same means. No one has been able to prove that the majority of Cuban citizens actually support the despotic Castro dynasty. They have had no chance to express themselves at a ballot box or by any other fair and impartial method.

If all the estimated 500,000 rural workers and country bumpkins who from time to time are hauled into Havana from the hinterland to shout vivas to Fidel's frenzied harangues actually believe or even understand what he says, there still are 6 million other Cubans whose opinions have neither been voiced nor sought.

Many of the key figures who fought with the bearded fanatic in the revolution have turned against him. Hardly a day passes that Cuban exiles do not arrive in this or other nearby countries. Most of these people have declared that they fled their homeland because the Communists have been allowed to take over.

Even if Fidel, as he is popularly known in Cuba, has never carried a Communist card, his favorite associates, since his student days, have been known Communists as well as extremists of every stripe.

His very childhood was spent in a lawless and often violent environment. His father, Angel Castro, was a Spanish immigrant who came to the island in the early nineties. After 7 years as a pick-and-shovel man on an American-owned sugar plantation in eastern Oriente Province, he was fired and indicted for theft. He jumped trial and went out into the backwoods and squatted on the property of absentee ranchers and farmers. In Cuba it has always been difficult to eject squatters once they have settled down.

In 1917 the elder Castro took part in a local civil war as the head of a group of recruits from his own and surrounding farms. Actually, he spent most of his time moving fences on neighboring ranches and taking over more property, so that by the end of the conflict he had accumulated a small fortune.

From such surroundings Fidel and his younger brother, Raul, went off to parochial schools in Santiago de Cuba, and eventually to a Jesuit high school in Havana. In 1945 Fidel enrolled at the University of Havana. From the very first he was the overbearing bully and rabble rouser he is today, determined to dominate everybody around him. But he was unpopular with the majority of the students because of his uncouth manners and fanatical arguments. He wore dirty clothes and seemed never to take a bath. The youngsters nicknamed him "Bola de Churro," or grease ball.

Shunned by the great body of students, he teamed up with the flaming leftist and hoodlum elements, at the time numerous in all the big Cuban public educational institutions.

During the period 1945–47 the university, as described by one of its most distinguished professors, was "a training ground for intellectual gangsters. These groups," he declared, "were involved in no less than 164 murders, for which nobody was ever punished."

In 1947 Fidel and most of his friends were involved in the Cayo Confites filibustering expedition, a freebooting attempt by irresponsible students, soldiers of fortune, and a few burning idealists to invade the Dominican Republic and overthrow dictator Rafael Trujillo. But before the adventurers could set sail, the Organization of American States cracked down on the Cuban Government and the force was disbanded.

Returning to the university Fidel resumed his old associations. Terrorism among the students rose to new heights and he and other hotheads were arrested several times and haled into court, but each time they succeeded in escaping conviction. Meantime, he had come under the influence of Alfredo Guevara and Lionel Soto, the two principal Communist Party leaders in the university. He remained in close contact with these two Reds during the remainder of his student days.

One high U.S. Government employee, who was studying Spanish at the university in those days, personally confirms that Fidel became fascinated with the writings of Karl Marx. He also read and went around the campus spouting his enthusiasm for the Communist theories expressed in The Yenan Way, a book written by Eudocio Ravines, a prominent Peruvian Communist. The Yenan Way depicts the Chinese Communist road to power and suggests that its methods would be more suitable than those of the Soviet Union in waging communism in the Latin American countries.

In early 1948 Fidel was implicated in two more murders in Havana and was arrested. Again, he escaped conviction. In April of that year he and others among his closest colleagues found it advisable to take several weeks of vacation outside Cuba.

Curiously enough, their vacation period coincided with the Ninth International Conference of American States, which met in Bogotá, Colombia, that year. Gen. George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State, headed our delegation. The conference was destined to be disrupted by one of the bloodiest revolutionary outbreaks in the history of the southern continent.

Meantime, Fidel Castro of Cuba and a fellow student by the name of Rafael del Pino had made their way to Bogotá, as Cuban members of an international "anti-imperialist" student organization scheduled to convene in the Colombian capital simultaneously with the gathering of inter-American statesmen. The purpose of the student meeting, ostensibly, was to agitate against colonialism in the Western Hemisphere. Colombian officials later established that this assemblage was financed by the Communist Party, and that Fidel and Del Pino were there representing the party in Cuba.

According to a book published in 1949 by Alberto Nino, then chief of the Colombian secret police, the activities of all the foreign students were under strict surveillance from the time of their arrival. Señor Nino pointed out that the two Cubans were special objects of attention because of advance information that they had traveled by way of Caracas, Venezuela, and had conferred with Communists in that country.

At any rate, the police learned that a few hours after their arrival in Bogotá the Cubans made contact with representatives of the Soviet Embassy. That night their hotel room was searched and incriminating literature was confiscated. A few evenings later, the two were caught redhanded in a theater distributing leaflets in which the United States was denounced as the chief imperialist of the hemisphere.

On April 8 Castro and Del Pino held a meeting with militant agitators of the Colombian Labor Federation at which they lectured on "the techniques of the general strike and armed uprisings." It was the next day, April 9, that the revolution broke and 3,000 persons were killed or wounded within 24 hours.

The Nino volume goes on to say that investigations following the blood bath showed that Castro and Del Pino had taken active part in the uprising. At any rate, Colombian President Mariano Ospina Perez publicly denounced them as "Communists who have been in the leadership of the insurrection." But before they could be taken into custody they took refuge in the Cuban Embassy; and Dr. Guillermo Belt, head of the Cuban delegation to the conference, who was also the Cuban Ambassador in Washington, arranged to have them flown out of the country.

There are people in this country who still seem to be under the impression, or the delusion, that Fidel Castro was a creature of the dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista, that he is a sort of white knight who rose out of that despotism to restore liberty and freedom to the Cuban people.

Whatever else may be said against the former dictator, he was neither responsible for, nor the excuse for, Fidel Castro's rebellious and violent tendencies. During all the years Castro was running with the terrorists, gangsters, and Communists at the University of Havana, joining in soldier-of-fortune adventures, and mixing in bloody insurrections in foreign countries, Batista was not even in Cuba, much less in power. In the years from 1945 to 1948 the old sergeant and former President was living quietly abroad, most of the time in the

United States. He did not return to power in Cuba until 1952.

The President of Cuba during those years was Dr. Ramon Grau San Martin, himself an oldtime leftist, who in his earlier days as an instructor in the University of Havana Medical College had been a Communist sympathizer. In fact, throughout his administration as President the Reds in Cuba enjoyed a field day. Under him communism flourished in the labor unions and at the university. It was during his administration that the university was a "training ground for intellectual gangsters," among whom was the man destined to become its most famous student, Fidel Castro.

In June 1948 Carlos Prio Soccaras was elected to succeed Grau San Martin. Upon assuming office, President Prio began slapping down the Communists. At the time the party boasted a membership of 158,000. He broke their hold on most of the big labor unions and weeded them out of government.

Meantime, Fidel had received his law degree at the university, and had entered politics, on the antiadministration side, of course. For a time he seemed to have cooled toward his leftist and Communist friends. But Prio officials said differently. They pointed out that he had had so many close shaves with the law that he realized if he was to get anywhere in politics he had to present a more circumspect front.

Unfortunately, the fiery revolutionary was unable to get along with the top leaders of the important opposition groups. As usual, he wanted to dominate them. Even so, he announced himself as a candidate for Congress in the 1952 elections and launched a bitter campaign against the Prio regime. But the elections were never held. It was on March 10, 1952, that Batista sprang his military coup, ousted Prio, and annulled the elections. Naturally, Fidel was outraged and began his long struggle to drive the dictator from power and from Cuba.

He forged his ties with the university groups, including his old Communist advisers, Guevara and Soto. He became a close friend of Blas Roca, secretary general of the Communist Party, and of another Marxist enthusiast, Raul Roa, who was eventually to become his Foreign Minister.

On July 26, 1953, Fidel and his followers made a foolhardy but bloody attack on an army barracks in Santiago de Cuba, which failed after dozens of men on both sides had been killed and wounded. Most of the attackers were arrested, tried, and sent to prison for 15 years. Later Batista pardoned Fidel and permitted him to go into exile in Mexico, where, according to Mexican authorities, he immediately made contact with Communist elements.

It was in Mexico that he met Ernesto "Che" Guevara. "Che" Guevara (no relation to the Guevara of the University of Havana), is not a Cuban but an Argentine. Today "Che" (an old Argentine term for pal or buddy) is the financial boss of Castro's government as well as the master of the island's entire industrial setup.

"Che" Guevara had started out in Argentina much in the manner of Fidel Castro in Cuba. He was a student at the University of Buenos Aires at about the same time Fidel was active at the University of Havana. Like Fidel, he was a fanatic and a leftist, closely associated with the Communists in the university. He, too, tried to be top dog among the students but was extremely unpopular with the majority.

He organized his own group and promoted organized strikes against professors who refused to cater to his whims. As a result, he was in continual hot water with the police and eventually had to leave the country. He headed for Guatemala, at the time Red-dominated President Jacobo Arbenz was in office. He joined up with the Red labor leaders in the little Central American Republic and worked with them until the revolution of 1954, when he escaped into Mexico.

Mexican sources say it was no accident that Guevara made the acquaintance of Fidel Castro and that the two became such fast friends. As one Mexican diplomat put it: "The Communists had ordained it long in advance." At any rate, they spent a year and a half studying Marxist economics at the Mexican Labor College, which is operated by pro-Communist labor leader Vicente Lombardo Toledano. Meantime, with the help of Mexican Communists and extreme nationalists throughout the Caribbean and in this country, they raised money and plotted their now historic invasion of Cuba, which took place on December 3, 1956. In the course of his meanderings prior to this invasion, Castro entered the United States illegally and was returned to Mexico. He was refused a visa to enter the United States in 1956 because of his Communist activity.

Raul Castro, the second most influential person in Fidel's ruling clique, spent a short time at the University of Havana, but soon went off to Communist Czechoslovakia for instruction and indoctrination by the Reds in that satellite state. Behind the Iron Curtain Raul spent most of his time learning the techniques of sabotage, handling mobs, and easy and quick methods of whipping workers and peasants into fighting militia forces. Raul is the commander in chief of the Castro armies, whom Fidel has designated as his personal successor.

Antonio Nunez Jimenez is the third ranking member of the Fidel team. Nunez is the intellectual of the group. He was a fellow student of Fidel's at the university, and he prepared himself for his destiny in the Castro hierarchy by attending and participating in the various Communist-organized youth and peace congresses around the world.

On his travels he became fascinated with the Soviet and Red Chinese agrarian programs, particularly with collective farming as practiced in those countries. Therefore, it is no surprise that he should become the author of the Castro land confiscation scheme, of which he is today the all-powerful director.

Latin American intelligence and diplomatic services, as well as our own, have charted the backgrounds of a number of the other prominent figures in the present Cuban Government and have documented their sordid involvements. But since his three most powerful right-hand men have had such indisputable communistic associations, it is not necessary to catalog the careers of the others.

Even if Fidel and all of his associates had been completely free of any previous ties with the Reds, their every action since they came to power has been in strict conformity with Communist practices.

Their first act was to destroy, in the best Communist tradition, the keymen of the military forces of the country by executing—most of them publicly—more than 800 top officers of the army, navy and air corps. These bloody purges of the Cuban military rival those of the old Bolsheviks when they took over Russia.

Far from freeing his country of burdensome armies and armament, as he promised during the revolution, Castro has made all Cuba an armed camp. Labor unions have been given guns. Hotel restaurant workers take rifles with them to work. Hoodlums and teenagers walk the streets of Havana with firearms slung over their shoulders. Schoolchildren are organized into "youth militia."

He promised the agricultural workers, who supported and fed his straggling forces during their long siege in the Sierra Maestra, that the big estates, Cuban and foreign owned, would be parceled out to them. So far the big farms and plantations that have been confiscated have been collectivized, and the employees are now working for the state rather than for the private owners.

He pledged the Cuban people a free press and freedom of speech. Today there is no freedom of press or speech. All the leading newspapers and radio stations have been taken over or squeezed out of business. Censorship is stricter than it ever was in the days of Batista.

Free elections have been abolished. Revolutionary or summary tribunals have replaced regular courts of law. A secret police force, far more numerous and powerful than that of the hated Batista, eavesdrops on every citizen day and night. As in all Communist states, friends and even families are required to inform on one another.

Schools and colleges, as well as the University of Havana, are now completely dominated by the government, something Batista was never able to do completely. Textbooks are being rewritten to teach the Castro, not to say the Communist, line.

Practically every policy and device in the totalitarian lexicon has been introduced into Cuba and perpetrated upon the Cuban people. Further to identify the Cuban state with the Communist world, Castro has boldly sought ironclad trade or barter agreements with Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany; and he has reestablished full diplomatic relations with the Kremlin. Batista had slashed all ties with Moscow.

The United States, Cuba's long and faithful friend, as well as its best customer, has been singled out as the great enemy of the island nation and its people. Only a dedicated Red or a deranged and depraved mind could subscribe to the crude and violent charges that Castro, Guevara, and other parrots of Fidelismo daily heap upon Washington, the American press, and any American citizen who questions what goes on in Havana.

According to Castro, the United States did not help win Cuban independence from Spain. We only got into the Spanish-American War to line our own pockets. The North American exploiters have done nothing but bleed the Cuban people of their lands and riches.

The fact that for years we have obligated ourselves to purchase half the annual Cuban sugar crop at 2 cents more per pound than anybody else pays for it, has been of no benefit to Cuba. It has only enslaved the island. Our newspapers, our radio, and all our agencies of information are damned as "lying organs of imperialism."

Yet no public figure ever had such warm and wholehearted support from these same agencies as was heaped upon Castro while he was fighting to overthrow the Batista dictatorship and for months after he came to power. If all these and other such mouthings had come directly from Khrushchev himself they could not have been closer to the Kremlin line.

Many of the liberals in this country—who stood by him so stanchly in the beginning, and for a year or more after he came to power continued to give him the benefit of the doubt, hoping he would finally display some degree of sanity and responsibility—have lost hope and now admit publicly that Cuba is a Communist bridgehead in the Americas and a mortal threat to the security of the United States and the whole hemisphere.

The Chicago Tribune's crack correspondent, veteran Jules Dubois, who was one of the early champions of the bearded revolutionary, having written a laudatory biography about him, now sees Castro as a Communist-dominated dictator.

Spokesmen for the powerful U.S. labor organizations, the AFL–CIO, which also withheld judgment against the Cuban for many months, now speak of his regime as the Castro-Communist menace.

One of our most distinguished churchmen, Cardinal Cushing of Boston, in a para-

phrase of an old epigram, says: "When I see a bird that looks like a duck, waddles like a duck, and quacks like a duck, I know he is a duck."

Although there is no longer any doubt on the part of most of our Government officials that the Castro dictatorship is communistic and a stiletto at our jugular vein, some of them shrink from any firm and decisive steps to prevent it from spreading to other less advanced American Republics.

They point out that in the charter of the Organization of American States and in other diplomatic pledges, and promises we are committed to the principle of nonintervention. In these documents we agreed, in effect, to depart from the historic interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, and to refrain from taking unilateral action in the political affairs of any of our neighbors. But we did so with the promise that all the others would assume an equal share in preserving the new world from alien interference and influences.

Furthermore, each and every one of our sister Republics is also pledged in the charter to oppose tyranny and to defend free institutions in the Americas. Specifically, in the Dulles resolution adopted at the Caracas Conference in 1954, they declared that "the domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international Communist movement would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of all the American States. Such an eventuality, the resolution provides, would call for a meeting of the foreign ministers of all the American Republics.

The charter of the OAS provides that any nation that feels its security threatened, has the right to call upon the organization for investigation and for protection from such a threat.

Since there no longer is any question in our minds about the menace that confronts us in Cuba, and since we are the chief target of this menace, and since we have indisputable proof of what it is doing and what it intends to do not only in Cuba but in other nations throughout the New World we should not hesitate to demand action.

The heads of any southern government who object to such a request should remember that we compromised on the Monroe Doctrine by making it multilateral instead of unilateral, meaning they are now equal partners in the defense of the hemisphere. If they are so concerned that we may return to the unilateral concept of it, they should get busy and live up to the multilateral concept to which they have subscribed.

We should make it plain that we welcome their cooperation and their initiative, but that we are not going to sit back and wait until our Communist enemies have firmly established themselves throughout the other Americas.

Meantime, we may as well make up our minds that all the leftists, extreme nationalists, Communists, and chronic Yankee-haters from Mexico to Cape Horn, as well as in our own country, are going to damn us no matter what position we take in the matter. But if our neighbors are disposed to shirk their obligations, we might as well know it now and not go on living in a fool's paradise.

If they should turn their backs on us, we still have an effective recourse of our own without resorting to armed intervention or even political intervention. We do not have to send the Marines. Castro can be stopped without U.S. bullets. All we have to do is to refuse any longer to guarantee Cuba a market in this country for half its sugar output, 35 percent of which is produced by U.S. companies whose lands and properties have already been or are to be confiscated without adequate remuneration.

Incidentally, Cuba received from this country last year a total of $150 million above the world market price for the more than 3 million tons we purchased. The amount in 1960 will be practically the same. We also pay cash in dollars, on the barrelhead. Russia and other Communist countries pay in barter and propaganda.

At this moment this extra bounty from Uncle Sam goes a long way toward keeping Cuba afloat financially. Many other major business enterprises throughout the island are merely limping along or have already closed their doors.

Probably the best indication of the actual situation is the lowly state of the Cuban peso. It has been on a par with the dollar ever since the Spanish-American War; but, as this is written, the dollar will buy nearly two and a half pesos in the streets of Havana.

Contrary to general belief, we have no treaty or agreement with the Cuban Government which obligates us to buy any of its sugar. The U.S. sugar law, which fixes the amount and price we pay for the island product, is a domestic law of our own Congress, designed purely for the purpose of assuring the American public of an adequate supply of sugar, since our own production is not sufficient for our needs.

The one benefit reaped from paying the premium price for Cuban sugar is that it helps to keep the price up for the domestic producers. In fact, it is a form of subsidy, which, incidentally, penalizes the American consumer.

The sugar law expires on December 31 of this year, and there is no obligation whatsoever on our part to renew it. If the law is not extended, the biggest single support for the Castro regime will have been removed. No responsible economist, Cuban or American, believes that the despotic regime could long survive if this were done.

Nor would the United States go without sugar. Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Peru, and half a dozen of the other Latin American countries have large sugar surpluses which they would like to sell here, but cannot because we guarantee Cuba such an overwhelming share of the market. Furthermore, they could easily increase their production.

In fact, there is a world glut of sugar, so much so that an international agreement has been set up to fix production quotas for all the free nations. Actually its purpose is to peg prices. Neither Russia, Red China, nor their satellites are members.

Our own domestic producers might suffer some disadvantage if the law were allowed to expire. They might have to take less for their product, at least for a time. But it is a question of whether the American public prefers to pay more for its sugar, thereby prolonging the life of a communistic Frankenstein here on our doorstep, or to pay less and help to shorten the life of the Castro menace.

Another argument advanced against discontinuing the sugar law as presently drawn is that we would be accused of economic aggression against a neighboring American Republic. Again we say that the United States would not be breaking any contract with Cuba, nor would we be breaking an international agreement, because the law governing our purchases of Cuban sugar is purely a law of our own making. Besides there is no international tenet which says a free nation has to guarantee any other nation a market for its product, even at the going world price, much less at a premium price.

We also repeat that Fidel Castro, Guevara, Raul Castro, and the other members of the Cuban cabal have declared time after time that neither our enormous purchases nor the premium prices we pay for their sugar are of any importance to Cuban economy, but that they merely enslave the Cuban people.

Uncle Sam certainly should not be compelled to enslave his neighbors.

FINANCIAL TRIUMPH FOR WESTERN CAPITALISM

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President. Soviet Premier Khrushchev has stated many times that Communist Russia will surpass the United States economically within a short while.

Unfortunately there are those who take this bloody dictator at his word and cry their doom and gloom talk about how the United States has become a second-rate power with a falling economy.

It is interesting to note that buried inside the newspapers because of the other events, including the Democratic convention, the shooting down of an American plane over international waters, the President's declaration on the Monroe Doctrine as a warning to any alien aggressor, little attention was paid to what is a historic and visible victory for Western capitalism over the planned economy of communism.

We find that the Central Bank of West Germany has made a $240 million loan to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

This important fact means that the underdeveloped world is no longer completely dependent on the United States for capital.

Mr. President, it means that the aid the United States gave to the free countries of Europe has now placed them in a position not only to help themselves but to help others.

It is a triumph of free world free enterprise. It is one of the reasons for Khrushchev's insistence on the Allies getting out of Berlin.

This whole picture is given vividly in the column entitled "Business Outlook," by J. A. Livingston, an outstanding economist, in the July 20 edition of the Washington Post. Because of its interest and the facts it gives, I ask unanimous consent to have this column printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

BUSINESS OUTLOOK—FINANCIAL TRIUMPH FOR WESTERN CAPITALISM

(By J. A. Livingston)

Too much competition for the front page all at once:

Amid the furore of the Democratic Convention, the exchange between Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower over the Monroe Doctrine, the turmoil in the Belgian Congo, and the shooting down of another American plane by the Soviet Union, a major international financial triumph got buried inside newspapers. It helps explain why West Berlin is a festering showcase to Premier Khrushchev.

The Deutsche Bundesbank (Central Bank of West Germany) has made a $240 million loan to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), half in dollars, half in marks. This is a historic and exciting victory for western capitalism in the contest with communism for these reasons:

It's the largest borrowing ever undertaken by the World Bank outside the United States.

It's the largest advance ever made by a central bank to the World Bank and for an unusually long term, 12 years. Other such loans have run from 1 to 3 years and have amounted to $50 million to $75 million and have been divided among several central banks.

The interest rate, 4½ percent, is lower than the going rate in Germany—around 6 percent to 6½ percent. This is less than the Bundesbank's discount rate of 5 percent.

It means that the underdeveloped world is no longer dominantly dependent on the United States for capital. Increasingly, not only Germany, but France, Great Britain, and other Western Powers will shoulder with the United States the rich man's burden.

Most important, it dramatizes the resurgent economic power of Germany. Here is a nation with a sense of destiny, an economic derring-do, which has lifted it from defeat to one of the foremost commercial countries in Western Europe and the world.

Germany has been able to sell its products abroad in competition with other nations. It has built up its reserves of gold and foreign currencies to $5.4 billion. The demand for its goods and services, both at home and from abroad, is so great that the Bundesbank is constantly fighting inflation. Recently it raised the discount rate from 4 percent to 5 percent.

This economic success makes clear to the East Germans, Czechoslovakians, Poles, Rumanians, Bulgarians, and Hungarians that a private-property economic system not only functions, but functions extremely well. The variety of foods, clothing, household wares, and conveniences available in West Germany and, particularly, West Berlin, perpetually belittle the achievements of satellite areas.

The shop-window prosperity of West Germany is palpable, visible, and invidiously superior to what East Berlin offers.

That's why Khrushchev can't stand Chancellor Adenauer. That's why he wants to cut off West Berlin—from its economic bloodstream.

WE LEARN FROM HISTORY

This prosperity proves that men learn from history. After World War I, Germany also demonstrated recuperative strength. But reparations payment drained off capital. The German Government borrowed and borrowed. Ultimately, all Europe went broke.

This time we did not bow down the vanquished with debt. Instead, we extended economic aid. Moreover, the quartering of troops in Western Germany actually proved to be a source of dollar, franc, and sterling income.

Success came not easy. In the early postwar days, Germany's balance of payments was brutally adverse. Marshall Plan aid was necessary. The German currency was devalued. In 1950, gold and foreign exchange holdings amounted to a measly $274 million. Today, they're 20 times that, and the Bundesbank has had to scotch reports that the mark would be revalued upward.

SOMETHING TO REMEMBER

By exporting capital, by letting the World Bank use its extra reserves, Germany not only shares the rich man's burden, but mitigates America's stigma of being the great and dominant dispenser of funds to underdeveloped nations. By doing this through the World Bank, West Germany guards against partisan political determination of where its money will go. Loans become *multinational*, rather than national.

This success story is something to remember as we balance the credits and debits in the postwar struggle of political systems. A strong Germany constitutes an enduring triumph of American foreign-aid policy. It is far more significant than the noisy though more dramatic demonstration which kept President Eisenhower from going to Japan.

TIME FOR A DECISIONMAKER

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in the Evening Star of August 9, 1960, there appeared an article by Constantine Brown entitled "Time for a Decisionmaker." It is an extremely appropriate article regarding the problems of today and those we will face in the immediate future. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

TIME FOR A DECISIONMAKER—FATE OF UNITED STATES HELD DEPENDENT ON ABILITY OF NEXT PRESIDENT TO ACT AGAINST REDS

(By Constantine Brown)

At no time in our history has the American electorate had to make a more momentous and careful decision than this year.

Much will be said the next few months over the airwaves, in print, and at whistlestop speeches about the dire needs of the country. Emphasis will be laid on the necessity of catching up with the Russians in science (hence much more Federal money for education and school facilities); the needs of our senior citizens; difficulties of the farmers; and, of course, the international situation which the administration proclaims as satisfactory while the opposition claims the contrary.

Our future in the 1960's depends not on what platforms contain, or on the promises to an often gullible electorate, but on the strongmindedness of the man who will become our Chief Executive in these tragic and confused years. The man himself, not the platform, is all-important.

More than ever in our history the future of the United States and a large segment of the shrinking free world will depend on resolute decisions to be taken by the President himself. For in the next few years we shall be faced with this Republic's greatest threat from international communism, unless we abdicate our ideals of freedom for which we have fought three major wars in four decades, and accept coexistence on the Russian-Chinese pattern.

Our determined enemies are closing in on us more rapidly. The Iron Curtain, which in the past was thousands of miles away, is now at our doorstep. Within less than 100 miles from our shores Cuba has become a satellite state controlled not only by the Castro kids but also by their advisers from the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and Communist China.

Last Sunday Fidel Castro announced the confiscation of practically all American property in Cuba—property which in the past has contributed so much to the welfare of the island.

There has been some Communist infiltration of Latin America since the last war when we pressed the governments of our sister republics to recognize the Kremlin dictatorship. But it is only since we, with reckless shortsightedness, helped Castro come to power that a Communist political and military base has been established dangerously close to our own shores.

Even the perennial optimists in the State Department and some segments of the news media admit now that there have been arrangements made between the clique in Havana and Moscow for either submarine or missile bases on the island. Raul Castro's statement that Cuba will accept Russia's military assistance is not being passed over as "youthful oratory" any longer. It has shocking substance.

Unless a strong hand is adopted forthwith under the leadership of the United States, there is a real danger that in the months (not years) to come, the Iron Curtain will descend over other Latin American countries.

It should be realized that smaller and weaker countries cannot adopt strong measures; if they do, they run the risk of being called aggressors. The initiative for preserving freedom must come from the United States. And we have been, to put it mildly, negligent in this respect. We have also developed a strange conception about dictatorships; the anti-Communists were described as pernicious while those who had imbibed the Communist ideology received our embrace. The Far East—especially southern Asia—is equally dangerous, but only if the enemy relies on hesitation and indecision by our President.

Our people have been terrorized into the belief that we have no defense if international communism goes on a war rampage and launches its missiles against us. It has been only in the last few months that the real reason that the Moscow-Peiping axis has not unleased a shooting war has been revealed: the real might of the American forces which can destroy all the important targets in the Soviet Union, while we may only be damaged.

But to make sure of this deterrent it is necessary that the President be a man of decision who would not have to listen to his brain trusters while the international kettle was boiling over. Unless such a man is in charge, international communism is bound to win by default.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, an editorial appeared in a recent issue of Life magazine which I commend to my colleagues in the Senate.

It is entitled "People's Success Story," and it delineates with clarity, objectivity, and perspective the many accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration in domestic, international, and defense areas.

This impartial and penetrating exposition of Republican accomplishments over the past 7½ years should be read by all thinking Americans.

Mr. President, the editorial makes particular reference to our strong military posture which has prevented Communist aggression anywhere in the world and, in fact, has enhanced our prestige and power throughout the nations of the world.

The Life editorial further comments on the Eisenhower sound money policy, increases in new housing, the new highway system, our excellent space satellite program, and our Polaris submarine program—all major accomplishments in many and varied fields.

Its reference to such matters as fiscal responsibility, educational advances, medical progress, tolerance and understanding, which were all increased without Government interference or regulation point up the values of the American system of free enterprise, freedom, and liberty.

Mr. President, in view of the excellence of this editorial, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

PEOPLE'S SUCCESS STORY—THE EISENHOWER ERA MADE POSSIBLE THE MUCH GREATER ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PEOPLE

In Chicago, where he won it from Bob Taft in the acrid battle of 1952, Dwight D. Eisenhower this week surrendered the leadership of the Republican Party. The record of his administration may be only one major campaign issue, since both NIXON and KENNEDY are bound to emphasize new goals and policies for a new age. But Eisenhower's record is well worth inspection.

Of the many flaws the Democrats will find in it, historians will probably agree at least on one. There is some substance to the charge that Ike has rather reigned than ruled. He has tended to assume, as you can in the Army but not in the White House, that an order once given is self-executing; a certain lack of followthrough has marred some of his best intentions, notably the rejuvenation of the Republican Party. He has been an easy boss. But that is not to echo the commoner (and mistaken) charge that he does not make decisions. Ike has made plenty of decisions. And most of them were right.

The duty he saw in taking office was to heal the wounds of 20 years of highly partisan government and chronic emergency. It was his genius to give the latent unity and goodwill of the American people a chance to recover and grow. He has been the least "divisive" of modern Presidents—and the most widely beloved.

Reinhold Niebuhr, no conservative, said Ike "rebuilt American conservatism into a viable political instrument." He gave a suspicious generation the reassuring experience of living safely and prosperously under a Republican government again—salutary for the people and for the Republican Party, too.

Such a government had to do more correcting than innovating. In our foreign alliances, Ike's long suit, he has preserved and developed previous lines of U.S. policy, but to them he has made two contributions of enormous importance.

The first was to modernize and strengthen our military posture and bring it into the missile era on a long-pull basis—i.e., no more crash emergency programs or budgetary zigs and zags. Though there is room for marginal argument, the essential truth is that when Ike leaves office, America will still be, as he found it, the strongest military power in the world.

President Eisenhower's second contribution was to rob the Communists of their most insidious propaganda weapon, Khrushchev's pretended guardianship of world peace. Ike personally shot down that phony Picasso peace dove. He did it by his personal dedication to peace, by his atoms-for-peace offer to the U.N., by his dramatic open-skies proposal at Geneva in 1955, by stopping the Suez war, by his serious pursuit of disarmament and by his goodwill travels. He has made the cause of peace so much his own that Jim Farley, only the other day, could accuse him of "peace-at-any-price leadership." That charge won't wash. Ike has twice faced down Communist threats of war in the Formosa Strait. He has not flinched under Russian pressure on Berlin. He took bold action in the Middle East. He has kept the peace without surrendering any point of strength. The Russian empire is no larger than it was in 1952 (in fact smaller by eastern Austria). The Chinese empire, though larger by North Vietnam and Tibet, is surrounded by stronger and more alert free neighbors than it was before Ike and John Foster Dulles took charge.

Ike used to be called a lucky President. His luck has run out lately at Sverdlovsk, Paris, and Tokyo. But let not these setbacks be confused with flaws in the solid structure of allied political, military, and economic strength built in the Eisenhower era.

The economic performance has been especially spectacular. Abroad, the Eisenhower policies have encouraged a rebirth of private trade and investment that has lifted the whole Western World and parts of Asia to amazing levels of prosperity. Europe has never been in healthier shape. We still need a new approach to the underdeveloped Southern Hemisphere, but even Latin America has improved politically, if not economically, in Ike's time.

At home the case is open and shut. The Eisenhower economic policy has been virtually a textbook model of how to befriend and stimulate a free-market system. He and his aides have handled two recessions with precise skill. Real wages and consumption have risen steadily, and profits and savings have remained healthy. He has led a tireless war on excessive government spending which has at last brought inflation under control. The $1.1 billion surplus announced last week is a symbol of this victory for a sound dollar.

Ike's government has helped finance the building industry while it set an alltime record of 8 million new homes in less than 8 years. It has launched a whole new highway system, 23 space satellites and 20 atomic submarines. It has expanded the union by two new States and created seaports on the Great Lakes.

Ike's government has maintained, not without difficulty, a high standard of integrity in Federal officeholders. His Cabinet has seen some stellar performers (Dulles, Brownell, Rogers, Anderson, Mitchell, et al.) and even the unfortunate Benson deserves respect for his persistent attack on Congress' scandalous farm policy.

Ike's government has appointed more scores of good judges than any previous one. This great improvement in the judiciary, essential to the Nation, is the kind of achievement to which voters and political writers give too little heed.

Ike's government has shifted the rate of Negro political and economic progress into high gear.

But all these achievements are only part of the great story of progress in the Eisenhower era. In a nation with a constitutional government, where freedom to act is left to individuals and unofficial groups, a full evaluation must include credit or blame for how the nation as a whole behaves. The greatest deeds of his era are what the people, responsive to their renewed liberty, have done for and by themselves.

Democrats charge that Ike's preoccupation with the budget has "starved" our public services. Yet total public spending—Federal, State, and local—is nearly twice what it was in Truman's time and most of the increase has been in welfare (nondefense) services. Of our school system, so righly under scrutiny, an impressive fact is how it has grown in teachers, classrooms, and students, with little Federal aid. But even more important: scholastic standards have risen sharply.

Not Federal but private and local spending have changed our urban skylines these light 8 years; and distributed more books and music than ever; and produced more goods and services of every kind. The Federal Government did not develop automation, nor discover the Salk vaccine, nor make American architecture a new wonder of the world; nor cause more Americans to travel abroad than ever before; nor double the anual gifts to higher education; nor raise our birth rate to a record height. The American people did all these—and more. They did them under the benign and permissive Eisenhower "sun."

A certain dissatisfaction has crept into the last months of the Eisenhower era—the antitailfin syndrome, the Puritan nostalgia, the hunger for new national purpose. And that is healthy, for it shows that Americans have not been entirely corrupted by their own success. But let's face it; it is success, not failure, that causes our unease. Ike leaves us reunited, rested, self-enriched, and newly appreciative of our liberty. As a people we are (or should be) firmly prepared for our next testing. The Kennedy-or-Nixon era will be different. It may be grim or it may be great. It can scarcely be more sunny or fruitful than these Eisenhower years, in which so many age-old visions of the good life first became real.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[Ex. 1]

Aiken	Ervin	McClellan
Burdick	Green	McNamara
Bush	Hart	Mansfield
Byrd, W. Va.	Hayden	Moss
Church	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Clark	Holland	Robertson
Cooper	Hruska	Russell
Dirksen	Javits	Stennis
Dodd	Johnson, Tex.	Wiley
Ellender	Keating	Williams, N.J.
Engle	Lausche	Young, N. Dak.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is absent because of a death in the family.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, action on the pending measure has been delayed. Therefore, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be requested to invite the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FONG, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GORE, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. LUSK, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. YARBOROUGH and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are trying to conduct a hearing on all the House bills relating to payola and other problems connected with communications and television. I desire to have the Senate know that that is taking place. If quorum calls persist, we shall probably be late in coming to the Chamber. The committee is conducting very important business. It is seeking to complete the consideration of important matters during this session of Congress.

THE ANTARCTIC TREATY

The Senate resumed the consideration of Executive B (86th Cong., 2d sess.), the Antarctic Treaty, signed at Washington on December 1, 1959.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I move that the further consideration of the ratification of the Antarctic Treaty be postponed until January 25, 1961. The motion is made pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement entered into by the Senate last night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from California yield himself?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield myself as much time as I may use of the 15 minutes under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I make the motion because I believe the new administration, which will take office in January, whether it be a Republican or a Democratic administration, should have the opportunity to consider this treaty. The new administration, which will have the responsibility of conducting the foreign policy of the Nation for 4 years, and possibly well into the next decade, should have the opportunity of passing upon the provisions of this important treaty.

I believe the new President of the United States should have an opportunity to express himself to the Senate with respect to the provisions of the treaty. I think the new Secretary of State, whoever he may be, likewise should have the same opportunity. Similarly, I believe the new Secretary of Defense should have that opportunity. The Senate ought to have the advice of those gentlemen in the new administration in acting upon this important treaty.

The treaty involves an area as big as the United States of America, plus all of Europe. For all practical purposes, the treaty disposes, in perpetuity, of the relationships of this Nation and other major nations to the vast continent of Antarctica.

I assert that we ought not to be required to vote upon this matter in the last days of this session under the pressures of time, and confronting, as we are, a new administration which will come into power the first of next year.

I think it would be important to know, for instance, whether whoever may become the Secretary of State, if he be on the Republican side, the successor to the present Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, would take the same attitude as Mr. Herter has taken with respect to the treaty. I have grave doubts as to whether Mr. Dulles, were he alive, would favor some of the provisions of the treaty.

I think it would be important to know whether, if a Democratic President is elected, the Democratic Secretary of State and the Democratic Secretary of Defense, who will have the responsibility of administering the foreign affairs and the military affairs of the Nation, will take precisely the same attitude toward all the provisions of the treaty. I say this because questions have been raised with reference to the intelligence of the treaty and with reference to whether or not it serves the best interests of the United States. What are some of those questions? Here are some of the questions which have been raised on the floor. Others will be raised before the debate is over.

Why are we admitting Russia to Antarctica on an equal footing with the United States and other nations which have a long history of activity and of claims in the Antarctic, when Russia has no claims whatsoever, except such tenuous claims as may be based upon the participation by the Soviet Union in the International Geophysical Year?

Have we thoroughly examined the alternatives to the treaty, alternatives which do exist, and among which are, as asserted by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] last night, the right of America to assert its claims in Antarctica, and the right of this Nation and the other nations which have good, standing claims in that area to try to adjust their differences and to agree upon the areas over which they, and each of them, hold sovereignty? Has there been a real examination of that kind of alternative?

What does the treaty give to Soviet Russia that which Soviet Russia does not have at present? I was impressed by the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut that the treaty was approved by Russia in 42 days. We know how the Russians negotiate when they do not want something. They negotiate like they negotiated in Korea. They negotiate like they have been negotiating in Warsaw. They negotiate like they have been negotiating at Geneva. But when they were offered an opportunity to get into Antarctica, with no sound basis whatsoever, they jumped at the opportunity and, of course, signed the treaty.

What reason do we have to believe that the Russians will abide by the terms of the treaty? What self-enforcing or self-executing provisions does the treaty contain to make certain that it will be enforced by the Russians, if it is ratified by the Senate of the United States?

Is it not true that the treaty gives to the Soviets the power of veto in Antarctica, just as the Soviets now hold a veto in the Security Council of the United Nations? Does the treaty have the effect, for all practical purposes, of abandoning our just claims based upon discovery in the Antarctic? I believe it does. It has been asserted on the floor that it does.

These are questions which ought to be carefully considered by the next administration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from California has pointed out to the Senate some very significant and far-reaching commitments that the treaty would impose upon the United States if it is ratified. He has wisely moved that further consideration of the treaty be postponed until January of next year.

I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that if Congress makes a mistake now in legislating, the next Congress, which will convene in January, can correct such a mistake in a matter of 3 or 4 days. If we should adopt a policy which is disapproved by the majority of the people in the November elections, that policy could be reversed within a few days after the convening of Congress in January.

However, if the U.S. Senate, acting under its constitutional duty to consent to treaties, makes a mistake and ratifies the pending treaty, the United States will be committed for 30 years and cannot honorably extricate itself without the consent of 11 other nations, including Soviet Russia.

Mr. ENGLE. The distinguished Senator is 100 percent correct. The treaty provides by its terms that it cannot be modified or amended except by unanimous consent on the part of all the signatories. In other words, the Soviet Union would be in a position to veto any modification whatsoever. If we made a mistake in ratifying the treaty today,

there would not be any way on earth to rectify that mistake; it could not be changed. In January the Congress could not do anything whatsoever about such a mistake, for then the Soviet Union would have the right of veto; and the treaty would run for almost half a century, without a possibility of any correction.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only could the Soviet Union prevent the correction of such a mistake, but unanimous-consent action by the other signatories to the treaty could not correct a mistake without the consent of our principal opponent.

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator is correct. There would be no way to change the situation, no matter what the new Secretary of Defense might say.

I think it might be well to find out the position of the Secretary of Defense. The Senator from Arkansas has referred to it; and I have heard rumors, too, that they have grave misgivings about this matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. ENGLE. In just a moment.

Mr. President, I think the new Secretary of Defense should have a chance to consider this matter. Although I have not been able to obtain any information on this subject—I read what the admiral said when he appeared before the committee; but he did not say very much—I have grave misgivings about the treaty.

If my motion is rejected, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who also is opposed to the treaty, will subsequently address himself to it.

Now I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As a result of the so-called rumors about the attitude of the Defense Department, yesterday evening, at 7:40, Admiral Burke—who certainly speaks, if anyone does, for the Navy Department—called me. He was very much disturbed about the rumors. He said there was nothing to the rumors. He said he is wholeheartedly behind the treaty. He said that it is possible that if we had followed some other policy since 1924, there might have been a different result, but that as of the moment he has no doubt that the treaty is in the national interest. And he said he regrets very much the statement—which had been made—that there was doubt about the attitude of the Defense Department.

Admiral Tyree spoke officially before the committee, for himself, as an admiral, and for the Defense Department. And I asked him about these rumors. In my opinion, these rumors originate with the opposition to the treaty, not with the responsible members of the Defense Department. And he went to great pains to point that out.

The Senator is very persuasive in referring to the possibility of making mistakes. But if the Senate rejects the treaty, it will also be a mistake that cannot be rectified.

Our Government initiated and negotiated, on its own initiative, this treaty. It has been 2 years in process. The committee reported it without dissent, although I believe there was one person who had doubts about it.

But in my opinion it would be even more serious to make the mistake the other way.

We have been telling all the world that we want inspection, along with Russia. But if the Senate rejected the treaty, such action would label us a complete fraud before all the world, as regards trying to make any kind of agreement with what may be called our antagonist.

Furthermore, the treaty is joined in by some of our principal friends.

But the idea that the Defense Department is opposed to the treaty or has reservations about it is, in my opinion, without any justification at all. I do not think Admiral Burke would call me up and make such statements, if that were true.

Someone said the State Department "beat the Defense Department over the head." That is nonsense; the State Department could not do that. The situation is more probably the other way around.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I cannot yield further; I have only 15 minutes. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas, for whom I have great respect.

But let me say that where there is so much smoke, there must be some fire; and I would certainly agree that it is better to postpone consideration of the treaty at this time, rather than to make a mistake either way in regard to it.

What earthly harm can result if this matter is postponed until January 25? At that time we shall have a new administration, a new President, a new Secretary of State, and a new Secretary of Defense. After January 25, there will be in those offices new officials who will have the responsibility of managing the affairs of the Nation for the next 4 years of the 30 years of the lifetime of the treaty.

Mr. President, in a matter as important as this one and as vital as this one to the welfare of the Nation, is it not important that we move on the basis of the best possible information we can get, and that we move under the advice of those who will have the responsibility of going forward with the execution of American foreign policy in the years ahead?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I cannot yield at this time. If I obtain additional time, I shall yield. But at this time I wish to complete my remarks. After I complete them, if I have additional time, I shall be glad to yield.

Let me say that the administration now in power will not have the responsibility of operating under the terms of this treaty. The responsibility will be that of the new administration, in any case.

What I am saying is, not that we should make a mistake today, but that we should postpone until January 25 the further consideration of the treaty, and should give those who will have the responsibility of going forward at that time with American foreign policy, during the next few years, an opportunity to examine the treaty and advise the Senate regarding it, so the Senate will not make a mistake.

The treaty would last a long, long time. For all practical purpose it would determine in perpetuity what will happen in the only unoccupied and unclaimed continent on earth. So we certainly should take additional time in our consideration of the treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I regret that the time available to me has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to ask one question. First, let me say, incidentally, that the treaty was negotiated by a highly respected constituent of the Senator from California, Mr. Herman Phleger, of San Francisco.

The Senator from California has pointed out that Russia's eagerness to have the treaty go into effect is evidenced by the fact that within 40 or 45 days Russia approved the treaty; and it is said that that fact indicates that Russia has some interest in having the treaty go into effect.

However, I point out that in the absence of the treaty, Russia would be without limitation as regards the Antarctic. So would not our rights be better preserved by having Russia included among the signatories of the treaty, because the treaty will freeze the status quo as of today?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, to permit me to answer, let me say that at the present time there is no limitation on the operations of the Soviet Union in the Antarctic. When the Soviets went into the Antarctic during the International Geophysical Year, they squatted on an area which had been claimed for many, many years by Australia, and established their camps there. And they are still there.

My objection to this treaty is that it ties the hands of America. It demilitarizes the area. There would be nothing we could do about it if the Soviet Union moved in one of its satellites and established a military base. The satellite would not be bound by the treaty, but we would be bound not to put in a military base, even of a passive nature, even for the purpose of detection, not to mention for aggressive action. So it ties our hands. That is my objection to the treaty.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time is left on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirteen minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself 3 minutes. Then I will yield the remainder of the time to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, there has been talk about what the attitude of the next administration will be. As the Senate knows, we have the next President of the United States in this Chamber, and, to the best of my knowledge, the nominees of both parties for the highest office in this land are in favor of the treaty. I am assuming that the Vice Presidential nominees of both parties are in favor of the treaty, and would so vote. Therefore, I think that the question of postponing the treaty on Antarctica to the next session is not germane to the question at this time. A vote to postpone, in my opinion, is a vote to kill.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Why would a motion to postpone be a motion to kill if both candidates to be the future President were to favor the treaty at the next session? We want to give them a chance to look at it in the objective atmosphere of a postelection period, rather than in the atmosphere of a political campaign and the pressures being brought to bear.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I can appreciate the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Georgia, for whom I have the greatest affection and respect.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can assure the Senator that feeling is reciprocated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

It appears to me this is one of the very few measures which this rump session can consider with a great degree of objectivity. Perhaps it is the only measure which we can look at in that manner. But, I repeat, in my opinion—and it is just my opinion—a vote to postpone until a day certain in January next means that the purpose behind it is, in effect, to kill this treaty.

On the basis of what the Senator from California, for whom I have the greatest respect and affection, has said to the Senate, he is not in favor of the treaty. I may call to the attention of my colleagues the report by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which accompanied this particular treaty, and I hope my colleagues will be able to read it. May I refer them to:

1. PURPOSES OF THE TREATY

Twelve countries are signatories of the treaty: the United States, the Soviet Union, and 10 other nations, including all 7 which have advanced territorial claims to Antarctica. Through the treaty, these countries accept the following objectives: the Antarctic Continent and surrounding areas shall be used exclusively for peaceful purposes; nuclear explosions and radioactive waste disposal shall be banned in the treaty area; no territorial claims or rights shall either be recognized or affected; freedom of scientific investigation shall be maintained—

That has been a big factor in that area, and shows that different nations, differing in outlook, can work together and can make contributions toward the common good—

and international cooperation to that end promoted; and complete rights of unilateral inspection—

I emphasize "unilateral"—

shall insure fulfillment of these objectives. The overall purpose thus is to neutralize Antarctica and obviate future conflicts between nations so that knowledge may be derived from the continent to benefit all mankind.

What greater objective could we have? Who started these negotiations?

In May 1958 the United States—

Our own country—

sent identical notes to each of the 11 other countries which participated in the Antarctic program of the International Geophysical Year (IGY) of 1957–58, inviting them to join in a conference aimed at formulating a treaty on Antarctica. In so doing, the United States was mindful of broadened interest in and claims to Antarctica by several countries, conflicts between Britain, Argentina, and Chile because of their overlapping claims, the refusal of the latter two nations to permit the question to be taken to the International Court of Justice, and the failure of U.S. efforts in 1948 to arrange a conference with the seven claimants looking toward a settlement of territorial interests. Added to these considerations was the fact that the U.S.S.R. had engaged in extensive activities during the IGY and had a number of bases in the Australian-claimed portion of Antarctica which it showed every intention of maintaining. The United States, therefore, was concerned lest the great benefits of international scientific cooperation derived from the IGY should end with the close of 1958, to be replaced by future national disputes and militant maneuvers. Friendly interest in such an endeavor, informally expressed by several projected treaty members, also stimulated U.S. adoption of the initiative.

All 11 governments accepted the U.S. invitation, and their representatives held extensive informal preparatory talks in Washington.

Deliberations covered a period of 6 weeks. Two of our most distinguished colleagues were participants in those deliberations, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. They represented the Senate during the course of that 6-week period.

Some reference has been made about the stand of the Department of Defense. Rear Adm. David M. Tyree, Antarctic projects officer, appeared before the committee, representing the Department of Defense, and asserted it fully approved of this action.

Furthermore, one other individual, for whom we all have great respect, the Hon. Herman Phleger, who used to be a high official in the State Department under this administration, and who is a man of circumspection, great ability, and integrity, was the chairman of our delegation. He was looking after our interests, as were our colleagues, the Senators from Kansas and Wyoming, and all those associated with them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself one-half minute.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to inform the distinguished Senator from Montana and the Senate that within 15 minutes I have personally talked with Mr. Gates, the Secretary of Defense. He stated, I can say affirmatively, that he, General Twining, Admiral Burke, and Mr. Douglas, are wholeheartedly in favor of the treaty; that the Chiefs of Staff and the civilian members of the Department of Defense feel that the treaty should be approved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield my remaining time to the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Montana has covered the major points very well. I believe it would be a great mistake to postpone action on the treaty. We have spent over 2 years on it. The committee has had full hearings. As a matter of fact, I tried to bring it up before the end of the regular session. The Senator from Illinois was party to those discussions. But because of the rush, it was decided to put it over, and it was agreed to bring it up at the beginning of the session. I thought there might be an impression that we were doubtful about it or intended to reject the treaty.

I do not know that this is the time to go into the merits of the treaty. In my opinion, all the talk about what might have been the situation, if we had not followed what is known as the Hughes Doctrine in 1924, is completely irrelevant to the present discussion. The fact is, we have followed it. We are confronted with a situation in which we and the Russians have followed the same policy—that is, nonrecognition of any claims. If we reverse that policy and abandon this treaty, I think we shall be primarily responsible for creating a very chaotic and dangerous situation.

Among the signatories to the treaty are some of the best and stanchest friends of this country. Five of the 12 countries have already ratified—the United Kingdom, Belgium, the Union of South Africa, Japan, and Norway. If we are going to be hesitant about our action, or reject the treaty, I think it will be a major disaster to our standing in international relations.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With respect to the point made a little while ago in the colloquy, that we ought to defer the matter until we can consider it in a more objective atmosphere, is it not true that the invitations went out 25 months ago; that the 6 weeks' conference was held 10 months ago; that the treaty came to the committee at least a month before the national conventions, before the air was surcharged with certain political feelings?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It came to us in February.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Thus it was reported well before that time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We were under no pressure at all. The treaty was reported very calmly, without any political implications. There are no politics involved in the treaty at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator yield for one other point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from California made the point that we should defer consideration because a new administration will come into power and it, insofar as a treaty is administered, will administer the treaty. Would that not be true with respect to every convention, every protocol, every treaty we have considered on the executive calendar throughout this session and the prior session as well?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that seven of the nations which, under international law, have proved claims on the basis of discoveries have become signatories to the proposed treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Those nations have asserted claims. We have not recognized their claims, but all seven have asserted claims. Those nations have valid claims if we recognize them, and they have signed the treaty.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Two of the seven are the United Kingdom and Norway. Those countries have asserted claims and make the claim that they have the bases to support the claims, although they have ratified the treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct. Those two countries, plus three others which have not asserted claims, have ratified. Those others are Belgium, Japan, and the Union of South Africa.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Neither the Soviet Union nor the United States has asserted a claim, yet these two countries have become signatories to the proposed treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Thus all the nations with potential claims—claims either asserted or capable of being asserted—have subscribed to the treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Two nations, the United Kingdom and Norway, which were very active in respect to discoveries, have asserted claims in accordance with international law.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct.

I thank the Senator for that clarification.

The Senator from California referred to the Soviet Union as having "squatted" on some land which I believe he said belonged to Australia. That brings up another aspect of the problem. As a matter of fact, the land where we have "squatted," one might say, belongs to New Zealand, if we recognize the traditional claims. If we recognize the claims which have been asserted under the usual procedures of discovery and occupation, that would be the case, although there has been such limited occupation that the old doctrine of discovery has not applied.

One of the principal reasons why the United States has refused to recognize the claims of these various countries is that the countries have failed to actually enter, to occupy, and to control these various areas. That is largely a legal matter.

The fact is that the best part of this area is the area to which New Zealand asserts a claim. That is McMurdo Sound and the Ross ice shelf. Even if we threw this overboard and asserted a claim to the now unclaimed area, which is some 20 percent of Byrd Land, according to the testimony before the committee that is the poorest, the least accessible, and the least desirable part of the entire area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All time for debate has expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE.]

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on my motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer, for the information of the Senate, state the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] to postpone further consideration of the Antarctic Treaty until January 25, 1961.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay"; I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SYMINGTON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay"; I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is absent because of a death in the family.

On this vote the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 56, as follows:

[Ex. 2]

YEAS—29

Anderson	Ervin	Magnuson
Bartlett	Frear	Robertson
Bridges	Goldwater	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Hayden	Smathers
Cannon	Holland	Stennis
Curtis	Hruska	Talmadge
Dodd	Kerr	Thurmond
Eastland	Long, Hawaii	Yarborough
Ellender	Long, La.	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	McClellan	

NAYS—56

Aiken	Dworshak	Mansfield
Allott	Fong	Morton
Beall	Fulbright	Moss
Bennett	Gore	Mundt
Bible	Green	Murray
Burdick	Hart	Muskie
Bush	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Butler	Humphrey	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Proxmire
Carlson	Javits	Randolph
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Keating	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kennedy	Scott
Church	Kuchel	Smith
Clark	Lausche	Wiley
Cooper	Lusk	Williams, Del.
Cotton	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Dirksen	McGee	Young, Ohio
Douglas	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—15

Capehart	Hill	Monroney
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S.C.	Morse
Gruening	Jordan	O'Mahoney
Hartke	Kefauver	Sparkman
Hennings	Martin	Symington

So Mr. ENGLE's motion was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from California was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is before the Senate. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is in control of 2 hours of time for debate, and the balance of the time, 1½ hours, is under the control of the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, ever since Gladstone wrote that the American Constitution is the most marvelous document to come from the mind and hand of man within a given period of time, the world has marveled at our system of checks and balances. Under our system of government, the primary responsibility for the initiation and, indeed, for the negotiation of foreign policy matters is vested in the executive branch of the Government. However, under the Constitution one of the most important of all the checks found in our Government, the responsibility that devolves upon the Senate is to consider and to give its consent to treaties with foreign powers, before such treaties become effective.

It was difficult in the early days of the Republic for the heads of foreign states to recognize this division of power. Often when treaties were signed, these foreign signatories accepted them as conclusive and binding upon the Government and the people of the United States.

Throughout the years it has become perfectly well understood, by even the most remote and primitive governments of the earth, that any treaty designed to bind this country over a period of years will not become effective until it has been approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. That is a heavy responsibility on the Senate. It is one that I hope the Senate will measure up to in the decision of the pending question.

In my judgment, it would be difficult to overstate the vital importance of the issues at stake in the decision that the Senate will soon make on the pending treaty. As I indicated earlier today when I interrupted the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], we shall have taken an irrevocable step, if the Senate ratifies the treaty.

That is not the case with respect to legislation. If we make a most grievous error in a legislative matter, Congress can correct that error in a matter of days. If we make a grievous error in a legislative matter, every 2 years the people of the country have an opportunity to give expression to their views on the subject. They can elect new representatives to come to Washington and rectify the error and to change the course of the policy affected.

That is not true with respect to treaties after they have the consent of the U.S. Senate. No matter how grave an error we might make in the case of this treaty, it would be impossible for us to extricate ourselves from the evil effects of the decision.

I realize that a grave responsibility rests today upon the United States as a leader in world affairs. I realize the necessity for leaning over backward to generate the support of the other free nations of the earth in the great cause that is now at issue between the forces of freedom, led by the United States, and the forces of tyranny and repression over free men, represented by the Soviet Union.

Although we must be attuned to international interests and to global considerations, I hope the day has not come when the safety and the welfare of the United States will not be the primary concern to every Member of Congress. It is in that light that I have undertaken to measure the proposed treaty against what I regard as the primary interest of the American people.

By that yardstick, I have come to the considered opinion that the treaty clearly fails to meet the test of the national interest. Indeed, I find that the treaty is diametrically opposed to the best interests of this Nation and the future of our people.

I do not desire to restate all the matters that have been so ably brought to the attention of the Senate over the past several days. I am proud to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and others Senators who have spoken on the floor of the dangers that are in the treaty and who have implored the Senate not to take hasty action upon it.

In the last analysis the treaty, as I see it, represents a surrender of American rights, of American interests, and of the future security of America in a vital area of the world as large as the United States and Europe combined. I realize it is all too true that those rights have not been asserted by the Department of State. Nevertheless, I say it comes with poor grace for the Department to come to the Senate and to cite its own laches, its own negligence in asserting the claim, as a reason for the Senate to ratify their surrender of it.

Mr. President, the treaty would give to the Soviet Union a role equal to ours in the use, the control, and the development of the vast Antarctic area. That is true notwithstanding a total absence of any legitimate Russian rights and of any legitimate interest in that continent.

The proposal before us completely reverses the historic roles that Russia and the United States have played in the Antarctic. The United States has been more active than any other nation—indeed, than all the other nations—in its explorations and discoveries in that area. Yet, it is proposed by the treaty that we completely abandon those rights, rights that are superior to those of all the other nations who claim rights, merely because of the timidity that has seized the Department of State since the end of World War II. I do not make that statement in a partisan sense. It has not been only this administration that has neglected to assert our claims.

As a matter of fact, so far as is known, Russia had never set foot upon the continent of Antarctica prior to the time she took part in the activities of the International Geophysical Year in 1956. Yet we have before us the preposterous proposal that the Soviet Union be invited into Antarctica on terms of equality with us. This is in the light of our record of 150 years of exploration, navigation, and discovery that has resulted in the expenditure of more than 250 million American dollars and the loss of several American lives. Thus we have laid the predicate for claims which, in all other periods of human history, have been considered as adequate to support claims to sovereignty. Yet in the light of that disparity of real interest in the Antarctic area we are asked to approve a treaty whereby the United States will give away all the benefits that should accrue to us as a result of our activities. In other words, we would give away all and gain nothing, while the Soviet Union would give nothing and gain all.

No fair-minded person could quarrel with the expressed objectives of the treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does he prefer not to yield until he has concluded his address?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not matter. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With respect to the matter of our giving away all and gaining nothing, is it not true that about 80 percent of the claims are made by countries other than the Soviet Union, most of whom, I believe, are friendly to the United States?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall deal with that subject. That is why we should consider some other way to settle this matter. After I have concluded my criticism of the treaty, I shall present my alternative. This is not a purely negative position on my part. I shall point out how I believe we should proceed to settle the claims if the Senate rejects the treaty. I prefer to proceed in the order in which I have my presentation arranged.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator from Georgia does not wish to yield, that is quite all right.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; I am not here simply to condemn the treaty without presenting an alternative. I think the treaty is to be condemned. I think it is subject to condemnation. However, I shall go further and propose what I believe is a far superior program for the settlement of the conflicting claims to Antarctica.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be much interested in the Senator's remarks in regard to this point. The Antarctic is claimed by a number of friendly nations. Seven of them that have signed the treaty have claims to the Antarctic. Among the 12 who have signed the treaty, 5 have ratified it, and 2 are among the principal claimants. Is that not so?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what I referred to earlier when I said the State Department was depending on its own negligence in not asserting rights that belong to the American people. The State Department says that Americans explored and discovered this area; the Department concedes that. The State Department says that at one time or another American citizens explored and discovered more than four-fifths of the continent; but as a matter of fact, other nations have claimed most of the continent. In most instances those nations filed their claims after the American explorations that gave our country title to that area.

It is almost like the overflight issue. The State Department says we must have the right to overfly the Antarctic. I have no doubt that Russia would be glad to sign a treaty with us that would au-

thorize both the United States and Russia to overfly Arkansas. It would be about as ridiculous to claim that as a great achievement as to claim that our representatives have made a great achievement in negotiating this treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With respect to the prejudice in regard to the State Department——

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Arkansas may call it a prejudice if he wishes to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But is it not true that the unalterable policy of the United States since 1924 has been not to assert any claim to the Antarctic?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, that is not a fact.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is not that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Arkansas is relying on the old Hughes declaration, and the Senator has succeeded in drawing me away from the remarks I wish to make.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then I apologize; I regret that I asked the Senator from Georgia to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. But I shall undertake to show that the Hughes declaration, on which the Senator from Arkansas relies, has been as dead as Russia's claim to the Antarctic ever since 1939.

Mr. President, this treaty might have some justification if we were dealing exclusively with friendly nations who were as good as their word. But in addition to the fact that we are inviting Russia to share our claims to this great area, we are relying altogether on Russia's promises and Russia's pledges for the consummation of this treaty. Every person of intelligence in this country knows that Russia is a ruthless, conscienceless, atheistic, Communist society whose pledges are absolutely worthless, and are used only to achieve an end, without any intention of being honored.

I am not willing to place any trust or reliance, in surrendering America's valid rights, on the pledged word of Russia; and I am not willing to vote to commit this country to what I regard as a most one-sided international agreement, even though it originated in our own State Department.

The Senator from Arkansas says that position is just a matter of prejudice against the State Department. Some of us who are objecting to this treaty think that those who are supporting it are doing so on the basis of an unquestioning faith in the State Department. In the discharge of my obligation to participate in the exercise by the Senate of its responsibility in the ratification of treaties, I believe it my duty to approach that task without blind faith in the State Department. I believe it my obligation to use my best judgment in the interest of the people of the United States. Certainly that is the duty of every Member of the Senate.

This treaty would certainly be a dismal conclusion to one of the brightest and proudest chapters of American history. I refer to the history of the exploration and discovery of the mysterious and vast frozen expanses of Antarctica. I shall not recount here in detail the dramatic story of the dangers and hardships that have been encountered by the daring and brave men who have sailed under the American flag and have conquered the vast expanses of the ice-covered continent of the Antarctica. We know that since the early 1800's Americans have been in this area, and have been more active there than have the citizens of any other nation. We undertook official explorations there as early as 1838. We sent Lt. Charles Wilkes there to make sightings and maps. It was alleged that he had not been there, and I believe he was court-martialed or was subjected to some kind of inquiry. But all the maps made by later explorations have demonstrated that Wilkes was there; there was no other way by which he could have known the outline of the continent that he so accurately depicted in his maps.

The greatest period of U.S. activity there, and one of the most extensive explorations, began in 1928, under the command of the renowned Adm. Richard Evelyn Byrd. Except during the war years, the United States has been engaged since that time in almost continuous scientific exploration of the Antarctic area. We have had the physical presence there of citizens of the United States in official capacities, representing the people of the United States.

The names of those great explorers are familiar to the American people, and have been recounted here again and again by other Senators who have discussed this subject.

The most recent activities were preparatory to, and in conjunction with, the International Geophysical Year; and 11 other nations, including the Soviet Union, participated in those scientific investigations during the Geophysical Year. Those 12 nations are the ones that participated in drafting this treaty.

I should like to point out that when the State Department sent out its note inviting the presence of those nations, it outlined the rights and interests of our Nation, which the State Department had never formally asserted before the world. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the American note of May 2, 1958, which states that for years we have continued to have direct and substantial rights and interests in the Antarctic, commencing with the early 1800's.

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

> The United States for many years has had, and at the present time continues to have, direct and substantial rights and interests in Antarctica. Throughout a period of many years commencing in the early 1800's, many areas of the Antarctic region have been discovered, sighted, explored, and claimed on behalf of the United States by nationals of the United States and by expeditions carrying the flag of the United States. During this period, the Government of the United States and its nationals have engaged in well-known and extensive activities in Antarctica.
>
> In view of the actiivties of the United States and its nationals referred to above, my Government reserves all of the rights of the United States with respect to the Antarctic region, including the right to assert a territorial claim or claims.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, instead of asserting our claims, as the other nations have done, the State Department says we have only reserved our rights. The State Department reserved them until, under this treaty, it proposes to put them in cold storage in perpetuity. If that happens there will be no way on earth ever to assert them. If the Senate votes to ratify this treaty, the $250 million of the tax funds of the American people and the sacrifices made by the brave Americans who gave their lives in that area to establish American rights and American claims would be effectively wiped out.

Mr. President, I say the Soviet Union has done nothing whatever to deserve the enticing plum we are obligingly offering the Soviet Union in this treaty.

Eleven other nations are participating. Some of them have claims. The Senator from Arkansas refers to a conflict between their claims and our claims there. as a factual matter, there already is a great conflict of claims in this area, between other nations. I fully agree that those claims should be settled. However, our State Department proposes to settle them, not by asserting our claims, but by surrendering them. That is what I oppose here. I oppose settling our claims by any process of surrender, instead of using the ways that normally are used by nations.

The main effect of this treaty is to freeze indefinitely the existing status of sovereign claims in Antarctica. That, of course, is tailored for the benefit of the Russians, who have no claim of any kind dated any earlier than 1956; but they came into this meeting, when they responded to our invitation, with the old Russian claim of being first in everything. They have given out the propaganda that a Russian first invented the airplane; that a Russian first invented the telephone; that a Russian first invented the radio. In the same way they now claim that in 1820 Admiral Billingshausen was the first to discover Antarctica. We ratify this treaty, and the Russians will move in and say, "All right, we have signed up in Antarctica for a common administration. Now let us go to the Arctic and sign up for a common administration there." We will find they are making a claim that an "Admiral Vonkisky" had been in the Arctic long before any American, any British, any French, any Dane, any Norwegian, or any other explorer who might have asserted a claim there.

If we ratify this treaty, if we persist in refusing to assert a just and valid claim of primary rights in Antarctica for future generations of Americans, we will have lost those rights. Russia has made some tenuous claims there, in the same category with the claims that a Russian discovered radio and so forth. The palpable unfairness of this treaty to future generations of American citizens is shocking to me, and I cannot ratify, by my vote, any such unusual advantage to Russia, to which I do not think she is entitled.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have a very high regard for the legislative capabilities of

the Senator from Georgia. Serving on the Committee on Appropriations with him, I usually find myself in general agreement with his judgment and his conclusions, but I want to point out that in the deliberations of the Appropriations Committee, frequently a controversy arises, and very often there is not complete unanimity on some of the very vital issues.

Mr. RUSSELL. There very seldom is, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is the reason why I rise to ask a question. Is it not somewhat peculiar that the Foreign Relations Committee, made up of 11 Democrats and 6 Republicans, should report this treaty favorably, urging ratification, with not a single member of that very important committee presenting a divergent viewpoint? I am somewhat at a loss and somewhat in a dilemma to know whether, on one side, we can rely upon the composite judgment and the recommendations of the 17 members of the Foreign Relations Committee, which reported the treaty without a single dissenting vote or recommendation, when at the same time my good friend from Georgia is pointing out some very salient factors involved in this treaty. It is difficult for me to understand why we do not have a more thorough explanation of this treaty by the members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows that often the Appropriations Committee, and the Foreign Relations Committee, and other committees report matters that have not been unanimously approved and without any minority views being filed. I do not believe that all the members of the Foreign Relations Committee are supporting this treaty. As a matter of fact, I know that they are not unanimously supporting it.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Idaho has stated that there had been no explanation of the treaty, or no adequate explanation. First of all, I should like to say that there has been an adequate explanation of it, but none of the statements have been made by those who have the prestige of the distinguished Senator from Georgia. If the Senator will read the RECORD, he will find there has been an explanation of this matter made in the RECORD. We all know of the respect we have for the Senator from Georgia. I rarely find myself in disagreement with him, because I have great respect for him and confidence in his committee recommendations. I only regret that he does not have a similar confidence for the measures reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is not an accurate statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The fact that he is speaking has caused the largest representation I have seen on the Senate floor during this discussion. That is one reason why I hope he will allow questions, so we may develop this matter, because I am quite sure that when he sits down and leaves, Members of the Senate will have more important places to go to, and we shall have no opportunity to develop the matter.

It has been said that about the only thing we have done in the area affected by the treaty is carrying on scientific investigation. We have mined no minerals. We have drilled no oil wells. We have taken nothing out of the area. This whole area is covered by an average of a mile of ice. It is important for scientific experiments. That is what has gone on. But is it not a fact that if we asserted exclusive jurisdiction over some 20 percent of the area, then the other nations would do likewise, and we would be excluded from 80 percent of the area; whereas, under this treaty, we have the right to go anywhere, at anytime, in the whole area? It is not as one sided as the Senator feels it is. The Senator is not seeking to leave the impression with the Senate, I hope, that we should assert our rights to the whole area. He does not think there is any possibility of that, does he?

Mr. RUSSELL. In the first place, let me say that some have taken the position that the area is completely worthless. I do not share that opinion. I say that without any reflection on the Foreign Relations Committee. I think the Senator said that I am always in disagreement with the Foreign Relations Committee. That is not correct. I regret I must disagree with my friend. I have great respect for his many great capabilities, particularly in this area. But I shall not close my mind—I could not if I tried—to the considerations in a matter of this kind and fail to form an opinion of my own. I regard it to be my duty as a Senator of the United States to express my own views even though they may run counter to those of others.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not intend to assert that the Senator should do anything different.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do think, with due deference and respect to the Senator, that is the duty of a Senator of the United States.

I realize that there are going to be conflicting claims in that area, but some of the area has not been claimed by anyone, and the Senator said today it is completely worthless. I do not think it is. There is Marie Byrd Land. The reason claims have not been made is that several nations have a hesitancy about asserting claims until the United States has asserted a claim. They cannot understand why the United States has not asserted some claim in this area. In this atomic age, when someone may develop a means, such as by atomic power, to burn off some of that icecap, one could not say that that area is completely worthless.

I do not wish, Mr. President, to have history put me in the position of that unfortunate Commissioner of Patents who said in the 1880's that the Patent Office ought to be abolished because men had already discovered everything that could possibly be known. I think we shall find out a great deal more about the Antarctic area in the days to come. I shall deal with its strategic value in a military way in the course of my remarks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question about melting the ice cap?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Washington, who was recently in the Antarctic——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator please speak louder?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the new chairman of the Democratic National Committee, was on the floor of the Senate yesterday, and discussed with me this question, and said that it had been stated we might melt the ice cap, and he said that the ice cap in places is 10,000 or 12,000 feet deep. He said, "If we melt the ice cap it will raise the level of the Pacific Ocean some 100 feet and submerge most of the State of Washington." He also said he did not think he would be in favor of that, and that the submerging might well include many other areas. He said he had been in the area and had discussed the matter with scientists, and that such a proposal was a wholly unrealistic proposal.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the testimony of Dr. Laurence M. Gould, chairman of the Committee on Polar Research of the National Academy of Sciences. This distinguished geologist and explorer was second in command of the first Byrd expedition. He is one of the leading scientists in this country in regard to Antarctic matters. He states in no uncertain terms, very positively, that except for its scientific value he cannot see that this land has any commercial value whatever. He says it is valuable to the United States only as a scientific area. Therefore, by retaining and obtaining the right to go all over the land, as we do under the treaty, in contrast to having an exclusive right to a small part—which is generally said would be some 20 percent if we should assert a claim—he thinks, and most people think, it is of far more value to have the right to use the whole area for scientific purposes than to have a small area for any possibility of melting the ice cap.

I ask the Senator how the United States is going to melt the ice cap if the United States owns only a small amount of the area. Are we going to melt the ice cap owned by everybody else?

If that should be a feasible procedure to follow, it is much more likely to be done under an arrangement where the land is internationalized and all the various claimants are in agreement, than if we had only a small segment of the area for ourselves.

All that the Senator's proposal would result in is a Balkanization of the area, where no one could do anything but war about it, assuming the land ever became valuable.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was going to say that a little Balkanization, with a Balkanized part of it under the flag of the United States, is better than putting 100 percent of the area under the veto of the Soviet Union. I prefer the former.

Mr. President, the Senator has cited with great satisfaction the testimony of Dr. Laurence M. Gould, who, as the Senator stated, was the chairman of the

Committee on Polar Research of the National Academy of Sciences. Dr. Gould testified: "I would not give a nickel for all the mineral resources I know in Antarctica." However, in the same statement, and in the very next breath, the good doctor said: "We have not examined 1 percent of the area geologically."

I simply think that we ought to have a little better basis for our determination before we accept the view that this land is worthless and therefore we can give it away to Russia very freely. I assure the Senator that militarily this is not true.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Some years ago many people did not think that one could drill an oil well in the ocean or in the sea. Once oil was found under the water, off the shores, the oil people found that they could go out into hundreds of feet of water and could build platforms which would withstand the worst tornadoes, as well as waves coming in 30 or 40 feet high, and still produce oil. The Federal Government, with its great resources, by a great effort, went in to throw the States out of the area and to exclude them from oil development, after the oil was found.

The Senator knows that the test, so far as mineral resources are concerned, is that until one has explored there is no reason on earth to assume one acre of land is any better than any other acre of land anywhere on earth. Any oil company which is taking leases will lease "wildcat acreage" without even taking a seismograph on the land.

There is every reason to assume, since there is such a vast amount of area in Antarctica, that some values may be discovered. I assume the Senator will cover that point later on.

The Senator no doubt knows that we are paying as much as $20 million a year for a single small location, for the right to have a tracking station to track missiles. Under the treaty we would give up the right to put such a station on property in this area.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. This clearly shows the folly of casually discounting resources in this vast area. What reason is there to believe that this vast continent, larger than the United States and Europe combined, contains absolutely no valuable resource of any kind? It would certainly be the only continent of its kind upon the earth if it were completely worthless, as some of the witnesses would have us believe.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he passes on to another subject, since he has mentioned the Russian veto and that we could not do anything about a veto?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the statement of Mr. Phleger, who negotiated this treaty, as shown on page 56 of the hearings. I know all Senators have copies of the hearings before them.

Mr. Phleger was asked by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] about the veto of the Russians, and he said:

> Senator, we were very careful in drafting this treaty to see that no right granted by the treaty was subject to any approval by any other party in order to be exercised, and there is a provision in this that the consultative body which can recommend and propose and whose proposals are only effective if universally accepted, is not applicable to the rights given by the treaty.
>
> For instance the right of inspection can be exercised without anybody's consent, the right to go anywhere in Antarctica, the right to engage in scientific inquiry, the right to appoint observers; all of those rights are unilateral rights that require no consent by anyone.

This is one of the valuable parts of the treaty. I do not think it is fair to say that we cannot do anything because of a Russian veto, or without Russian approval. This is an important part of the treaty. We can do all of these things without approval by anybody.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator believe that the United States could move in, if mineral deposits were found there today, and take them out to any extent it desired, without the consent of the other parties?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. I asked the witness specifically about that matter. The question of who owns the mineral rights is not settled by the treaty at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Those rights are not settled now. We have no claim to one ounce, or to one foot of mineral rights in Antarctica. We have not asserted any claim. If we should assert any, immediately everybody else's rights would come into effect, and we would thereby exclude ourselves, ipso facto, from all the other parts of the area which the other nations claim.

I am talking about all of Antarctica, that great land.

This is not all one sided, as the Senator presents it to us. We have now maintained the status quo, as the Senator has stated, with respect to the rights which are not asserted and with respect to the mineral rights, if they should ever develop. That matter will have to be settled by future negotiations, exactly as it would have to be settled in any case.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This treaty would not change that situation at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall not be able to follow the arrangement I had hoped to follow in presenting my remarks today. The Senator compels me at this stage of the proceedings to refer to what I regard as being one of the fatal defects in the treaty. The Senator refers to the limitations imposed upon the United States and the other signatories to the treaty.

One of my objections to the treaty is that it can lead to utter confusion in Antarctica. The fact is that we assert no claim. The other parties, while they do not definitely waive their claims, do not assert them under the treaty. There are 12 nations, out of the 80 nations on earth, which are signatories and which would be bound, but the other nations on earth could go to Antarctica and locate to their hearts' content. They could assert claims to any extent they desired to assert claims, and who would stop them? Who would put them out? We have tied our hands.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I must say that the discussion of the Senator from Georgia surely is one that is needed, because this is a far-reaching treaty. I have no doubt about that. I sat through most of the hearings on this treaty. The question of claims was discussed at length by members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, both during the testimony and in our informal, private discussions.

Mr. Phleger, who was the chief negotiator, former counsel of the State Department, and a man of competence in that field of law, stated in his testimony on page 39 of the transcript of the hearing relating to these claims:

> I might mention for a moment that the basis, it seems to me, of the objections to this treaty which we have just heard, are based on a failure to understand or recognize the provisions of the treaty itself.
>
> The provision of the treaty with respect to claims does not relinquish in one iota any claim or basis of claim of the United States of America. It is so stated categorically. Nor does it pretend, nor would it be realistic to expect the other claimants to relinquish their claims, so that the legal status quo now existing with all of the rights or basis of rights or claims of the United States are preserved and nothing is relinquished by the United States.

A little earlier he pointed out that—

> The United States has not asserted any claim to territorial sovereignty in Antarctica. Nor has the United States recognized any claims made by others there, but has consistently reserved all of its rights throughout the whole of Antarctica.

He discusses in some detail the claims. The fact of the matter is that there are a number of conflicting claims, but, as the Senator has so thoroughly pointed out, all these claims are held in abeyance. But we do not neglect our right to our claim.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; we have never asserted our claim.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the fact.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are far behind Argentina, Chile, England, France, Australia, New Zealand, and Norway—countries that have asserted claims, whether they are conflicting or not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But no other nation has recognized those claims.

Mr. RUSSELL. In this treaty we are stepping back for 30 more years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say most respectfully to the Senator from Georgia that we do not step back at all. We leave ourselves in the position of status quo. We still reserve our right to make any claims we wish to make. If we are going back to original claims, we must go back to the claims of the United Kingdom and Norway. Those countries were the first there.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Minnesota falls into the error of considering that every other nation has a

better claim than has the United States. I do not agree with that statement at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not agree that every other nation has a better claim than we have. I believe our claim is substantial, and I believe the United States has done more in Antarctica than has any other nation. I think the Russians have cleverly worked their way into this particular area. I do not deny that. But I say that on the basis of original contact with the area, our major contact came in the 1920's with the Byrd expedition. Of course, some of our explorers visited the area prior to that.

Mr. RUSSELL. We sent Wilkes down there in 1838.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree.

Mr. RUSSELL. And before that other Americans had been down there.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I recall, the New Zealanders made some claim in this area through British expeditions. The Scandinavians had some claim in this area, if they wished to exercise it. We have exercised no claim, and we have not recognized any claims, but we have not given up any right to exercise a claim. In other words, we are doing under this treaty nothing more than we have done up to date in terms of original claims, but we seek some agreement relating to international inspection and to scientific exploration.

We can inspect any station. We can fly over the area. We can forward our claim to the area. We have lost nothing, it seems to me, and we may have gained considerable.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish I could be as optimistic as is the Senator from Minnesota. In my opinion, if we ratify this treaty, we shall have lost all and gained nothing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has well made the point, and it has been agreed to, that this Nation, through its State Department has been derelict in never asserting any American claims in the Antarctic. I think our potential claims are probably the best of all and the most numerous. We have no claim because none has been asserted.

The last sentence of article 4 reads:

> Antarctica. No new claim, or enlargement of an existing claim to territorial sovereignty in Antarctica shall be asserted while the present treaty is in force.

Our claim has never been asserted, and in the treaty we agree not to assert any claims for another 30 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Phleger, the architect of the treaty, said he hoped that would be the situation in perpetuity.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Meanwhile, there are a number of Communist satellites, such as Red China, which is the largest; Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia, to mention a few, which are not signatories to the treaty. They could go down there any day or night and not be bound by the treaty, and the provision with respect to right of inspection would not apply to those nations.

As the Senator knows, those nations are not signatories.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Louisiana has put his finger on a fundamental weakness of the treaty. It binds only 12 countries. There is reference in the treaty to getting some action in the United Nations if anything happens, but we have not always been successful in using the United Nations as an instrument to assert rights or claims unless the United States foots most of the bill in blood and money as was the case in Korea. But in this instance, a nation like Red China could move into the antarctic territory tomorrow and say, "We are building a military base," and we would have to say, "We have never asserted any claim to that land."

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With reference to the point discussed between the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I call attention to article X of the treaty. Article X is to me a rather significant article. It reads:

> Each of the contracting parties undertakes—

That is a mutual undertaking—

> to exert appropriate efforts consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, to the end that no one—

It does not say "no one of the contracting parties," but it says "no one," which is an all-inclusive phrase—

> that no one engages in any activity in Antarctica contrary to the principles or purposes of the present treaty.

Had the makers of the treaty wished to say that the provision was to be limited only to the 12 contracting parties, I think they would have said so in the treaty. They might have said, "to the end that no one of the contracting parties engages in any activity in Antarctica." They did not say that. They said, "no one," which means no nation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree fully that article X is the expression of a pious hope that nations not signatory to the treaty will not come in. Those who drew the treaty were not referring to the 12 signatory nations. They were hoping that no other nation would come in. But what machinery have they to enforce it? How are they to get another nation out? That is my question. If Red China were to send a large expedition tomorrow to the lands that other nations have not claimed—for example, Marie Byrd land—does the Senator think the United Nations, under the language of the treaty and consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, would help those 12 countries get Red China out of there?

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How does the Senator believe we can do it without a treaty?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would settle the title to the area now.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How would the Senator propose to get Red China out?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would settle the question under the declaration of that great Secretary of State Cordell Hull in 1940, when he applied the Monroe Doctrine to this vast area.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How does the Senator propose that we could settle the title now without a treaty?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will get to that subject in a few minutes. I would keep them out just as I would keep them out of the United States itself. In 1940, when Germany was suspected of seeking this area, Cordell Hull undertook to apply the Monroe Doctrine all the way to the South Pole. I will leave the discussion there, and stand on that policy, instead of backing up, surrendering, and giving way every time someone writes a treaty and brings it before the Senate.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. What right do 12 nations have to write a treaty, and in it say that they are going to kick others out of 20 percent of Antarctica on which none of them has made any claim and on which no other nation has made any claim? What conceivable right have these 12 nations to undertake to say that no one else on the face of the earth shall get on a piece of ground that none of them has claimed or anyone else has claimed?

Mr. RUSSELL. None, so far as I can see. Viewed in its best light, this treaty puts us in a dog-in-the-manger attitude. The treaty nations say, "We are not claiming any right, but you cannot assert any down there either."

It shows the fallacy of the entire proposition. I realize that the official position of the administration is in support of the treaty. There are certain limitations under which we work, and we must do the best we can in the light of the orders that have gone out from the higher echelons.

Adm. George J. Dufek has been a great leader in the U.S. explorations to Antarctica; I believe he accompanied Admiral Byrd on some of the earlier trips. Recently, Admiral Dufek voiced grave concern about the effect of the treaty on the status of our U.S. territorial claims. He believes that the United States should assert its territorial claims before the treaty is ratified, even though in fairness to Admiral Dufek it should be stated that he favors the objectives of the treaty. However, he feels that we should assert our territorial claims before ratifying the treaty. Otherwise he correctly assumes that our claims will be jeopardized, if not entirely lost.

The admiral, who commanded the Navy's Deepfreeze operations, outlined his feeling on this treaty in testimony only a few weeks ago before a subcommittee of the House, where he was appearing on another matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of his testimony dealing with the matter of claims be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

> I think we should make up our minds now whether to make claims or not make claims and go ahead with this treaty. I recommended a few years ago that we claim the

unclaimed sector of the Antarctic but at the same time form a condominium with New Zealand and France in which these four nations would share the condominium—a large sector of the Antarctic Continent. Nothing was done about that.

I still feel very strongly about it that that is what we should do.

If this treaty is ratified, it means that no new claims will be made. Of course, they will be frozen and no one gives up any claims over this period of 30 years. But we have no claims to hang on to.

Over the past hundred years we have sent expeditions to the Antarctic. Since 1928, when Admiral Byrd led his first expedition there * * * we have had bases in the Antarctic and we have put in a great deal of effort, cost of money and men and material to build these bases, and develop the information on the country.

Now, the Russians had never had a base on the Antarctic Continent, until the beginning of the IGY and they were invited to participate in the scientific investigation. Now, if we wait 30 years, if this treaty is ratified and nothing is said about claims for 30 years, and the Russians are there for 30 years along with us, then their claims to any part of the Antarctic are greatly strengthened and then we would be in a very difficult position if for some reason we wanted to go into claims again.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was especially interested to note that the Senator from Georgia mentioned the action of our distinguished former Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and in the Senator's reference to the Monroe Doctrine, which has now become an inter-American doctrine.

I have before me what is said to be one of the latest maps of the antarctic region. I notice that it is only approximately 1,000 miles or less from South America to the area of Antarctica which is closest to Latin America, immediately south of Argentina and Chile, the Palmer Peninsula.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe it is only about 500 or 600 miles.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe it is about 1,000 miles from the mainland. There are areas lying off the mainland which are closer.

I should like to ask the Senator whether it is not possible under this treaty for the Soviets to enter upon those closest areas to Latin America and to construct airbases, ostensibly for the purpose of exploration and scientific discovery, but which would be just as useful, in case of emergency or war, for military purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is eminently correct.

Later in my remarks I will discuss the military implications of the treaty. I will point out that the Russians could establish bases there that would have the effect of closing the passage between Palmer Peninsula and the tip of the continent of South America, which is vital to us in case of any international emergency.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I note from the same map that these distances which intervene between those close-by land areas of Antarctica and those two important friends of ours, Argentina and Chile, and, for that matter, between Antarctica and the South American Continent, are much shorter than the distances from important cities in our country and Canada to our own air bases in Greenland, which we prize so highly.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do we not regard that complex of bases in Greenland, and in other areas of the far north, of vast importance to our own defense?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only are they of vast importance to our own defense, but they are our principal sources of information to warn us of a surprise attack, information that might enable us to save countless Americans from devastation in a nuclear war.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator think it is a matter of great importance that under the proposed treaty our own potential and greatest rival and enemy would be able, without interference, to construct air bases on Palmer Peninsula and in other areas in Antarctica relatively close to the South American Continent?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe there is any question about it.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is of great consequence, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would impose an unbearable threat, one we could not afford to tolerate, if we knew about it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator one more question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. As chairman of the Committee on Armed Services undoubtedly the Senator has the best opportunity given to any Member of the Senate to know about the defense aspects of the matter. Is the Senator from Georgia concerned or unconcerned about the defense implications of this treaty?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Florida has identified the primary concern of the Senator from Georgia. I will deal with that in my remarks, at some length in a few minutes, to show that this is a matter of vital concern to us from the standpoint of the defense of the United States. The world has been so diminished in size that if we fail to utilize all geographical advantages, and if we take a chance that will enable a potential enemy to utilize that area, it could contribute to a disaster for our country. I cannot make it any stronger than that. It could destroy us.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am inclined to apologize to the Senator for having gone into this phase at this stage.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad the Senator has done so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I note from the map that the air distance between Antarctica and the South American Continent is decidedly shorter than the distance between the South American Continent and the areas in Africa which are closest to the South American Continent. Would the United States be unconcerned, from the defense standpoint, to have the Soviets move in and build airbases in the area of Africa which is closest to the South American Continent?

Mr. RUSSELL. The question answers itself, of course. It shows that this is a very important aspect. I shall point out later that not only is the Panama Canal susceptible of destruction, but some of our greatest striking forces at sea cannot use the canal because it is not large enough to accommodate new carriers. We must use this Antarctic area and must keep it open. I will discuss this aspect at some length later.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the Senator's intention to deal with this matter. Speaking for myself, I feel that we would be blind if we did not recognize that, while the treaty provides that no military use shall be made of Antarctica, it is entirely possible for the Soviets or any other potential enemy under cover of this treaty to create what could be used quickly and almost overnight as air bases very close to friends of ours and within striking distance of military bases of our country.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe they would do it directly. I believe that, under cover of hypocrisy and sanctimony, they might utilize one of their satellites.

As a matter of fact, they have already turned over one of their Geophysical Year bases to Poland, and are threatening to turn over another one to Czechoslovakia. Neither of those countries is a signatory to the treaty. Neither of them would be morally bound not to build bases, as the Senator has said.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. I should like to emphasize the testimony of Admiral Dufek, to which the Senator has referred, and which was put in the RECORD. I should like to make this very clear, because it has been stated that all the military people favor the treaty.

Admiral Dufek, who knows more about this subject than any other naval officer, said:

> If this treaty is ratified, it means that no new claims will be made. Of course, they will be frozen and no one gives up any claims over this period of 30 years. But we have no claims to hang on to.

He goes on to say, plainly, that he is not in favor of the treaty unless those claims are made. I am glad the Senator from Georgia has brought up that point, because Admiral Dufek does not support the ratification of the treaty in the absence of the firming up of those claims.

Mr. RUSSELL. We all realize that when the word comes out from the Secretary of Defense, that is the party line; those on active duty have to take that position. But Admiral Dufek is retired.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DODD. I simply wish to raise one question and make a statement. Unfortunately, I was called to the telephone at the time the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was posing questions to the distinguished Senator from Georgia about what the treaty does to our claims. I notice that the language of the treaty

and the report of the committee both assure us that the treaty in no way prejudices the rights of the United States. However, I also find in the report of the committee a statement by Dr. Philip Jessup. I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia is familiar with it. Dr. Jessup is very friendly to the pending proposal, and was testifying before the committee on the matter of why it is to our advantage. Dr. Jessup said:

It would prevent the development of previously asserted claims of other countries to parts of Antarctica.

My question is, How in the world can anyone logically argue that if the treaty prevents claims of other countries being asserted, it does not prevent ours? I think that point ought to be made clear.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Connecticut is absolutely correct. It does not pretend to be any limitation whatever on the claims of any country except the countries signatory to the treaty, as Admiral Dufek pointed out in his testimony.

There is such a thing as squatters' rights and squatters' sovereignty; and there is title by prescription.

This is what Admiral Dufek said:

Now, the Russians had never had a base in the Antarctic Continent until the beginning of the International Geophysical Year, and they were invited to participate in the scientific investigation. Now, if we wait 30 years, if this treaty is ratified, and nothing is said about claims for 30 years, and the Russians are there for 30 years along with us, then their claims to any part of the Antarctic are greatly strengthened and then we would be in a very different position if for some reason we wanted to go into claims again.

That is elementary. If the Russians stay there for 30 years, and then we said we would go back to 1820, to our original claim that we had never asserted from that time until now, I do not think it would be persuasive.

Mr. President, it is sad to relate, but we have only ourselves to blame for the illogical, implausible position that we now face in Antarctica. As has been pointed out by Admiral Dufek, Admiral Byrd, and others, this is due to our having failed to assert—formally and officially—our unchallengable claims to a large section of that continent. That should have been done a long time ago. Almost everyone, including some of the supporters of the treaty, deplore our failure to make claims. But no one has yet given a satisfactory answer to the mystery of why we have not made those claims.

Admiral Byrd believed, as early as 1936, that we had established clear claim to a large section of the continent. He said:

As to geography, we have discovered and taken possession for the United States of a land area as large as the combined Atlantic Seaboard States from Maine to Georgia. There can be no controversy concerning the ownership of this land for it is beyond the British claim and no human eye other than that of American citizens has ever looked down upon this land.

Mr. President, think of this vast area, larger than the area from Maine to Georgia, upon which no eyes other than American have ever looked upon; yet no formal claim has been made to it, and we are asked to vote to ratify the treaty, and to postpone into oblivion any hope of ever asserting any claims to it.

This subject has been before the Senate Committee on Armed Services from time to time. In 1954 we were told that one purpose of the then forthcoming expedition to Antarctica would be to establish our territorial claims there.

I have obtained permission from the members of the committee to read portions of the transcript of the executive hearing of the meeting of the Committee on Armed Services held on July 29, 1954. At that time, Mr. President, I asked Admiral Nunn, who was the spokesman for the Navy, and who appeared before the committee, if one of the purposes of the expedition would be to establish our claims in Antarctica. I read from the transcript:

Senator RUSSELL. One of the purposes of this expedition, I assume, Admiral, would be to not only notify the world that we are claiming the area there, but to give evidence of the fact that we are insisting on our title that we have acquired by prior explorations; is that right?

Admiral NUNN. That is part of it, sir; definitely.

Senator RUSSELL. Thank you.

Later in the meeting, I said:

It should be a matter of transcendent importance to have a valid claim.

I hope the ground that they come upon, that they fly over it with an airplane, at least as to the far reaches, and perhaps drop a few little lead cylinders stating that this is U.S. territory, all over the entire area.

Mr. President, a resolution was adopted at that time by the committee, urging that plans for the expedition be carried out for the purpose of validating American claims. The resolution was adopted on July 29, 1954. It is quite brief; I shall therefore read it into the RECORD:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, recognizing the immediate need for further exploration on the Antarctic Continent, urges and commends that an expedition be undertaken at the earliest possible date, under the direction of the President, for the purpose of validating the territorial claims of the United States and thereby increasing the security of this Nation, exploring the mineral resources of the area, and accomplishing any possible advancements with respect to mapping surveys and scientific observations.

Mr. President, a copy of that resolution was sent to the present President of the United States and was acknowledged by him personally. The resolution was not adopted as an effort on the part of Democrats to embarrass the new Republican administration. At that time the Republicans were in control of Congress, and the Committee on Armed Services was presided over by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The resolution simply expressed the feelings of the members of the committee—Republicans and Democrats—that the United States was already late in asserting its territorial claims, and that it should take steps to do so.

For a time, it appeared that something might be done along that line. It is worthy of note that earlier postwar Antarctic expeditions were officially and specifically directed to enhance and promote U.S. territorial claims to the southern polar region. For example, the directive for Operation Highjump in 1946—and I can read this because the paper has since been declassified—set forth one of its missions as consolidating and extending U.S. sovereignty over the largest practicable area of the Antarctic Continent.

Similar instructions were given Operation Windmill in 1947 and Operation Deepfreeze I in 1955. Subsequent deepfreeze operations, however, were assigned no political or territorial mission because of the nonpolitical nature of the International Geophysical Year.

Mr. President, I have searched diligently for any possible reason, however farfetched, as to why the United States has failed to validate its claims to this area.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. If the purpose of the United States expeditions was not to stake out claims for purposes of defense and the obtaining of minerals and other purposes, what was the purpose of those expeditions?

Mr. RUSSELL. When the Armed Services Committee approved those expeditions, those of us who serve on the committee had in mind the assertion of territorial sovereignty over those vast areas of the Antarctic Continent.

Mr. THURMOND. That was the reason why the American expeditions were made, was it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, so far as I am concerned; and I think the same is true of the other members of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THURMOND. The able Senator from Georgia has been chairman of the Armed Services Committee for many years, except during the brief period when the Republicans had a majority; and no Member of the Senate is more familiar than is he with this subject. I desire to commend him for the magnificent argument he is presenting, in bringing to the attention of the American people the importance of not ratifying this treaty.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Is there any reason for bringing Russia into this matter? Russia has not justified any claim there. If Russia were now brought in, she would only be in a position to veto whatever the United States wishes to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I have already referred to that.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not a fact that Russia would not regard any such contract seriously? In fact, has not Russia repudiated 50 out of the 52 contracts into which she has entered? If Russia enters into this one, it will be nothing more than a scrap of paper, to be repudiated at the whim of Russia, will it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly. The record of history shows that the Soviets will

immediately violate any agreement, however solemn, that they may have signed, whenever it may suit their purposes to violate it. They adhere to treaties only so long as the agreements suit Russia's ambitions and aims.

Mr. THURMOND. I am glad the Senator from Georgia has made the point that the opposition to ratification of the treaty is not an attempt to embarrass the administration. It is merely an effort to protect the interests of the United States.

In any event I will oppose the treaty, no matter who negotiated it or advocated it, because it is not in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. I share the Senator's views; and I, too, will oppose this treaty, regardless of who advocated it.

Mr. President, I probably shall not be able to cover, in the time available to me, all the points I wish to cover.

One of these is the so-called Hughes doctrine. Mr. Phleger, the architect of the treaty, relied on it; and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and others have referred to the Hughes doctrine. This doctrine was to the effect that we adhered to a position of not asserting any claim unless we occupied an area, and that the physical characteristics of Antarctica were such that we had no valid basis for making territorial claims in Antarctica. I think it only fair to say that that was the position of the United States, as announced by Secretary Hughes in 1924. But, Mr. President, times change; and as they have changed, our policies have changed.

As a matter of fact, as long ago as 1933, in a case before the Court of International Justice in connection with a dispute between Denmark and Norway over Greenland, the so-called Hughes policy was stricken down and annulled. In addition, our most extensive explorations in Antarctica have been made since the announcement of the Hughes doctrine.

I think it also fair to point out that our views have changed very considerably, particularly in the period leading up to World War II.

Indeed, a 1939 report by the State Department, drawn up at the request of President Roosevelt, actually reversed the Hughes doctrine. The report strongly supported U.S. interests in the Antarctic, citing the impending importance of transpolar aviation, the strategic location of Antarctica from a military standpoint, the probability of rich mineral resources, and the concern about claims by other nations.

Immediately following the report, the U.S. Antarctic Service was created in the Department of Interior to lay the groundwork for asserting this country's claims.

Out of that grew the various explorations by Admiral Byrd. Admiral Byrd was placed in charge of the Service's expedition to the Antarctic, which headed south in 1939.

Admiral Byrd's instructions from President Roosevelt, set forth in a letter dated November 25, 1939, 15 years after the Hughes pronouncement, and completely contrary to it—made clear the new U.S. position with respect to territorial claims in the Antarctic.

The President's letter said:

> Members of the service may take appropriate steps such as dropping written claims from airplanes, depositing such writing in cairns, et cetera, which might assist in supporting a sovereignty claim by the U.S. Government. Careful records shall be kept of the circumstances surrounding such act. No public announcement of such act shall, however, be made without specific authority in each case from the Secretary of State.

Secretary of State Hull gave further evidence, as I have said, of the new U.S. position in May 1940, when, in effect, he extended the Monroe Doctrine to the South Pole. With an eye on the growing Nazi menace in Europe, Hull stated:

> Considerations of continental defense make it vitally important to keep for the 21 American Republics a clearer title to that part of the Antarctic Continent south of America that is claimed by any non-American country.

Mr. President, if this treaty is ratified, the Senate will renounce the extension of the Monroe Doctrine to the South Pole, as announced by Secretary Hull, and will put all that area into the hands of 11 other nations, including Soviet Russia that have no legitimate claim there.

The American people are entitled to have a fuller debate in regard to this matter than we have had on this issue.

At this time, Mr. President, I wish to inquire how much time remains available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Georgia will expire at 1:48.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, for the time being I should like to reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, at this point will my colleague yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I desire to express to my distinguished colleague my appreciation of the able and scholarly address he has made on this subject. In my opinion it is unanswerable. I know that in his long and distinguished service as chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, he has devoted many years to the study of this subject. I believe that any Member of the Senate who hears or who reads the remarks the Senator from Georgia has made today must refuse to vote to abrogate America's claim to this territory. Certainly I take that position.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

Let me ask the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee whether he will be willing to suggest the absence of a quorum at this time, or whether some other Senator is prepared to speak at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] said he wished to speak for a few minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me ask how much time the Senator from Kansas desires to have.

Mr. CARLSON. Ten minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well; I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, first, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who, in my opinion, has rendered a service to the Senate in discussing this treaty as he sees it. However, I do not agree with his views on this particular treaty. It was my good fortune to be a member, not only of the Foreign Relations Committee, but——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I had intended to ask the Senator if he cared to have a quorum call, with the understanding that the time would not come out of that of either side.

Mr. CARLSON. I would not object, but I assure the Senator it is not necessary.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would like to have the Senate have the opportunity to know the Senator from Kansas is speaking.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the time will not be charged to either side.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, preceding the call for the quorum, I had expressed my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Georgia for the service he had rendered in discussing this treaty. I stated I appreciated his views, but did not agree with his conclusions on the treaty. I think it is well that all treaties be discussed and analyzed. Of all those with whom I dislike to be in disagreement, I dislike most to be in disagreement with the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who is not only an able legislator, but who has had many years of service here, which demands that we give thought to his suggestions on this treaty.

I rise in support of the Antarctic Treaty and sincerely hope it will be approved by the Senate. There have been many treaties before the Senate for approval, but I firmly believe that this is one of the most constructive documents presented during my years of service in the Senate.

First, we were fortunate to have as negotiators on this treaty men who have had years of experience in this field. I know of no one that I think is more qualified and who has the qualifications than the Honorable Herman Phleger, who was our representative and head of the U.S. delegation to the conference on Antarctica. In addition, we had Ambassador Paul Daniels, who was the alternate representative, and Mr. George H. Owen. These individuals, with the background they have give me a great deal of confidence in the matter that is before the Senate.

As I started to mention earlier, it was my privilege, as a Member of the Senate, to be listed as one of the congressional

advisers, together with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. Those of us who were given that privilege were briefed daily during the discussions.

It has been said that this treaty was hastily entered into. The facts are, according to the testimony before the committee, that conferences regarding the treaty began on May 2, 1958. It is true that actual negotiations did not begin until months later, but there were conferences between the 12 nations, and they reached an agreement on the details, so when they did meet they were in a position to write this treaty.

I wish to point out that this treaty was conceived by the United States. I think when the Senate acts on the treaty today it should keep in mind that this country originated the idea. We called the nations together. That is the first reason why the treaty should be ratified.

Second, the conference which drafted it, comprising the individuals representing the 12 countries, was called at the instance of the United States. We conceived the idea. We called these nations together.

Third, the treaty contained all of the provisions which the United States believed were required for the protection of our national interest.

With that background, and with the men who negotiated this treaty representing the United States, I cannot be as concerned as are some individual Members of the Senate as to the contents of the treaty.

There were several reasons why we tried to reach an agreement, and did reach an agreement, on the treaty. The main objectives of our Government in negotiating this treaty were, first, to prevent the use of Antarctica for military purposes, and to assure that this continent should remain an area where only peaceful activities were pursued.

During the testimony before our committee, Mr. Phleger discussed this matter, which will be found on page 44 of the hearings. In regard to the objective of preventing the use of Antarctica for military purposes, he said this:

> As regards this objective, article I stipulates that Antarctica shall be used for peaceful purposes only and that all measures of a military nature there are forbidden. Of course, we know that agreements prohibiting military activity in a certain area must necessarily be complemented by some system of effective control in order to assure their observance. In this treaty, the provisions of article VII which I have outlined establish sweeping, immediate, and unilateral rights of inspection pursuant to which U.S. observers may go anywhere throughout Antarctica at any time. In addition, there are established absolute, unrestricted rights of overflight for aerial observation.

We have been trying for months and months—probably for years—to negotiate inspection on an international basis, at Geneva. Now we have an opportunity, in the Senate today, to vote to have an area where we have established these rights subject to inspection under a treaty which has been signed by 12 nations, including the Soviet Union.

There was a second objective. The second objective was to continue the valuable scientific investigation throughout Antarctica which our scientists have been engaged in for the past several years, and to promote the continuation of international cooperation for the purpose of continued scientific investigation. Even during the discussion of the distinguished Senator from Georgia this morning, the Senator mentioned and realized the importance of the scientific investigation in this great area, an area larger than the United States and Europe combined.

Mr. Phleger, when he discussed this particular objective before our committee, made a pertinent comment. I shall read the objective, as Mr. Phleger stated it:

> Second objective was to continue the valuable investigation throughout Antarctica which our scientists have been engaged in for the past several years, and to promote the continuation of international cooperation—

We have been striving for that—

> For the purpose of such scientific investigation among the parties to the treaty, in the same manner that was instituted during the International Geophysical Year.

These are Mr. Phleger's words, and he wrote the treaty:

> In this regard, article II of the treaty provides that scientific investigation and cooperation to that end, as practiced during the International Geophysical Year, will continue, subject, of course, to the provisions of the treaty.

That is an important step. I think we are all agreed it is important in this great area.

Mr. President, the third objective was to eliminate controversies arising out of territorial claims. We have heard a lot of discussion this morning about territorial claims. Many countries have claims. None of them, including the United States, has pressed the claims.

The third objective, in addition, was to eliminate, insofar as possible, any political rivalry which accompanied the claims. It is only natural that if we began to press our claims there would be political rivalries involved.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

I intend to vote for ratification, but one of the things which has been bothering me in connection with the treaty is found in a comment at the bottom of page 3 of the committee report. The last paragraph on that page states:

> Disputes between two or more contracting parties, according to article XI, should be resolved through consultation and means of their own choice. If not so resolved, any dispute may be referred to the International Court of Justice, but only with the consent of all parties to the dispute. In this connection, while the United States and the majority of the contracting parties were willing to accept compulsory jurisdiction by the International Court, the opposition of three signatories negated that proposal.

The Senator has brought up the question of claims, and so on. My question is, How are those claims to be settled if the parties cannot agree and will not go to the International Court of Justice?

Mr. CARLSON. It so happened that at the time of consideration of the treaty by the 12 countries, some of the countries had already filed their claims. The United States has not made any claim, but two or three countries have formal claims. Those countries are the ones which negated this section, as to how this should be handled. Those countries felt they had priority rights.

I would say that is a matter which will have to be determined by a meeting of the countries affected in the future.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, a controversy which exists as between two countries may continue? There is no way of ending that controversy under the form of the treaty?

Mr. CARLSON. It could continue. It is now continuing and it no doubt will continue.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have one other question in that connection. I refer to page 4 of the report, the second paragraph, which states:

> Amendment and duration of the treaty are covered by article XII. The treaty may be modified or amended at any time, but only by unanimous agreement of the consultative parties.

In substance that means there will be no amendment to the treaty for 30 years; is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. It was brought out by the committee that while the treaty has no specified duration——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. Will the Senator yield me an additional 3 minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 3 more minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 3 more minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. I state to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that in the report it is also stated:

> While the treaty has no specified duration, it is provided that after 30 years any of the consultative parties may request a conference of all treaty members to review the operation of the treaty. Amendments approved at such a conference by a majority of those represented, including a majority of the consultative parties, will enter into force when ratified by all of the latter parties.
>
> Any country—

Including the United States—

> may withdraw from the treaty, effective 2 years after notification, if an amendment approved at such a conference does not enter into force within 2 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a practical matter, it means that when we make the treaty it will last for 30 years.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct, provided these folks keep the commitments they have entered into in the treaty.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And there is no method to completely resolve the dispute between two contracting parties?

Mr. CARLSON. Except that individual countries can withdraw, under certain circumstances, within the 2-year period.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Can a country withdraw before the 30 years have expired?

Mr. CARLSON. Only those nations which adhere after the agreement comes into effect.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One Member of the Senate is necessarily absent today, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. The Senator telephoned me a little while ago and told me that he was on an urgent mission with respect to certain appropriation matters with regard to our public lands and the interior domain, but he does have an abiding interest in the pending matter. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I believe the Senator from South Dakota first introduced the resolution to authorize an expedition to Antarctica; and he subsequently, I think, was one of the moving forces in making possible the cooperation of the Navy, as well as the transfer of funds to the proper account so that the Navy might manifest an interest in this matter.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services I would say that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] did initiate a bill and did work out a compromise arrangement so that the Navy could go to Antarctica.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In his statement over the telephone today the Senator from South Dakota made the point that he regards this as a real opportunity to test our relations with other countries and with the Soviet Union in a field which is far from here, where rights are somewhat indefinite and in conflict. He could think of no better place for the matter to be fully tested and explored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think that is an important point.

Another point made by the Senator from South Dakota was that if there were Members of the Senate who felt we had to go in for partition, then the question arises, How would we partition the area? If we tried to divide it up like a pie, we would only develop more conflicts of interest there and solve no problems at all.

Out of his experience, out of his background, and out of his continuing interest in this problem, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] would, if he could be present today, support ratification of the treaty.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in conclusion I simply wish to state that the United States took the initiative in writing and securing the approval of the treaty by other countries affected. In so doing, our Nation again demonstrated its interest in trying to work out cooperative arrangements with other nations in order to build a program for peace and security.

I think Mr. Phleger expressed it well when he stated:

> This treaty, for the first time in history, devotes a large area of the world to peaceful purposes with adequate inspection. It is the first treaty which prohibits nuclear explosions, with adequate inspection.
>
> It is the first treaty to provide freedom of scientific investigation over large areas, and it constitutes a precedent in the field of disarmament, prohibition of nuclear explosions and the law of space.

It is for these reasons I am supporting the treaty and sincerely hope that Members of the Senate will do likewise.

I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

VITAL ANTARCTIC TREATY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON.—Just before the Senate recessed for the national conventions, Majority Leader JOHNSON promised Chairman FULBRIGHT of the Committee on Foreign Relations that one of the first actions after the Senate reassembles on August 8 will be consideration of the Antarctic Treaty. The committee favorably reported this legislation on June 21.

Senator JOHNSON also promised opponents of the treaty sufficient time for full discussion of their objections. The vehemence of this opposition is surprising because of the great advantages of the treaty to the United States and the weight its rejection would give to a charge by the Soviet Union that the basic disarmament policy of this Nation is a sham. That policy is expressed by the standing offer of the United States to reduce armaments and ban nuclear explosions on a global scale if the compact is safeguarded by adequate inspection and control, a formula the Soviet Union accepted in signing the Antarctic Treaty.

The treaty also reserves all U.S. territorial claims in Antarctica, and prohibits any signatory nation from making claims founded on its activities during the life of the treaty. It has been our historic position that sovereignty over unpeopled areas is acquired by discovery and exploration only when accompanied by an effective occupation. The latter is unattainable in a frozen terrain as large as the United States plus Europe.

By the requirement of effective occupation, the treaty sets a precedent against Soviet claims of celestial sovereignty if its aeronauts should be the first to reach the moon or the planets. This is a vital defense policy in the space age.

The treaty bans all military action, including nuclear explosions, and grants unlimited and unilateral right of inspection and overflight to every signatory nation.

The full Senate debate pledged by Senator JOHNSON will disclose the nature of the opposition to this great diplomatic achievement by the United States. It was negotiated in a period when Soviet-American relations made it possible to gain Moscow's agreement to a compact which will demilitarize an entire continent and forbid nuclear explosions in an area where the winds would steadily blow fallout northward over the entire southern hemisphere.

The present state of these relations is such that, if the Senate rejects the treaty, the progress it represents toward world peace will be canceled for the indefinite future.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Out of whose time does the Senator wish the time consumed for the quorum call to be taken?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Out of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall not take a great deal of time this afternoon to discuss the details and ramifications of this treaty, because it has already been discussed in great detail by able members of the Foreign Relations Committee. For me to rehash those details would be unnecessary and repetitious.

I do wish to say that the question of this Antarctic Treaty is something that has not been approached lightly. It has not been approached lightly by those in the State Department and the administration who have negotiated this treaty, and it has not been approached lightly by the Foreign Relations Committee, which has considered it. A great deal of thought and attention has been devoted to the whole situation involving the Antarctic area, and rightly so.

The Antarctic is unique, of course, in the territorial landmasses of the world. It is unique because it is in the main a great landmass, inaccessible, and practically unusable for commercial purposes because of its icecap. Therefore it is unique because the economic attractions which normally bring nations and people to territories of that kind are not in existence. It has been a geologic phenomenon in many ways, and it has attracted scientists and tempted the venturesome on voyages of discovery of one kind or another. But it has remained in recent times literally an unclaimed area of the world, and an area of the world whose utility, until very recent times, has been questionable for any practical purpose except scientific.

However, within the past few years, with the advance of science and the technology of military weapons and devices, the knowledge that outer space can be used for military purposes, and with the increase in the range and speed of rockets and other weapons of war, the question of the Antarctic as a potential military base has begun to draw the interest of some countries of the world.

The United States has perhaps done more exploratory work in the Antarctic than all the other countries of the world combined—at least so far as total expenditures and consistency of exploratory work are concerned. Much of that work was done under the late great Admiral Byrd, and we have a tradition and a history of scientific interest in that area.

Be that as it may, the United States has probably the most sustainable claims

for sovereignty in the Antarctic of any nation in the world, but it has not seen fit to adopt a claim of sovereignty as a part of its national policy.

However, four or five countries have asserted sovereignty or claims to sovereignty over certain portions of the Antarctic. Those claims have not been recognized or agreed to by any other countries except the countries so asserting them, but that makes little difference. The claims have been asserted.

In recent years certain other countries have asserted and claimed and maintained certain interests and certain rights in the Antarctic. The interest in the Antarctic and the apparent intention of many countries to go into the Antarctic and establish further and broader interests certainly has become apparent. For that reason, and for many other reasons, it was considered highly desirable that we seek some kind of solution to the Antarctic problem before it became so confused and complex as to defy any kind of reasonable or satisfactory settlement. So this treaty was negotiated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption at this point?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What disturbs me most about the treaty is what prompted me to raise the question with the senior Senator from Kansas, namely, that there is no method in the treaty for finally resolving a difference of opinion or a dispute between two of the parties, without their consent. Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct. A veto is provided on disputes, because decisions on any change of policy or alteration must be by unanimous consent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If that is true, and if a nation cannot get its difference of opinion resolved, can it resign from the agreement at the end of 2 years?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is that right in the case of a later contracting party rejecting an amendment agreed to by the 12 original parties.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Even before the 30 years have elapsed?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; there is such a provision in the treaty. However, the original 12 contracting parties would not be so covered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. According to page 4 of the committee report it would seem that a party could not resign until after 30 years.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe that under the circumstances described above a certain party to the treaty can, if it desires, set machinery in motion so that it can withdraw from the treaty, and would not have to wait for 30 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That would be the only solution if, for instance, we put in a very strong claim and there was a contrary claim. Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That would be a violation rather than a solution. I will discuss the point in a moment, if I may. It was realized that some kind of solution to this problem was desirable now, before the Antarctic situation got so complicated that solutions could not be satisfactorily arrived at.

So all the nations of the world which have expressed any interest in Antarctica were invited to participate in the conferences, looking toward some contractual relationship or treaty or agreement which would approach a solution of these problems. Twelve nations only expressed an interest in Antarctica, and those nations got together and formulated the treaty.

The treaty is not perfect. I presume that if each Member of the Senate were trying to draw up a treaty there would be 100 different versions of it. I do not believe that in a vital matter of this kind every provision can be made satisfactory to everyone, particularly when there are four or five nations which have already asserted sovereignty. We have not asserted sovereignty. Whether we should have is beside the point now. However, a number of nations have asserted interests and rights of various kinds. When they get together there must be a compromise of what they believe to be their basic interests, if they are to arrive at a composite agreement which will move forward the cause of peace and the cause of proper administration of this great area.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The treaty does not take away from the United States any existing rights which the United States has today, with the exception of the fact that the treaty—for its duration—does debar us and any other country from asserting in the future any additional claims to sovereignty. We give that up. So does every other country. So will every other nation which accedes to the treaty. So will every other member of the United Nations which accedes to the treaty in the future. No nation can assert any additional claims of sovereignty over and above those which they have asserted or claimed up to this time. So we are giving up nothing which we presently possess. We are giving to no nation anything that that nation does not already possess in the Antarctic. However, we are preventing by this treaty the possibility of a chaotic condition existing in Antarctica in the next few years, which could rise up to intrigue us, and cause us some trouble in that part of the world, which we never thought possible a short time ago. To me, that is the alternative we must face.

If we do not ratify this treaty, what is the alternative? The alternative is the possibility, and the strong probability, that there will be an increasing number of nations who will stake out claims in Antarctica, and we will have a mare's nest of international confusion that we will never be able to straighten out.

I believe this is a magnificent opportunity, first, to settle the jurisdictional questions in Antarctica and the question of rights in Antarctica, and, second, to prevent a mad scramble which an uninhibited world could get into. By the treaty we would prevent that from happening, and once and for all—I am speaking of the first 30 years of the treaty—establish the basic principle that Antarctic land shall be used under no circumstances for military purposes or for bases of any nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, may I have an additional 2 minutes?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is vitally important. It is the first time, as far as I know, that we have had this opportunity.

There is another aspect which has been emphasized by other speakers, and that is that the treaty is clear that no signatory to the treaty—that is, anyone of the 12 nations—or any other nation which accedes to the treaty in the future, can import for military purposes any equipment or any personnel into Antarctica, and that every piece of equipment, every program, every plan that any nation has in Antarctica must be put down on the record beforehand. The ships and planes and vehicles that take that material into Antarctica are subject to inspection by every other party to the treaty, in advance. Installations in Antarctica are subject, not to an inspection of a committee of these nations, but by everyone of the 12 nations. Everyone of those nations has a right to inspect the installations and equipment and records of everyone of the other 11 nations, at any time, without any inhibition or restraint.

That to me is a tremendous step in international comity. It is a tremendous step on this great road that we are trying to follow to get access to the other man's operations. It is the same access that we are willing to give him so far as our operations are concerned.

Of course, the treaty is not perfect. I am the first to admit that it is not a perfect treaty. I would like to see certain things added to the treaty for our own benefit. However, we must bear in mind that some of the things which would copper-rivet the treaty so far as we are concerned would be totally unacceptable to other nations. I believe this is a great milestone and opportunity in the interest of the world and in the interest of the establishment of principles which we espouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as I have listened to the debate today and read the speeches in the RECORD yesterday, the thought has gone through my mind that actually this is a contest in the Senate between the age which has passed and the age which is thronging before. A number of extremely able speeches have been made in opposition to the treaty, notably by the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUS-

SELL]. I honor their views, and regret that I cannot find it possible to be in accord with them.

The opposition to the treaty, in my judgment, is based on the old-fashioned theory of complete and absolute sovereignty; the right of any nation to do as it sees fit in a world which has become too small to permit that kind of conduct any longer to be feasible.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has summarized, far more cogently than I could, the reasons supporting the ratification of the treaty. I shall not reiterate what has been so well stated. I should like to complete my brief remarks by reading a few comments from an editorial which was published not too long ago in a document rarely quoted on the floor of the Senate. I think we would be wise if we quoted from it more frequently. The editorial was published in the Saturday Review of Literature. Its distinguished editor, Norman Cousins, was speaking about an entirely different subject, but I think his remarks are pertinent to the subject under discussion today. He said:

The central problem, essentially, is to arrange the affairs of human society on earth in such a way as to make it safe for people. * * *

The fact is that life on earth is made possible by the most precarious balancing act in the universe.

Human life is the rarest, most complex, and most precious of all the prizes in the universe. It is this prize that is now in the process of being diminished and rejected—by humans themselves. * * *

The direction of men's thoughts * * * has yet to adjust itself to the new total demands. Forms of human organization, shaped in response to the evolving needs of the past, are absurdly inadequate for present and future. * * *

One problem that the individual nations most certainly cannot handle adequately has to do with the common safety of the world's peoples. * * *

Beyond the charges and countercharges and clamor of sovereignties a basic problem persists. The existing mechanisms by which human society operates are inadequate to sustain the cause of life. New mechanisms must be created. The time for creating them is short. * * * The place to begin is with the idea that it is necessary.

Mr. President, this treaty is an effort to create such a new mechanism. It will take out of the field of international rivalry a huge continent as yet not conquered by man. It is an experiment with an effort to make world peace possible through the rule of law. For that reason, I support the treaty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from which I read, entitled, "Life and the Vital Fraction," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LIFE AND THE VITAL FRACTION

It is said that the world has been totally changed since Paris. This may be true of the atmosphere. It may be true of the prospects. But it is not true of the problem. The nature of the problem remains the same.

The central problem, essentially, is to arrange the affairs of human society on earth in such a way as to make it safe for people. Things are now happening that threaten, within a comparatively short time, to reduce or eliminate that safety.

The failure of the Paris meeting has not changed the fact that life on earth is made possible by the most precarious balancing act in the universe. A small change in the total amount of radiation on earth could result in a vast reshuffling of species through wholesale mutations. A small shift in the distance of the earth to the sun could cause the earth either to freeze over or burn up.

The internal economy of the human being operates through an endless number of delicate balances. A small alteration in the balance inside the body of salt to water, of oxygen to carbon dioxide, of red blood cells to white, could put an end to life. Lessening of the supply of oxygen to the head for only a few consecutive minutes could damage the brain beyond repair.

* * * * *

That is, out of 500 million sperm cells available for fertilization, only 1 achieved fusion. No two cells were alike. Each had the potential stamp of a complete and unique personality built into it. It would be theoretically possible for a single man to double the earth's population, in terms of the sperm cells he could make available in a relatively short period of time.

In addition to the vital and elusive fractions, man must run a gamut represented by the hundreds of thousands of years it took life on earth to produce a species with intelligence, sensitivity, an awareness of beauty, a sense of wonder, and an ability to change its environment.

Human life is the rarest, most complex, and most precious of all the prizes in the universe. It is this prize that is now in the process of being diminished and rejected—by humans themselves. The humans are tampering with the vital fractions. They are altering the radiation balance in the atmosphere. They are damaging their own germ cells, producing defective creatures, and canceling out hundreds of thousands of years of evolving development. They are rearranging the vital proportions in the soil. Indeed, they are at the point of eliminating life altogether.

These new capacities have come up so suddenly that their thunderheads have hardly been observed. The direction of men's thoughts, conditioned by centuries of local environmental habits, has yet to adjust itself to the new total demands. Forms of human organization, shaped in response to the evolving needs of the past, are absurdly inadequate for present and future. Old methods for protecting life now become the fuse points for exploding it; that is, the Nation is no longer the outer ring of security. It is now a flailing unit of a world anarchy. The greater its insistence on maintaining its traditional absolute sovereignty, the greater the threat to its own people—and indeed, to all peoples.

It becomes necessary, then, for man to develop a survival perspective. He must think in a way he has never thought before—about his uniqueness, about his place in the universe, about the meaning and preciousness of life, about his values, about his relationship to other human beings, about the new institutions or mechanisms that are required to deal with random and pulverizing power, and about the rights of the next generation.

If there is any single vantage point in the world for the development and use of a survival perspective it should be the United Nations. No one knows whether another meeting of the leading statesmen will be held any time soon. But meetings of the United Nations are going on every day. The organization was created for the express purpose of coping with problems that the individual nations could not handle adequately. One problem that the individual nations most certainly cannot handle adequately has to do with the common safety of the world's peoples.

As soon as the United Nations gets over its present decibel-duel over spies and counterspies, high-flying planes and low-flying microphones, it would be helpful if it addressed itself to the main need. For beyond the charges and countercharges and clamor of sovereignties a basic problem persists. The existing mechanisms by which human society operates are inadequate to sustain the cause of life. New mechanisms must be created. The time for creating them is short. The U.N. might supply such a mechanism. The place to begin is with the idea that it is necessary.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whose time will the time for the quorum call be charged?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the opponents of the treaty have some 38 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to address myself further to the treaty, but I do not desire to use all my time now if any Senator desires to speak on the other side of the question. If no other Senator desires to speak now, I shall proceed in my own time, but I give notice that if any Senator desires a brief opportunity to speak, I shall be happy to yield to him.

Mr. President, earlier in the day I discussed briefly the fantasy of bringing Russia into the Antarctic to share equally in this vast continent that lies around the South Pole. I also adverted to the lack of specific knowledge as to the actual wealth of that area. Despite the contentions that there was no evidence of mineral wealth, the evidence shows that less than 1 percent of the area of the Antarctic has been actually examined to determine the nature and extent of the mineral deposits there.

Time will not permit me to lay before the Senate all the objections I see to the treaty, but there are one or two aspects that I should like to discuss. One in particular is the effect this treaty has on the national security—the surrender of strategic advantage by the United States; the meaning of the threat to the defense of this country that is implied by the treaty.

It is an affront to the national pride and the national prestige that we have failed to assert our claims. Our failure poses a grave and direct threat to our national defense. It does not require

any military genius to grasp the strategic importance of Antarctica in an age of intercontinental missiles, space rockets, and earth satellites.

Indeed, we were aware of this in the age of the ordinary submarine and of the airplane of 20 years ago. Secretary of State Cordell Hull looked far into the future when he proclaimed the doctrine that the American Republics would not permit any foreign power to take over this area. I regret very much that it is proposed here today to abandon that position and to retreat from the application of the Monroe Doctrine to the Palmer Peninsula which is vital to keeping open the Drake Passage.

The strategic importance of the Antarctic has been stated many times, in many different ways. But it has seldom been stated more eloquently or expertly than by the late Admiral Byrd, whom I consider our foremost Antarctic authority.

In a magazine article published in 1954, Byrd stated:

> As any astute military planner now knows, the nation that controls Palmer Peninsula at the northern tip of the continent could strangle America's lifeline in case of another world war.
>
> Should the easily disabled Panama Canal be knocked out by an A-bomb, ships traveling from the Atlantic to the Pacific would have to sail around the toe of South America, between Cape Horn and Antarctica. At present we have no defenses in that area and our ships would become easy prey for enemy jets and submarines that might some day be based on Antarctica.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In fact, with work and foresight, Antarctica could some day be made into a large strategic American bomber base and A-bomb arsenal guarding the entire southern world. Bombers based there could effectively nullify any Soviet threat to South America, Australia, New Zealand, the southern Pacific islands, and parts of Africa.

Even the advocates of the treaty recognize and admit the military significance of this area. Mr. Phleger, the chief negotiator of the treaty, stated, when he appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee:

> Having in mind that the Palmer Peninsula is 400 miles from the tip of South America—

And, Mr. President, in terms of today's weapons, 400 miles is not as far as 50 miles was prior to World War II—

> and that Antarctica is about 2,000 miles from Melbourne, Australia, and realizing the significance of that great area being opened for military purposes, the establishment of launching pads and missile bases, then you can well understand the agitation of the countries, our friends in the Southern Hemisphere, when the Soviet Union moved into that area.

A more persuasive argument could hardly be made for retaining full American interest in the Antarctic Continent, including the right to use it for defensive purposes if necessary. Mr. Phleger truly stated the threat. But as a remedy, he proposed that we permit the Russians to establish themselves in an area where they have no right to be in the first place.

Earlier, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] asked questions about the distance from the tip of the Palmer Peninsula to Africa. But, Mr. President, no American with even a meager knowledge of geography could today fail to grasp the strategic importance of that part of the Antarctic Continent.

Yet, the State Department contends the strategic importance of Antarctica is a primary reason that the United States should take the lead in neutralizing the continent, and why we should give Russia an equal voice in its control. Mr. President, I simply cannot understand any such argument. It seems to me to be both illogical and fallacious.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. In the absence of this treaty, will not this entire area be open to exploration and exploitation by the Soviets, without restraint? Would not they then have as much access to the area as we or anyone else would? It seems to me the danger lies in the absence of a treaty, whereas if there is a treaty the situation will be frozen and there will be some possibility of legal action in the event of exploitation by one of the members of the treaty organization.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator's argument would apply to any part of South America or to the Caribbean area or, more immediately, to Cuba. What keeps the Soviets out of Cuba, today? It is the Monroe Doctrine. It is the knowledge that the United States has announced a policy of resisting any intrusion by European powers into Cuba.

That is what would keep the Soviets out of this area, which is so vital to us, in the Antarctic. Secretary Hull extended the Monroe Doctrine to this part of the Antarctic Continent. But now it is proposed that we abandon the Monroe Doctrine, as regards Antarctica, and allow it to be open to exploitation by any of these 12 nations or by any other nations on the earth.

If we are not willing to fight for our security wherever it is involved, we might as well surrender now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In stating that we would abandon all our rights to the area and that we would abandon the application of the Monroe Doctrine to the area, what basis does the Senator from Georgia have for stating there would be any such abandonment of our rights?

Mr. RUSSELL. My position is that we have a valid claim there, today, although we have not asserted that claim. It does not matter how valid our claim is; if Russia came in now and remained there, beside us, for 30 years, when the treaty would expire, Russia would claim rights there equal to our own and would assert her claim.

The primary vice of this entire matter has been the failure to assert our claim in this area when we have a valid right to it.

No, Mr. President, the strategic factor involved in the Antarctic becomes readily apparent to all when we recognize what undoubtedly would happen in the event of war—namely, that the Panama Canal and the Suez Canal would be closed or destroyed. If the Suez Canal were lost to the free nations of the West, it would mean that ships sailing to and from the Atlantic and Indian Oceans would pass between the tip of Africa and the Antarctic. Although the width of the passage is considerable, it would still be imperative that control of the Antarctic mainland and waters remain in Western hands in order to protect the lines of communication and supply between Western Europe and the East.

But the problem would be infinitely more acute were we, for any reason, denied the use of the Panama Canal. In that likelihood, passage to and from the Atlantic and Pacific would be by way of the Drake Passage—a 500-mile-wide waterway between Cape Horn and the Palmer Peninsula. Earlier today the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] adverted to that.

Mr. President, if access to that waterway were denied to the United States and to Western Nation shipping under any circumstances, we would have suffered a great disaster, one which would be irrevocable.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Earlier today, I asked a question which I would like to repeat now, in order to obtain a direct answer by the distinguished Senator from Georgia: Is it not true that under the proposed treaty, if it were to go into effect, the Russians would have a complete right to establish an airbase for exploratory purposes or scientific purposes in the Palmer Peninsula, and is it not true that such an airbase could be quickly converted for military purposes in the event of a war emergency?

Mr. RUSSELL. A military plane can land on the same base that a civilian plane can land on, and it undoubtedly would be used for that purpose.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Soviet can build such a base, is it not a fact that our country also can?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has fallen into an error I never thought I would see befall the distinguished Senator from Ohio. He knows the United States deals in good faith, and he believes the Russians will do likewise; he is willing to place the destiny of this Nation in the good faith of the Soviets. That is where we differ. I do not trust Russia as far as I can push this Capitol. The Senator knows if we sign an agreement we will live up to it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concede that the most effective argument which can be made against the treaty is the assumption that the Soviet will not abide by its words. I agree theoretically with the

Senator from Georgia on that point; but if we adopt that attitude forever and forever, we would never be a party to entering into any agreement, never anticipating that there is going to be a worldwide solution of the problems facing us. I would say that if there is any reason to vote against this treaty, it is on the basis of declaring that never shall we accept the word of the Soviet. I am not prepared to do that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator narrows the issue too much. We will give the Soviets rights where they have no rights, if we ratify this treaty today. They have no just or valid claim of any kind, but we are proposing to give it to them by this treaty. If the Soviet Government is in good faith, let it sign an agreement that will allow aerial inspection of both countries, as has been proposed by the President.

This was a sunshine treaty. When this treaty was negotiated, it was on the eve of the visit of Premier Khrushchev to this country. It was a time when the Soviet was generating an aura of good will and back slapping and smiles; we were giving lavish parties for each other. It was when Mr. Khrushchev was using the charm treatment on the Western world. That was apparent from the statement of the Russian delegate who was there at the opening of the session. He referred to the great good will that was being generated then.

This treaty would apply only to our areas, not to Russia's areas. It gives Russia rights where they have none. I am willing tomorrow to have an agreement signed with Russia for total disarmament, if we can do it with safety to the United States, but I shall not by my vote approve a treaty that will endanger this country unless I know all of our rights are protected; and that is not true in this treaty.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There are seven nations that have asserted claims to Antarctica, and all are signatories to this treaty. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The United States and the Soviets allege that they have some basis for claims, but they have never asserted them. I concede that our bases are much stronger than those of the Soviet; but will the Senator explain to me how we are to reconcile the conflicting claims that we have even with the United Kingdom, Norway, France, New Zealand, Australia, Argentina, and Chile, all of them our friends?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I shall deal with that question presently. I have a proposal. I am not being merely negative in opposing this treaty. I have stated that before. I realize the conditions are there, and must be resolved if we are to solve the matter.

Mr. President, I was referring to the fact that this was a sunshine treaty, that it grew out of the hopes and aspirations for peace on the part of people everywhere. That was before Mr. Khrushchev destroyed the last hope we had for any peace, when he broke up the conference; and I pray God we will never get ourselves entrapped again without knowing what we are walking into. But just to show this is a sunshine treaty, here are the opening remarks of the Russian representative at the conference. He declared:

> At present favorable conditions are emerging in the world for more active cooperation of all states in the interests of consolidating peace and security.
>
> The visit of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., N. S. Khrushchev, to the United States of America, and his talks with the U.S. President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, was an important contribution to the normalization of the international situation.
>
> Our Conference is meeting at the moment when the trend toward warmer relations between states is discernible, and, figuratively speaking, this fair wind which has risen in the international atmosphere is favorable for our Conference and must assist in the happy sailing of our ship.

Mr. President, there was a great difference in the atmosphere of the Conference when the treaty was signed by our representative, and in world conditions today, when the Senate of the United States is called upon to ratify the treaty. I say the difference is so great that it becomes our solemn duty to reject it, and not fall into the Russian trap of the artificial atmosphere of warmth that was generated. It could have been generated in part for the purpose of getting us duped into this treaty. I would not put it past the duplicity of Khrushchev and his associates to have had that period of joviality and love and good wishes just to get us entrapped into a treaty.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that the United States has found it possible to reconcile and settle very important differences of opinion as to boundaries between ourselves and our greatest ally, the United Kingdom, on at least two occasions, one of which led to the motto "Fifty-four-forty or fight" in an American political campaign, and the other of which had to do with the settlement of the boundary of Alaska, after we had purchased it from Russia, so that the matter of reconciling differences in claims of land is nothing new at all or impossible of settlement?

Mr. RUSSELL. Undoubtedly the settlement of this area as a part of the free world can be enhanced if Russia is frozen out—not that she has been frozen out. She was invited in for the International Geophysical Year. But if Russia is not brought in, we can settle those differences with the other nations involved. But what hope is there to settle that controversy if Russia is in it, when we have had experience after experience? How many more times must this Nation surrender a little bit here and a little bit there? I am willing to go as far as any man and come to a complete understanding with Russia on every issue. But when an understanding is reached there must be authority and power to see that it is enforced before I will submit the future of this country, even in limited degree, to Russian good will.

There is a great deal of difference between the atmosphere that prevails today and the atmosphere that prevailed when the treaty was signed. This justifies us in taking another long look at the whole question before we take a step from which we cannot retreat. If we ratify the treaty it will be ratified. There will be no way to undo what we shall have done.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not true that article X says:

> Each of the contracting parties undertakes to exert appropriate efforts, consistent—

And I emphasize—

> consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, to the end that no one engages in any activity in Antarctica contrary to the principles or purposes of the present treaty.

If the Communist Chinese should go to Antarctica and should build a rocket station or a missile-tracking station or anything else, the principles of the United Nations would bar us from throwing them out forcibly without having a resolution passed by the United Nations, under article X, which Russia could veto.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is folly to state that the 12 signatories could stop such a thing. As I pointed out, the Russians already have turned over a base to Poland, without a signatory agreement, and they are reported to be getting ready to turn over another to Czechoslovakia.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is nothing we can do to enforce article X without going through the United Nations, and the Russians have a veto there to block any action.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. President, I have only a few minutes remaining. I was adverting, before I engaged in the discussion with my valued friend from Ohio, to the strategic importance of this area.

The treaty itself, by its very terms, as the Senator from Louisiana says, could be utilized to prevent us from taking steps necessary for our own preservation and protection.

Even without disruption of the Panama Canal, the Drake Passage is essential to the U.S. security. Anything which affects it will nullify the command of the seas, for which the American people have spent billions of dollars and on which we have lavished our ingenuity and genius. Loss of our defensive rights in the Antarctic will impair seriously the mobility and maneuverability of our naval striking force.

Mr. President, the modernized aircraft carrier long ago outgrew the Panama Canal. To shift from one ocean to another our latest carriers must pass between the tip of South America and the Palmer Peninsula of Antarctica. That is not a military secret, Jane's Fighting Ships publishes the size of every vessel. Every nation in the world knows the size of the Panama Canal. We have 22 aircraft carriers now in operation and 3 under construction that cannot pass through the Panama Canal.

As a matter of interest, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names

of these vessels, which constitute the very heart of our mobile striking force on the seas, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

VESSELS PROHIBITED BY SIZE FROM USE OF PANAMA CANAL

Fourteen CVA—large attack carriers: the *Independence*, the *Saratoga*, the *Midway*, the *Coral Sea*, the *Bon Homme Richard*, the *Ticonderoga*, the *Shangri-La*, the *Ranger*, the *Forrestal*, the *F. D. Roosevelt*, the *Oriskany*, the *Lexington*, the *Intrepid*, the *Hancock*.

Seven CVS: the *Kearsarge*, the *Bennington*, the *Wasp*, the *Essex*, the *Randolph*, the *Hornet*, the *Yorktown*.

One training carrier: the *Antietam*.

Three under construction: the *Kitty Hawk*, the *Constellation*, the *Enterprise*.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, my time is about up. I hope the Senate will prayerfully and carefully measure up to its constitutional responsibilities. There are a few matters, Mr. President, to which I should briefly refer.

In the first place, to those who speak about this being a conflict between the ancient age and the modern times, I would point out once again that Franklin D. Roosevelt, considered to be somewhat of a modernist in his time, was preparing to lay claim to sovereignty over this entire area at the time World War II began.

I further point out, Mr. President, that since World War II, as the Congress has authorized these missions to the Antarctic it has been for the express purpose of asserting U.S. sovereignty. Despite all that, Mr. President, we have made no claims. We say now we shall make no claims. We say that our $250 million expended on exploration and the lives of the Americans who died in undertaking to build the future security of this country shall be pooled with a Russian claim, which the Russians made at a conference, that 2 days before the Britisher sailed in the Antarctic a Russian did.

I referred earlier to the fact that the Russians have claimed everything. They claim they discovered radio, invented the airplane, and everything else. I would like to read a story datelined from London, June 15.

The Russian claim said the sixth continent was discovered by a Russian expedition January 28, 1820, 2 days before the Briton generally credited with the feat—Lt. Edward Bransfield—got there.

The claim was advanced by Vladimir Lebedev, an Antarctic explorer and secretary of the Soviet National Antarctic Committee.

Mr. President, are we to lend encouragement to these spurious claims against our vital national interests by the ratification of such a treaty as this?

Mr. President, time and again during the consideration of this treaty my thoughts have drifted back to Thomas Jefferson and the purchase of the Louisiana territory, and to William Seward's acquisition of Alaska. That may be old-fashioned, Mr. President. It may be the modern trend to give Russia a great deal and to try to work with Russia, but I will take my place with Jefferson, with Seward, and with those who contributed to the sovereignty of the United States and to the building of these United States, rather than adopting any idea that we will accomplish anything by collaboration with the Soviet Union. In those times these purchases were considered by some to be unmitigated folly, but they were actually acts of great vision. They were acts of courage. Today they shine down through the pages of history, and even into the timidity of the present hour, as great beacons that mark the forward movement of American civilization.

These men were unafraid to take bold action to promote the interests of the nation even at the risk of unpopularity. We are determining America's future here. Within the next hour we shall have an opportunity to take bold action at the risk of temporary unpopularity by refusing to sacrifice and to surrender, through this treaty, the rights which are based upon American daring and the expenditure of American lives and American money.

Mr. President, I shall briefly outline what I think the Senate should do.

First and foremost, we should reject this treaty on the vote which is to be had within the next hour or so.

After we reject the treaty, we should instruct the State Department to express immediately a claim to our valid rights in this vast continent, rights that are ours on the basis of all the standards that have historically been used for establishing claims to title all over the world—rights based on exploration, on discovery, and on longer occupation than any other country can establish.

Mr. President, in order that there will be no enemy interlopers, we should immediately reaffirm the Hull declaration of 1940, saying that the American republics, from Canada to Cape Horn, have a vital interest in this area, warning the aggressive nations of the earth to stay out.

Then, Mr. President, we should call a conference of the seven friendly powers that have asserted claims to this area.

They are our friends and allies. We will get along much better in negotiating with them than we would if Russia were at the conference table.

What does Russia do at every meeting it attends? It tries to plant the seeds of discord. It tries to create trouble, and it will create trouble if a question should ever arise with respect to the sixth continent.

Let us reject this treaty and sit with our friends among the seven claimant nations to solve this problem. It can be done. There are conflicting claims in some areas, but they can be settled by negotiation, by an exchange of lands and, indeed, by purchase if necessary, as was done in the case of the Louisiana Purchase and in the case of the purchase of Alaska. We shall never do it if we invite Soviet Russia to the table, as is proposed in this treaty.

There are many other alternatives. I have never been more serious in my life, Mr. President. I say we should reject this treaty and, if necessary, to arrange a conference with the seven other claimants immediately for the control, protection, defense, and administration of these lands during the time of the negotiations, or in the event it is impossible to negotiate.

If we bring the greatest enemy to the American way of life—Soviet Russia—into this picture, we will have destroyed any hope of ever settling the question, and we will have done violence to future generations of Americans yet unborn. This treaty should be rejected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield whatever time I have remaining.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I did not protest this treaty being reported from the committee. As a member of other committees, I found it impossible to attend some sessions of the hearings on this treaty. I ask only that there be sufficient delay so that Senators who are opposed to the treaty may have time to prepare their case.

I have since reviewed the record, and I find that the vital questions raised on the floor were for the most part not answered in the committee. I see Mr. Macomber, one of the able representatives of the State Department, in the gallery from time to time. I assume he is undertaking to give private answers to some who may not know otherwise.

But we have before us the record of the hearings that were held. The record shows that there was a morning session at which eight Senators were present, which was less than a quorum. That session lasted for 2 hours. Of the eight Senators present, five asked questions during the course of the hearing, which would indicate that perhaps all eight were not able to remain throughout the hearings, since they probably had somewhat the same problem that confronted the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Other committees were meeting, and the Senate was in session all day. Then there was a brief evening session which lasted for 2 hours and 15 minutes. In that time we had less information adduced than the Senator from Georgia has presented to us today in a single presentation of one side of the issue. A total period of about 4 hours and 15 minutes was devoted to the morning and afternoon sessions. There were five Senators present that afternoon.

One of the five, of course, was the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] who had been an adviser when this subject was considered. He would undoubtedly know a great deal about the subject and would perhaps not need the benefit of the hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired. The proponents have 48 minutes remaining.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the distinguished Senator. The junior Senator from Louisiana was compelled to vote on this matter somewhat in the

dark, and did so as a courtesy to other Senators. In view of the gravity of this question, it seems to me more study is required before we undertake to approve the treaty. The record we have is scanty, in the light of the many serious questions that have been raised affecting the very vital security interest of this country.

As the Senator from Georgia has pointed out, this is a "sunshine" treaty. I believe it was negotiated immediately after Khrushchev's visit to this country. His visit came in September or October, and this treaty was negotiated within 60 days of Khrushchev's visit, at a time when people felt that Khrushchev was not a bad fellow, and before he resumed his rattling of his rockets at us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, with regard to the last comment of the Senator from Louisiana, of course, the chairman has no way to compel the attendance of members at a committee meeting. All chairmen know that. These meetings were held in the usual order. The ones who were interested were present and attended. We have the record before us. It consists of 101 pages. We had the representatives of the State Department and the Department of Defense; also scientists and independent authorities on international law, for example, from Columbia University; and also public witnesses. Any public witness who was willing and desirous to appear could do so.

I do not believe there is anything sketchy about the hearings. With all deference, the statements made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in my opinion, are not information on this subject. Many of them are quite irrelevant. As an example, he makes much of the Monroe Doctrine. He seems to forget that more than half of Antarctica is not even in the Western Hemisphere. I do not know what he proposes to do about the part which is in the Eastern Hemisphere. He will have to create some new doctrine to cover that area.

I do not accept the statement that this record is incomplete or inadequate in any respect. I think it is an excellent record. The Antarctic Treaty, of course, was prepared and negotiated under the direction of one of the ablest men in this country, Mr. Herman Phleger, with the assistance of two of the Members of this body, and the usual assistance from the State Department.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One moment. I may say the Navy was represented. A Captain Davis was present and participated at all times. All these proposals were cleared with the Department of Defense, and it approved them.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would not wish to see the impression go out, if it should go out as a result of the observations of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, that this or other matters which come before the Senate do not receive proper consideration. Attendance at committee hearings is a matter of an individual Senator's diligence, for one thing; but all the documents are constantly available. This subject has been before the committee for some time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Since February, when it came to the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is easy to let the impression go out that the treaty has been very hastily and sketchily considered. I do not deem that to be the case at all, and particularly so by virtue of the well-rounded and completely documented statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate in this debate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. I believe he is quite correct. I believe the situation is somewhat similar to the occasional story we hear, to the effect that the Senate passed a bill with only 6 or 10 Senators present. Usually such bills are private bills or bills agreed upon in committee, and they can always be presented in the fashion described. This treaty was considered in the usual course, with the staff work and the attention of committee members in exactly the same way in which all treaties are considered.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my belief, based upon my experience of 3½ years in the Senate and in connection with hearings held by the Committee on Foreign Relations, that if we are to heed the argument made by the Senator from Louisiana in this instance, we will have to heed it in instance after instance when measures are brought before us on the floor of the Senate.

I venture to say that in these hearings there was a greater attendance than is normally the case. If we are to accept the Senator's argument, we will find that in instance after instance the same argument can be made, that there were not enough Senators present. I observed that yesterday, in the absence of a quorum at subcommitee hearing, a measure was acted upon. What are we going to do when that question comes before us? A quorum of four members was necessary, and three members were present, and action was taken.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows, does he not, that he himself has insisted, as a customary thing, and has granted time, as chairman, for members of the committee to study a matter and to decide what position they will take on it, and to give them an opportunity to submit minority views. In this instance the junior Senator from Louisiana was willing to waive that customary courtesy and to have the treaty reported to the Senate without further consideraion, because we were in the closing days of the last session.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; I have not criticized the Senator for his action. That is quite true. The Senator was not in favor of the treaty, but he consented to allowing it to be voted upon and reported to the Senate. That is true. The only point I am making is that I disagree with the Senator from Louisiana that the hearings were not adequate and that the treaty did not receive proper consideration. I believe that with the exception of the Senator from Louisiana, virtually all the other members of the committee were present when we voted on the treaty.

I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like first to say that, as one of the eight members of the committee who attended the hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations when it considered the proposed Antarctic Treaty, I consider eight to be a pretty good number of members to be present. It is not necessary to have a quorum present in order to hold a hearing, as everyone knows. Nearly all the members of the committee were present, as the chairman says, when we reported the bill to the Senate. As I recall, only one Senator, the Senator from California, of all those who have registered their opposition to the treaty on the floor of the Senate, made any objection to it at the time of the hearings. Apparently things have transpired since then which have made others decide to oppose the treaty.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] was also present.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; the Senator from Alaska has objected to it. I said that of all the Senators who have opposed the treaty on the floor the Senator from California was the only one who opposed the treaty at the hearing.

I believe that all of us who attended the hearings were in a rather critical mood with respect to the treaty. I did not know whether it was a good treaty. I had heard some objections voiced to it. In fact, I knew what the objections were. Therefore, in committee some of us raised those points with the witnesses who came before us. The objections were satisfactorily met and explained. So when the time came to vote, I voted with the majority of the committee to report the treaty favorably.

I can enumerate on the fingers of one hand the points which have been raised against the treaty. First there is the objection that we would surrender territorial claims if we ratified the treaty. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has clearly explained that we do not surrender any basis for territorial claims. We say so in the treaty.

We say no one can assert or use that authority during the next 30-year period, or expand or make claims which have not been made up to this point.

The second objection that has been raised is that Russia will not keep her agreements. It is said that we would agree to do certain things or not to do certain things, and that, although, Russia would also agree, she would not live up to her agreement.

Russia does not have to sign the treaty. She can go to Antarctica now if she wants to do so, and she can test bombs, she can establish missile bases, and build airports. I believe that all the nations interested down there are using airplanes. Therefore, we are not giving up anything in that respect.

The third point that is raised is that under the treaty Red China will be able

to go there and establish bases. Well, Red China can go into Antarctica today. There is nothing to prevent Red China from going there. However, if the treaty is approved, then these 12 nations of the world are bound together to keep Red China, or any other country, from going there and establishing bases from which to attack anyone.

I believe it is a good treaty. It provides for open inspections. For the first time we have a treaty which provides for open inspections, as open as it is possible to get them. That provision is written into the treaty. We provide in the treaty for open inspections. If the other nations agree to the treaty and we agree to it, at least we can try that principle in the great Antarctic area.

As to the Soviets establishing bases, I suppose it is possible for the Soviets to go to Antarctica and establish missile bases or airfields if they have enough money or the desire to do it. But why should the Soviet Union or any other country go to Antarctica to establish a base from which to attack the United States or any nation allied with us?

It is common knowledge that Russia has the potential today, through long-range bombers and long-range missiles, to land nuclear warheads on the great military establishments in Florida, Georgia, California, Connecticut, Washington, and elsewhere from closer points of vantage than she would have in Antarctica. Why would she wish to build bases down there? Maybe she would; I do not know. On the other hand, we acknowledge that even without them she could destroy our war potential in the States I have mentioned and in other States as well. Of course, we could retaliate; we could plaster Russia.

We could plaster Odessa and Leningrad and Moscow and Kiev and Vladivostok, and the other great centers of Russia. We could plaster them with atom bombs.

Is that the answer to our problem? Is ultimate destruction of a large part of the world's habitable surface the answer? Is the destruction of hundreds of millions of people the only solution that we can look to in order to cure us and other nations of deep suspicions? Is there not some other answer?

The world is in turmoil today. It is in turmoil in Africa and Asia and almost everywhere else. It is in turmoil largely as a result, among other factors, of the intense propaganda being carried on by the great nations of the world. There is tension everywhere today. What are we going to do about it?

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the Senator has raised a most important question: Is destruction necessary? Here is a place where a number of nations—12—on our initiative are trying to work out a mutually satisfactory agreement which will, in effect, demilitarize this sixth continent and create a situation by means of which good faith can once again be established.

We know that there are very few untroubled spots left in the world today. Here is an agreement we have started on our own initiative. Here is something which we have proposed. The Senate has been represented by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE].

I hope that we will follow the reasoning of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and will give full and due consideration to this proposal, which means so much, because it may well be a starting point toward an eventual peaceful solution of the difficulties which confront us today.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Montana. It is possible that if we approve the agreement, Russia may violate it, or some other country may violate it. But if Russia violates the treaty, she is violating a treaty made with 11 other countries of the world, not with the United States alone. That puts us in a decidedly stronger position.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Following up the significant point being made by the Senator from Vermont, is it not true that for a matter of many months the United States has been undertaking to hold in Geneva, Switzerland, with other nations, a disarmament conference?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that in Geneva, Switzerland, for many months, we have also been undertaking to hold, with other nations, a conference seeking to bring about an end to nuclear testing?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Based on inspection?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What does this treaty have in store? What does the treaty agree to? For the first time, the things which the United States of America has been advocating over the years are given consideration. The complete right of unilateral inspection insures the fulfillment of these objectives. In other words, we are getting disarmament through demilitarization and are getting the right to unilateral inspection in the sixth continent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the treaty provides for the very things we have been demanding from Russia. So far as I know, there has been unanimous agreement on these in the Senate. I have heard no objection to these demands.

The world is watching the U.S. Senate today. What we do here will have a profound effect not only upon our future but also upon the future of all the people of the world. This is our opportunity to lessen world tension. It is an opportunity which we have not had up to this time. If we reject the treaty, it will be charged that we want no peace in the world, not even in that area covered by 200 feet of ice; that we want to rule the world by force. Much of the world will believe that charge. It will be charged that we wish to maintain tension over the world at a high level for economic reasons. Much of the world will believe that charge too. Many of the people of the world will believe it.

Mr. President, we need a strong defense. I feel free to talk today because, to the best of my knowledge, I have never voted against a recommendation made by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RUSSELL] since he has been the chairman of that committee. Therefore, I feel free to talk. But I want the right to talk of peace. I want to think of peace and then talk about it once in a while and work for it.

We cannot carry hate and suspicion on our backs forever, unless we are to achieve the final end of total destruction.

The world today is waiting to hear from us. It is waiting to hear what the Senate will do. Let us show, through the ratification of the treaty, that we stand ready to join with others to secure the future of mankind. Let that new start toward peace begin right now.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke rather in detail, analyzing the treaty and its provisions, which clearly and concisely declare that there shall be no change of rights possessed by any signatory to the treaty, if and when it is finally adopted. I do not contemplate discussing that phase of the question now. I shall take up the subject of the nations which are interested.

Seven nations have asserted claims based upon discoveries. That is the method, under international law, where a discovery is built up into a claim upon which territorial sovereignty can eventually be based.

The United Kingdom is one of those nations. The United Kingdom made its claims in 1908. The Palmer Peninsula is claimed by the United Kingdom. The Palmer Peninsula is that area which is a short distance from the shores of South America. Nineteen hundred and eight antedates virtually all the discoveries which were made by our country.

Our country's discoveries primarily began in 1928 through the stalwart and valiant character of a brother of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. That same area which includes the Palmer Peninsula is claimed by Argentina, on the basis of activities in 1942. That same area, in part, is claimed by Chile.

I pose the question: If we are to start deciding these adverse claims, what would be the result? Great Britain, whose discoveries were in 1908; Argentina, whose discoveries were in 1942; and Chile, whose discoveries were in 1940; in full, or in some degree, laid claim to what is known as the Palmer Peninsula.

I now go to another area, this are being claimed by Norway. Norway entered the area in 1939.

The next area is the space claimed by Australia in 1933. The next is the space claimed by France, in 1924.

Finally, there is the space and area claimed by New Zealand, in 1923.

In spite of the eloquent and impressive argument made by the Senator from Georgia, I submit that these conflicting claims, unless there is a combined effort made to adjust them, can precipitate untold grief and devastation in the world.

It might be said that I have not mentioned the United States or the Soviet Union. There is not one syllable of evidence in the RECORD that the United States ever laid official claim to any part of the Antarctic.

The Soviet Union, through a man by the name of Thaddeus Von Bellingshausen, did some sailing along the coast of Antarctica in, I think, about 1820. Our country had in that early period a man named Palmer, who in a sailing vessel went down the coast and asserted the discovery.

In 1839, I believe, there was Lieutenant Wilkes who sighted a part of the land now claimed by Australia and named after him.

The United States became active in about 1928. We never asserted a claim to any part of Antarctica.

I point out that there is a difference in international law in considering what is the basis of a claim and what is an actual claim. We have the basis for a claim; and in the event it is deemed desirable to do so, we can convert it into an actual claim. But when we do, we shall run head on into conflict with the United Kingdom, Norway, France, New Zealand, Australia, Argentina, and Chile.

Mr. President, I listened very attentively to the argument which was made. Certainly we should consult with our South American friends and allies, and should evolve a plan which will be in the interest of both our allies and our own country.

On that score let me point out that in 1959 these seven nations, which have claims to Antarctica, met. These seven nations—the United Kingdom, Norway, France, New Zealand, Australia, Argentina, and Chile—are our allies. In consultation, these nations, after considering their mutual security, the minerals which might be extracted from Antarctica, the military advantages which might be had, and the possibility that at some time in the future the 2-mile ice shelf might be eliminated, and populations might be established there—after considering all those factors—declared that in the interest of peace and in the interest of their countries and in the interest of our country, this area should be declared an international neutralized zone.

What is the alternative? Either we shall make it an international neutralized zone devoted to scientific research and free from military bases and military equipment, on the one hand, or we shall begin to fight with the seven nations which have conflicting claims and we shall begin to be involved in arguments with the Soviet Union.

How is Antarctica to be divided?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield 2 more minutes to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the argument that we should consult with our allies is a sound one, and we have done so. We have met with them; and, following that consideration of the facts, the distilled judgment was that this area should be declared an international neutralized zone and should be devoted to scientific research.

In conclusion, let me say that all of us want peace and are working in the interest of peace. I constantly receive letters in which I am asked why our country is expanding its armaments and why our Government does not devote to peaceful purposes those great amounts of money. It is argued that by establishing a world court and international police we would eliminate the great cost and the travail and the sacrifice of lives which result from war. As pointed out by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], this huge area has not yet been occupied by mankind, and is not yet the subject of disputes because of ethnographic differences or economic interests. This is a pristine area capable of being dealt with by means of the treaty which now is before us.

Mr. President, I shall cast my vote in favor of ratification of the treaty. I shall do so without any doubt in my own mind. I shall do so on the basis of my ability to analyze the facts involved and to understand the propriety of ratification of the treaty by the Senate. I shall do so in the belief that my country will thus be served.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time remains under my control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventeen minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending treaty.

I do not wish to repeat the arguments which already have been made in this Chamber. Instead, I desire to identify myself with the most eloquent arguments which have been made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who have carried on this battle most manfully for all of us.

It is now my purpose to emphasize a cardinal point which I believe is important for all of us to understand; namely, that the personality of our country is here in question, because the treaty was negotiated upon the initiative of the United States. In this instance the United States is willing to take this chance because it believes it has enough character and enough skill and enough competence to understand that it is not being "taken"—and I use that word in its colloquial sense—in the case of this treaty.

This matter, Mr. President, is most important to the entire world. The rest of the world is worried because it believes the leadership strength of the United States has been weakened as a result of recent attitudes taken by our country. That situation is apparent to all of us who have traveled abroad and have engaged in international negotiations—as have I, through the kindness of our minority leader, in serving as Chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians.

In that connection I have had the privilege of working with representatives of the other NATO countries and, therefore, I understand something about what is troubling these other countries at this time over the attitude and the position of our country. It is the fear that we really do not know what we want, and that our suspicion about the Russians—which is entirely justified—is paralyzing our will and our judgment to such an extent that we cannot be relied upon to lead the world as we are entitled to do and as we should do. In short, the other nations are convinced that today we do not know what we want.

But, Mr. President, in this case we do know what we want. I say we want this treaty to go into effect, and I say we want that to happen because the treaty is no danger either to the United States or to the rest of the free world. So we want the treaty to go into effect. We believe the treaty should be ratified, instead of saying to the President of our country, who is responsible for the conduct of our foreign affairs, "You may know what our country wants, but we do not think we do."

Mr. President, it seems to me that nothing would harm us more in the eyes of the other nations of the world than if we were to say that to our President, in connection with this significant area. In regard to it, we say we know exactly what we want, because we are proceeding with our eyes open, and we think we have some brains, to; and we are willing to take this risk in dealing with the Russians.

Certainly, this is the first instance in which we can enter with the Russians into an international agreement which has such correlative obligations, one dependent upon the other. Under the treaty we will be able to do many things, also, that will do us a great deal of good.

Mr. President, the important point for us to bear in mind is that in this case the United States knows what it wants and is prepared to deal on a proper basis with the requirements of the present situation; it is not troubled by hobgoblins about its own alleged inadequacy or about not knowing what it wants or about not being able to protect itself.

Today we live under that shadow; but we shall dispel it by resoundingly ratifying this treaty.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for yielding this time to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to make two points in connection with the treaty, which I support.

First, I have repeatedly asked, What is the alternative if we do not ratify this treaty and put it in effect? It seems to me that the alternative is to leave open to the world, including the Soviet Union, the right to explore and to exploit in the Antarctic to their heart's content.

The value of this treaty is to freeze the position of the 12 parties in the Antarctic. To me that would be a great step forward for the United States.

My second point is this. We have talked for a long time, and very vociferously, about equal justice under law in this world. It is one of the great aims of the United States and of the free world to promote equal justice under law. I believe this treaty is a move in that direction, and an important move. We have shown a willingness to join with these other nations in a treaty, which is the supreme law of the land under the Constitution. We have shown good faith. We have shown we mean what we say about equal justice under law, and we have indicated we are willing to submit disputes under this treaty to the International Court of Justice; although I understand three of the participants have not been willing to go that far. Nevertheless, we have shown our good faith. I think if we fail to ratify the treaty, it will be an indication to the world that the Senate of the United States does not mean what it says so often on this floor—that we favor equal justice under law.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I sincerely believe that the Antarctica Treaty is a great contribution to peace. I am proud that the United States was the initiator of this treaty, and I am confident that the Senate will support this initiative.

The Soviet Union has established its presence in Antarctica, and the only way to remove it would be by the use of force, an action which no Senator would approve. Although this treaty does not remove the Soviet presence from the Antarctica, it does insure that this presence will not be used by the Kremlin for purposes hostile to the interests of the United States. The signatories of the treaty agree to prevent the use of Antarctica for military purposes by prohibiting fortifications, military bases, and weapons, from the continent. We have no reason to trust the word of the Soviet Union now any more than in the past. But this treaty gives us the right to enforce the Soviet promises by sending inspection observers anywhere in Antarctica at any time. I am sure that all of us believe that if this inspection right of the Antarctica Treaty were extended to the Soviet Union, Red China, and the rest of the Communist world, the chance of war would be greatly diminished. Such a situation, however, is unlikely in the near future. But there is ample reason to believe that if we ratify this treaty, a precedent will be made which will serve as a useful model for future agreements on outer space.

There have been some fears that the United States by this treaty will give away the part of Antarctica which is its due by right of exploration. Nothing could be further from the truth. The signatories agreed that nothing in the treaty shall be interpreted as either a renunciation or recognition of claims or bases of claims to territorial sovereignty. The whole tangled claims question is therefore set aside. I am confident that the Senate will not resurrect this problem by postponing or denying ratification of the Antarctica Treaty. I am confident that by approving this treaty the Senate will show the world that regardless of the warm or cold winds blowing from Moscow this country knows its true interest demands that it always take all steps conducive to peace.

I would also at this time like to invite the attention of my colleagues to an excellent statement in support of the Antarctica Treaty by Dr. Charles M. Herzfeld, president of the Catholic Association for International Peace. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT ON THE ANTARCTIC TREATY BY DR. CHARLES M. HERZFELD, PRESIDENT, CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

The Antarctic Treaty now before the U.S. Senate for ratification offers an opportunity to extend the rule of international law to new areas of the world. It prohibits the use of the Antarctic for military activities of any kind, and bans nuclear explosions there. To enforce these bans, all signatories agree to unlimited inspection of all activities in the area, by any signatory nation, without any veto power. Any disputes not resolved by the signatories can be brought before the International Court of Justice. Finally, the treaty preserves the status quo with respect to territorial rights in the area.

Critics of the treaty oppose it principally on the grounds that the treaty is said to invite the Soviet Union into the Antarctic, and is said to jeopardize U.S. territorial rights there. This "invitation" of the Soviets is supposed to lead to the establishment of Soviet bases there, posing a grave threat to the free world, and is supposed to hand over important sources of raw materials to the Soviets.

These criticisms seem, on the whole, unwarranted. The Soviet Union is in fact present now in the Antarctic, and could be dislodged only by major military action. The treaty recognizes this presence, and attempts to regulate it. The United States has never made a territorial claim in the area, but has reserved the right to do so. The treaty would prevent the United States from making new territorial claims, but would also prevent the Soviet Union from making any claims.

Arguments based on fear of Soviet bases in the Antarctic are unfounded. The Soviet Union now has bases in existence in many parts of the globe which pose much greater threats to the free world than would fancied bases in the Antarctic. Fears of Soviet economic exploitation fail to take into account the enormous logistical difficulties which would be involved, as well as the fact that the United States does not give up its own rights to any possible future economic development there.

Finally, critics oppose the prohibition of all nuclear explosions in the area. Yet this prohibition is coupled with the right of all treaty powers to free and unlimited inspection of all parts of the area, including ships and airplanes. In this respect the treaty would be a unique international experiment in full nuclear disarmament in a selected part of the world.

The President of the United States stated, at the time of the signing of the treaty: "The Antarctic Treaty and the guarantees it embodies constitute a significant advance toward the goal of a peaceful world with justice." In these times of crisis, ratification of the treaty would be in the larger national interest and would extend the rule of international law.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield the remaining time to myself. There is not a great deal left to be said——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot let this opportunity go by, in connection with the treaty, without saying that the Senator from Arkansas has given very intelligent, zealous, and statesmanlike leadership to the piloting of this treaty in committee and on the floor. I simply want to congratulate the Senator because of his understanding.

I also wish to congratulate other members of the Foreign Relations Committee. As the Senator from Vermont said at the outset today, some of them had serious questions about this treaty, but as they got into it and studied it, they became convinced it is the only thing we can do and it is the thing we must do in the interest of international relations and our own best interests.

We ourselves are giving up nothing. We are permitting no one else to acquire anything beyond that which they have at the moment. It is the first great milestone of this particular type in international conduct I know of.

I again congratulate the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Iowa very much for his kind words. I may say, with all sincerity, that without his help I am certain we would not have been able to bring it to this point. I hope the treaty will be approved. If it is, I know much of the credit for it will be due to the efforts of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. President, this is a complicated treaty. It is a unique treaty. It has in it features which we have been attempting to obtain in other areas of the world, and have failed. I think for that reason alone it is worthwhile, although that is not the only reason at all.

There are two or three items I should mention, although I believe the debate has developed all of the significant ones. There is one aspect of this question with regard to our allies in Latin America. We are very much concerned about Latin America at the moment. The administration has proposed a large if amorphous, new program in that area. We have already done a great deal to assist our allies and our friends in Latin America.

Both Chile and Argentina are involved in this question. Both have substantial claims in Antarctica. They were reluctant in the first instance to agree to this treaty, and if we should renege on it now—if we should reject it—I think it would prove to be very embarrassing to them.

The same could be said, of course, of Australia and New Zealand. We are not as much concerned about them at the moment, simply because they do not need assistance, and they are not so much embroiled in international tensions.

It seems to me there is another important aspect of this question. If we reject this treaty, I think the Russians, who have been spoken of so much here today, would be justified in saying, "Well, the only reason the United States objects is that they intend to build bases there. They intend to make some military use of it." That would be a natural suspicion. If they did entertain that suspicion, and if we rejected the treaty, there is nothing under existing conditions, to prevent their attempting to build bases. They have scientific stations there. They came there really at the invitation of the international community of scientists to take part in the International Geophysical Year. I think rejection of the treaty would be tantamount in their eyes telling them that we intend to build bases there.

Finally, what bothered me very much about the opening remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia was that, in saying he thought we should judge these matters as to their effect upon the welfare of this country, he left the implication that the committee and myself and others had not been concerned about the welfare of this country. I think it is very clear that those who proposed the treaty and negotiated it—including the members of the Defense Department, not forgetting Captain Davis, who actually participated—were just as much interested in the welfare of this country as anybody was.

To leave the implication that those who are proposing this treaty are only offhandedly interested in the welfare of our country is, I think, quite unfair and unjustified. There is plenty of room for an honest difference of opinion, of course, as to whether or not the treaty is in the national interest. I have no doubt at all it is in the national interest. We are, in effect, preserving the right to exercise control by inspection and by restrictions upon other nations throughout the whole of Antarctica, a very large area. On the other hand, if we reject the treaty and go the alternative route of trying to establish individual sovereign rights over a small part of Antarctica, we almost automatically give up any rights over the rest of it.

It is generally stated in the testimony that there is some 20 percent of the continent, in the area called Marie Byrd Land, which has not yet been claimed. So it is probable that we would lose our interest in the rest of it, our right to travel about and to utilize it for scientific purposes.

The real value, clearly, is the right to make scientific investigations, to obtain weather data and so on, which are of value to all nations, whether they are members of the particular group of 12 signatories or not. I think we are preserving the real value. As Dr. Gould said, he would not give a nickel for all the mineral resources yet discovered; he felt the valuable export was scientific information.

It seems to me we have now an opportunity to make an agreement which is a step forward. It may not work out. We cannot guarantee it will. The agreement may be violated. We will be no worse off if the agreement is violated than we are today. If it is violated in any substantial manner, every member would be released from his obligations. I do not believe the agreement will be violated. I think it is worthwhile that we take the chance.

I think the only real justification for opposing ratification of the treaty can be based upon the assumption that it is impossible ever to make an agreement in this field with the Communists. I will agree with the Senator from Georgia and with other Senators who have stated that the Russians have not had a good record at all. Of course, they have not. I have not yet reached the conclusion that it is impossible to reach an agreement and that war is inevitable. It seems to me the wise policy is to continue to try.

There is a vast difference between making an agreement over this unpopulated land and testing out the good faith of the Russians, and trying to make one in regard to the home lands of our respective countries. I have often found that in instances connected with the United Nations, and in other cases, we evidence a great reluctance to abolish the veto, or to give up rights we expect other people to relinquish. In any case, it is a very complicated matter to give this kind of right to a fully developed country.

It is not that I am not in favor of such a thing, and I wish we were able to do so in other areas. This is a starting place. It would be a great tragedy to relinquish it and to reject it at this late date.

I think it would expose us justifiably to the charge that we are hypocrites, that we do not mean what we say, that we are unwilling to make an agreement for the inspection and the control of armaments even in an area covered with a great icecap approximately a mile thick. I think it would be a great tragedy to reject the treaty.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations if it is not true, as the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] stated, that the control and the conduct of our foreign policy lies in the hands of the executive branch of the Government, to wit, in the hands of the President of the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Who was responsible for undertaking the negotiations in an endeavor to bring about the agreement now before the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Our Government was. Our Executive was.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have any countries as yet ratified the agreement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Five countries have ratified it. Four of them have already deposited their instruments of ratification.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And the other countries are waiting for us to ratify it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly believe they think that without our ratification it will not be an effective treaty. I think that is extremely important. I was a little surprised that five countries have already ratified.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to point out that the United Kingdom ratified the treaty, and its claims antedate, precede, and are superior to ours.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will say, in conclusion, if I may, that the Senate was represented at the hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Without objection, the treaty will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to the point of consideration of the resolution of ratification.

The resolution of ratification of Executive B (86th Cong., 2d sess.), the Antarctic Treaty, signed at Washington on December 1, 1959, will now be read.

The resolution of ratification of Executive B was read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive B, 86th Congress, 2d session, the Antarctic Treaty, signed at Washington on December 1, 1959, by the Plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and eleven other countries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification of the treaty? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURDICK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] also if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. MORSE (when his name was called). On this vote I am associated with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] in a pair with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If the Senator from Alaska were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MOSS (when his name was called). As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] announced, we have a pair with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If the Senator from Alaska were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is absent because of a death in the family.

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 66, nays 21, as follows:

[Ex. 3]

YEAS—66

Aiken	Bennett	Cannon
Allott	Bible	Capehart
Bartlett	Bush	Carlson
Beall	Byrd, W. Va.	Carroll
Case, N.J.	Humphrey	Murray
Chavez	Jackson	Muskie
Church	Javits	O'Mahoney
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Cooper	Keating	Prouty
Cotton	Kennedy	Proxmire
Dirksen	Kuchel	Randolph
Douglas	Lausche	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Long, Hawaii	Schoeppel
Fong	Lusk	Scott
Fulbright	McCarthy	Smith
Gore	McGee	Symington
Green	McNamara	Wiley
Hart	Magnuson	Williams, Del.
Hartke	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Hayden	Monroney	Yarborough
Hickenlooper	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Hruska	Mundt	Young, Ohio

NAYS—21

Anderson	Ellender	Long, La.
Bridges	Engle	McClellan
Butler	Ervin	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Frear	Russell
Curtis	Goldwater	Stennis
Dodd	Holland	Talmadge
Eastland	Kerr	Thurmond

NOT VOTING—13

Burdick	Johnston, S.C.	Moss
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Smathers
Gruening	Kefauver	Sparkman
Hennings	Martin	
Hill	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

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

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS ADMINISTERED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in a moment I shall yield the floor, so that the minority leader may pay a justified tribute; but first I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 1839, H.R. 12326.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

EIGHTY-FIRST BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF CHARLES L. WATKINS, SENATE PARLIAMENTARIAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that this is the birthday anniversary of one of our most devoted, most competent, and most beloved public servants, Charles L. Watkins, our distinguished Parliamentarian. This is his 81st birthday anniversary. He has served us long and well. I know that all of us wish him happy returns of the day. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished majority leader in his tribute and his salute to the beloved Parliamentarian of this great body. May he long flourish, may his days be many, may his advice to the Chair always be right, and may we never find occasion to take exception to it. We wish him well.

EIGHTY-SIXTH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is the birthday anniversary of a great American, Herbert Hoover, the 31st President of the United States. Today he is 86 years of age. Sometimes, as I contemplate Churchill, Adenauer, Herbert Hoover, and others, I think there is something providential about the fact that they are somehow so richly energized over a long period of years, and that it is during the second mile when men often consummate their greatest work.

In the Book it is written, "If a man compel thee to go with him a mile, go with him twain." We often forget that little word "compel." That is the compulsive mile that is expected of us. The second mile is the voluntary mile.

Of all the people I can think of who have traveled the second, voluntary mile, no one has done a greater job than Herbert Hoover. He met the severe changes of his generation, and probably they were greater than those of any time in two generations. But it was thereafter that he rose to even greater heights, because of the work he did in the relief field, and also in the field of helping to reorganize the Government over which he once presided.

I had occasion to encounter the work done by Herbert Hoover among the children of Europe. I visited a good many schools, and nothing delighted me so much as to hear these children sing and utter their praises in tremulous voices, that here was an efficient man who so thoroughly coordinated and organized the food relief and facilities for distressed and impoverished people, particularly the youngsters of Europe.

That is one of the great things Herbert Hoover did.

Then, of course, he set about the business of organizing the Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, with the skill and efficiency he always exhibited, because behind his outstanding excellence were the engineering talents he possesses.

First, to examine the authority which Congress gave him; second, to develop the staff necessary to develop the preliminary plans; then to recruit, from all sections of the country, unpaid voluntary experts to serve on the many task forces in almost every field of governmental endeavor; and then to set them to work. I doubt whether in any time or generation so much voluntary, uncompensated talent from all corners of the country has ever been assembled in the Capital City for the purpose of devoting themselves to the various tasks which have been assigned. Much of it has been engrossed into law. Much of it has been accounted for by Executive order. Much still remains to be done. But here was a great brain; here was a great heart having an abiding interest in the well-being of this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I could not pay a tribute so eloquent as the distinguished minority leader has paid to this great American, but I can associate myself with the statement he has just made about this great man, who has a great heart and a great mind; who has served all of America so unselfishly through so many years; and who stands ready at any time, even now, to go wherever he believes he can be of service to this country.

I take pride in calling him my friend. I have had the benefit of his counsel. I have profited from it, as has our country.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for the very eloquent tribute he has paid to this most distinguished American.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would conclude these observations by thinking about the address which Herbert Hoover made to the Republican Convention in Chicago. It was not a partisan speech. He was showered with enconiums and congratulations from Republicans and Democrats alike. So when he held a press conference yesterday in New York, he said this:

> I made that speech because I hoped to awaken more pride in our country and an enlightened nationalism as a regenerative force from national apathy and moral slump.

Those have been the great guiding forces in the life of Herbert Hoover, now 86 years of age, who sits, with sharpened pencils, trying to complete within his life span what he calls the American epic, which is planned to run to 1,600,000 words. All of it is being done in longhand, by pencil. Then, from those notes, he plans to keep eight secretaries busy, so that he might round out, for other generations, some of the revealing things which happened in his long, constructive, and fruitful lifetime.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding to me.

I should like to add my voice to those of the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished majority leader in speaking words of praise and affection about former President Herbert Hoover.

In 1926, my State of Florida suffered a terrible flood catastrophe which resulted in the drowning of some 300 persons. In 1928, in another similar disaster, 2,200 persons lost their lives. The disasters occurred at different portions of the perimeter of Lake Okeechobee.

President Hoover was exceedingly sympathetic of our plight. He helped in every way within his power to secure early action by the Engineers and the prompt appropriation of funds by Congress—and, of course, we were indebted to Congress, likewise—for the construction of the great levees around certain portions of the lake, which in times of equal danger and emergency since the date of those tragic events have been sufficient to prevent any loss of life.

Last year, the Governor of our State; the members of the State cabinet, who comprise a board handling such problems for our State; and the counties and cities affected, through the governing units joined a great host of our citizens in a petition to the Florida Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, asking that we secure, if possible, early action by Congress to name the levee for that great and distinguished American, former President Hoover.

I am glad to say that although there is a rule, generally honored, which prevents the naming of such structures for persons while they still live, the Committee on Public Works, so ably headed by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and its subcommitee, so well handled by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], with all members of the full committee concurring, joined in placing that recommendation of ours in the recently passed omnibus public works bill. Thus, by the recent passage of that bill, which has now been approved by the President, those great and merciful works, which so effectively carried out in our own country works of mercy, have been given the name of Herbert Hoover.

We are proud of that fact. We expect to dedicate those levees to his name this fall. We understand that President Hoover will honor us with his presence.

I want to make it clear that on an occasion of this kind the Senate, the Congress, and the people have no political considerations. We all join in paying deserved honor and tribute to a very great humanitarian and a very great American on his birthday. I am glad to add my voice to the words of praise so eloquently uttered by both leaders of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I desire to add just a word to the very eloquent remarks of the distinguished minority leader regarding former President Herbert Hoover.

As one who knew him and had the opportunity to talk with him while he was President, and as one who knew him in after years and had the opportunity of having several long discussions with him on matters of government, economics, and social welfare, I have always had the greatest respect and regard for Herbert Hoover.

The speech which he made at the Republican Convention in July, to which the minority leader has referred, was one to which we could all, no matter to which party we belong, pay close attention and from which we could get benefit. It was on the high moral plane, which we all want to attain, and on which we want to build the citizenship of our great country.

I join with the minority leader and other Senators in congratulating former President Hoover on his 86th birthday. I hope he will have many more birthdays to come.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while Herbert Hoover was born in West Branch, Iowa, I think the land of sunshine, California, has always claimed him. So I yield with great delight to my beloved associate, the distinguished junior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

The splendid and deserving words of congratulation to a great American, uttered by the distinguished Republican leader of the Senate [Mr DIRKSEN], and echoed with equal eloquence by the distinguished Democratic leader of the Senate, on the birthday of a distinguished American, reflect the high and warm regard of the people of our country for Herbert Clark Hoover.

Iowa born, he grew to manhood in the State from which I come. A graduate of Stanford University, he began early in life to build a reputation as a great engineer and to seek opportunities to be of help to mankind. Surely one of the stirring chapters of his life occurred in the dark days toward and following the end of World War II, when his governmental responsibilities, in a very real sense, were those of administering relief and of directing assistance to the distraught peoples of a war-ravaged continent.

Cabinet officer, successful builder and engineer, distinguished writer and speaker, beloved husband and father, and President of the United States, as Mr. Hoover has continued a great journey in this life he has become, with the passing of the years, more enriched by the high and growing esteem of his fellow Americans—indeed, of mankind.

There remains in his State of California one of his distinguished sons, who himself gave unselfishly to the people of our country during the present administration of President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON, serving with honor, integrity, and high purpose in the Cabinet. We share with the Hoover family a warmth of respect on this natal anniversary.

I desire to associate myself with the remarks of our two leaders and the remarks of the other Senators who have spoken in wishing for former President Hoover many, many happy and healthful returns of the day.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished minority whip, the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I desire to join the leadership and my other colleagues in extending felicitations and congratulations to former President Herbert Hoover.

Everyone knows that for a great many years Herbert Hoover was a favorite target of the Democrats. He was blamed for many things for which he was not responsible. He is now looked upon as a revered elder statesman; and we are delighted that he is continuing to make so many fine contributions to the welfare of his country and that he is remaining so active during the declining years of his life.

Mr. President, the history of Herbert Hoover extends from the campus of Stanford University, through the Boxer Rebellion, in China, in the early years of this century, into Manchuria, into other parts of the world, and finally back to this country, where in time he became Secretary of Commerce and, eventually, President of the United States.

In the light of history, I believe he was a great President; and I think future historians will bear out that statement.

We hope his third official farewell visit to the Republican National Convention will be but the beginning of a series of other farewell visits to the Republican National Conventions, and perhaps at some time in the future to the Democratic National Conventions. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, it was my great, good fortune to be privileged to make use of the outstanding talents and wonderful mind of Herbert Hoover in a situation in which he is probably the greatest expert in the world. After my designation as Secretary of Agriculture, it became evident that the food needs of the world were of pressing importance. Mr. Hoover was kind enough to come from New York to Washington to have luncheon with me and to outline to me the probable developments if we tried to establish a food program in the period of emergency following the war. He outlined what the various countries would request and the circumstances and what might be done. I made notes in connection with what he said. I find it most interesting that in the course of the next 3 years, almost everything he predicted at that time did happen in the fashion he outlined.

Subsequently when famines reached great proportions, it became obvious that extreme measures would be necessary. I discussed the matter with Eugene Meyer, the then publisher of the Washington Post. Although Mr. Meyer had had many personal arguments with Mr. Hoover, Mr. Meyer suggested that I request Mr. Hoover's assistance.

At that time Mr. Hoover was engaged in his favorite pastime of fishing; he was fishing along the Atlantic Coast, near Miami. It was impossible to reach him during the day; he could be reached only in the evening, after the boat on which he had been fishing had returned to shore, and after he was at the fishing lodge. I succeeded in reaching him at that time on the telephone. I told him that conditions in the Far East were extremely bad, that I needed his advice and his help, and that I would greatly appreciate it if he would come to Washington briefly. He did so, and discussed the possibility of the formation of an emergency committee of some nature.

I discussed the matter with the then President, Mr. Truman. Although I have read many statements in regard to how Mr. Hoover happened to return to public life, I recall with a great deal of interest his willingness to serve in any sort of capacity.

A meeting with a number of other interested citizens was arranged at the White House, and at that time there was formed the Famine Emergency Committee, of which Mr. Hoover became the chairman. He accepted a small office in the Department of Agriculture. He never requested special treatment as a past President. He served quietly day after day, and helped us enormously in the handling of the food problem.

Subsequently, he decided that in connection with that problem a trip around the world should be made. I asked him to undertake that trip. He did so, and took with him representatives of the Department of Agriculture and of various other groups, and used a plane which was provided by the military services. He flew to almost all parts of the world, and located new and additional food supplies. He made his recommendations not only to the United States, but also to the then existing International Food Board.

I shall never forget the way he made his first recommendations. We were flying to Chicago, for a report which he was to make to the Nation, over the radio. He was seated on one side of the State Department plane. A small table was beside him, and I noticed that he was drawing some pictures. From where I sat, I was unable to determine exactly what the pictures were. But when he had finished, he had drawn three flags. One was the flag of the United States; one was the flag of Great Britain; and one was sort of a neutral flag of the Red Cross. He asked me if I would sit with him, and of course I did so. He pointed to the flags, and said those were the areas of responsibility. He said to me, "Where we have the American flag is your responsibility; you have the responsibility of seeing that food reaches everyone under that flag, and also that food reaches the people in Japan and Austria and Germany where our flag now flies and who must be fed."

Then he pointed to the British flag, and said, "This is the area of British responsibility." He used some interesting terms in referring to the British, because he did not always approve what they did. But he said, "This is what you will have to get the British to do."

Then he said, "In this area over here, you can leave a little to the French, and the rest to the Red Cross. But these are the three flag areas that must be cared for."

I found out then that Herbert Hoover had the most orderly mind I had ever encountered. He had outstanding ability to analyze problems and to arrange for their solution.

I have written to him many times to express my sincere appreciation of his great devotion to duty and his kindness to me; and on this occasion I am happy to pay tribute again to the very fine qualities of this great American.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me conclude my salute to this outstanding American, Herbert Hoover, by saying that I think two overriding impulses always carried him on. One was his devotion to mankind.

I recall a couplet from a poem by the Irish novelist, Donn-Byrne:

> Every man's death diminishes me, because I am of mankind.

If ever anyone has exemplified that, it is Herbert Hoover.

The second great imperative was his magnificent, unending, unremitting devotion to liberty and to individual freedom, because he thought that was the priceless boon, God given, the greatest thing that could happen to a man or a nation.

And so when I hear the strains of that march which was written for the Presidency, and when they say, "Hail to the Chief," on this, his 86th birthday, I think the American people can well constructively and symbolically arise as they contemplate this fruitful existence of his and say, "Hail to the Chief."

TABLING OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, because circumstances beyond my control made it impossible for me to be present yesterday when the vote on the motion to table the civil rights bill introduced by the distinguished minority leader was being considered, I should like to comment briefly on the action taken by the Senate on that occasion.

Mr. President, in the days before mechanization largely displaced draft animals on the farms, there was an old saying that was familiar to many Vermont farmers.

It went like this: "You can't judge a mule by the loudness of its bray." That old saying may be apropos of the action yesterday of most of the members of the present majority party in supporting a motion to table the proferred civil rights bill.

I am not surprised at the position taken by the four Members of the present majority who voted against tabling, since their votes were consistent with long-held positions. However, along with millions of other Americans, I am amazed and shocked beyond belief at the failure of two particular majority party Senators to grab their first opportunity to support civil rights legislation since the TV spectacular at Los Angeles which produced the high-sounding, low-standing, running platform of their party.

While I recognize that many at the Los Angeles convention—and this is particularly true of those who were candidates for office—were largely preoccupied with personal matters, it seems in-

credible that apparently they have not even read the platform on which they seek to run, let alone stand. Repeatedly, during and since that historic convention, the winning candidates have emphatically and solemnly, and even pugnaciously, embraced their party's platform, in its naked entirety, to their public bosoms and have sworn eternal allegiance and loyalty, if not voluntary love, to each and every one of its separate planks.

Forced love, said the poet, is a frail flower, and he must be right because here, so soon after the touching sentiments, shouted so affirmatively into the microphones and before the cameras, the great lovers have turned their backs on the object of their alleged affections.

Since they may not have had the time to read their own platform, or may have forgotten what they said, I feel I should remind them of their own words: "The time has come," they said, "to assure equal access for all Americans to all areas of community life, including voting booths, schoolrooms, jobs, housing, and public facilities."

"It is the duty of the Congress," they said, "to enact the laws necessary and proper to protect and promote these constitutional rights." That is what they said at Los Angeles in their party platform.

And yesterday, in Washington, they voted to table a civil rights bill.

The idea—or excuse—voiced by some that there is not enough time to pass legislation of this character in approximately 4 weeks is pure and undiluted nonsense.

In the Senate the Democrats have almost a 2 to 1 temporary majority. In the House of Representatives their temporary majority is not quite as large, but it is large enough for them to keep their pledges if they have a sincere desire to do so.

In addition, their party controls the leadership of both Houses and of all the committees and if they cannot make the leadership of the appropriate committees behave, they have the power to discharge those committees and take action on the floors of the respective Houses.

So it is obvious that the argument that there is not enough time is indeed a specious one and is set forth only because there is no desire to implement the platform of their party by passing civil rights legislation.

The indecent haste with which yesterday's civil rights bill was tabled by the majority party makes the insincerity of their noble speeches all too evident. I am informed by the Parliamentarian, who has a long and distinguished record of service in the Senate, that he cannot recall another single instance when a bill was tabled without a second reading. Why, Mr. President, were they in such a hurry that they could not even follow the usual procedure? What were they afraid of?

Every true advocate and lover of civil rights in this country will know the answer and will not fail to realize that there is no hope for meaningful civil rights legislation under the Democrats. Their only true hope lies with the party of Abraham Lincoln.

I may point out that I advised the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] that I would make some reference to them, by implication at least, during my remarks, and invited them to be present if they wished to be. I did hope they would answer specifically and categorically some of the questions which I think the American people have a right to know relative to civil rights.

STANDING SUBCOMMITTEE TO CONSIDER PROBLEMS OF DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I should like now to go to another subject, but one which is directly related to the question of civil rights.

Mr. President, at the next full committee meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I shall again offer a motion to establish within the committee a standing subcommittee to consider the problems of discrimination in employment whether due to age, sex, physical handicap, race, color, religion, or national origin.

On February 5, 1959, I made the same motion before the same committee. Unfortunately, the motion was tabled, and in effect rejected, by the vote of the Democratic-controlled majority of the committee.

Incidentally, may I point out that on that occasion not a single Republican member voted to table the motion.

VOTES ON THE RECORD

I serve notice on my colleagues here and now that when I renew my motion to set up an antidiscrimination subcommittee I shall couple with it the request that the executive session vote which took place on February 5, 1959, as well as the vote on the new motion, be made a matter of public record.

I intend to take my motion out of the deep freeze in which it was placed by the Democratic majority because the warmth of the television klieg lights at Los Angeles seems to have thawed their coolness toward human rights. I am pleased that the language of the Democratic platform now confirms my long-held conviction that the subject is of such overriding significance to the welfare of the Nation that this matter should not be allowed to rest in limbo any longer, but should receive immediate consideration.

Despite the fact that Republicans on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee failed last year in their effort to start the ball rolling to end discrimination in employment, there would now appear to be an excellent chance of success, provided the Democratic standard bearer can evidence those qualities of leadership which the public has the right to expect of a presidential candidate.

Discrimination in employment is a single and separate subject and should be dealt with by a single and separate subcommittee which has the specialized task of dealing with all forms of discrimination in employment.

There was such a subcommittee in the 79th, and 81st, and the 83d Congresses. There should be such a subcommittee in the 86th Congress, and the 87th Congress as well, because, unfortunately, the problem is still with us. Six bills dealing with this problem were introduced in the Senate during the last Congress, on which no hearings were held. Several bills related to the same subject have been introduced in this Congress.

The seriousness of the matter should warrant that these, and such other related bills as may be forthcoming, receive careful and comprehensive study and consideration by a subcommittee especially created for this purpose. Part-time and piecemeal consideration by several subcommittees already busily concentrating on other subjects is not good enough.

EVIDENCE OF DISCRIMINATION

Accurate figures on the number of individuals who are victims of discrimination in employment are not easy to come by. Many times the individual himself may not know why he has been denied employment, job training, advancement, or otherwise discriminated against. Some companies, some labor unions, and some employment agencies carry on practices which tend to limit or to deny employment opportunities, or which adversely affect working conditions, including wages and hours, to entire groups when the nature of the job does not require any such distinction.

Nevertheless, there are facts and figures from which reasonable men can draw only one conclusion; unfair and un-American discrimination in employment to whole groups of our citizens.

I shall not take the time to present all the evidence available. I shall only offer enough facts and figures to indicate the extent of these practices and the need for a particular subcommittee to deal with the problem in a unified manner.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

While some barriers against employment of women in certain jobs have been breaking down, there is plenty of evidence of discrimination against them not only in hiring but also in rate of pay.

Too many of the 21 million women in the labor force are today doing work comparable with that of men and requiring comparable skill, at wage rates lower than those paid to men by the same employer in the same plant or business. The employer is simply exploiting and discriminating against half the population on the basis of sex.

Many women workers are widows or divorcees who need to work to support not only themselves but also minor children. It has been shown that a large majority of women in business and industry are financially responsible for the support of dependents. A former Secretary of Labor has estimated that 92 percent of employed women who live with their families contribute regularly toward family support and that more than one-half of them turn over between 50 and 100 percent of their earnings to the family group.

It is obvious that a woman does not need to earn less simply because she is a

woman. Yet discriminatory wage practices on the basis of sex are widespread.

The existence of lower wage rates for women than for men in the same or comparable jobs penalizes those employers who voluntarily apply the equal-pay principle and represents a threat to the wage scale of men as well as of women. During times of economic recession there is always the temptation to cut wages by firing the higher paid workers, or forcing them to accept a lower scale. Over a period of time this tends to lower the levels of earnings of all workers with the result that purchasing power is reduced and standards of living decline.

The economy of our country cannot afford such discriminatory practices. In today's economic competition with the Soviet Union there is no room for sex bias. The Communist countries encourage their women to enter the labor force at all levels by fixing the same standards and wage scales regardless of sex. The result is increasing national productivity.

For two consecutive Congresses the administration has urged the House and Senate to enact legislation providing that women be given equal pay when they perform the same work as men. The Democratic majority of the Congress has taken no action on the President's proposals but they did endorse the substance of them in their election-year platform in Los Angeles.

JOB DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RACE AND COLOR

That discrimination in employment on the basis of race and color is prevalent throughout the country is so obvious it needs no amplification. One has only to look around him. I will give only one Labor Department statistic. Last year twice as large a percentage of the 7 million nonwhite workers as of the 60 million white workers were jobless; 14 percent against 7 percent. That speaks for itself, and it is unnecessary to burden the point to prove it.

That this dicrimination is not due entirely to employer prejudice is the position of a recent NAACP report. This charges that a pattern of racial discrimination exists in many unions in both north and south despite union efforts to ban it. In many communities and industries union membership is important, if not necessary, in obtaining employment. Discrimination by unions is no more palatable than discrimination by management.

I shall not attempt to cite statistics on discrimination in employment against the physically handicapped, or against persons of particular religions and national origins. The very fact that figures are difficult to obtain is evidence that the subject needs objective study and investigation.

THE PRICE OF DISCRIMINATION

Discrimination in employment, for whatever reason, is bad for the country as a whole.

It is contrary to our traditional principles of democracy and private initiative because the individual is denied the opportunity to utilize his full capabilities and is deprived of his right to be judged as an individual rather than as a member of a group.

It weakens our influence abroad because our friends as well as our enemies tend to judge us by our practice as well as our protestations of democracy.

It weakens our economy because it imposes artificial limitations on the size of our manpower pool; it deprives our industry of important resources in skill and experience; it increases the number of our citizens requiring public assistance, and it lowers our standard of living.

In the words of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON: "The United States cannot afford the moral, economic, and international cost of prejudice in its labor force."

The foregoing are some of the reasons why I believe that discrimination in employment is sufficiently important to the Nation to warrant the establishment of a special standing subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me?

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to express my commendation to the Senator from Vermont for the suggestion he has made. I feel certain that such a subcommittee would serve a useful purpose, and the initiative which the Senator from Vermont has shown in this matter should be praised, in my judgment, by all of us who are very much interested in the problem of keeping our economic life free from discriminatory practices. I am hopeful the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont will bear fruit with the full committee, and that such a subcommittee will be established.

Mr. PROUTY. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from New York. I assure him that I—and I am sure this is true of my colleagues on this side of the aisle—shall do my utmost to bring that about. I think it is significant that the platforms adopted by both major parties deal effectively with the question of civil rights. Now it is our responsibility to implement the platforms. I hope the candidates on both sides are going to speak out categorically, so that the American people will know definitely where they stand.

I am sorry the distinguished majority leader is not present. I wanted to ask the majority leader, for example, if, in the event of his reelection to the Senate, and in the event of his reelection as Democratic leader, he would strive to carry out the platform of the Democratic Party—if he would do his utmost to implement the Democratic platform in the next Congress. I am sorry he is not present so he can answer some of these questions. The Democratic platform, I believe, calls for the establishment of a Fair Employment Practices Commission. I should like to have the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] come out clearly and state their positions on that question, as well as their positions in many other fields.

Mr. KEATING. If the Senator will yield further to me, they stated their positions in their votes yesterday. Will the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. PROUTY. Certainly their statements should be so construed. As I suggested earlier, I was positively amazed at the action taken by the two distinguished colleagues to whom the Senator refers and many other friends on the other side of the aisle. I was more proud than ever to be a Republican following that vote yesterday on the question of tabling the civil rights bill.

Mr. KEATING. If the Senator will yield further, I know he shares my view that this problem should be as much bipartisan or unpartisan as possible since it deals with human rights. "Human rights" is a phrase that I often prefer to the phrase "civil rights." I wish to join him in his commendation of the four Members of the opposite party who voted in accordance with the convictions which they have on so many occasions evidenced by previous votes here.

Mr. PROUTY. Yes. I paid my tribute to the same Senators during the course of my remarks. I thank the Senator very much. I yield back the remainder of the time.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to say just a few words about the public works appropriation bill for the next fiscal year which is before the Senate. In my judgment it contains funds sufficient to carry out an orderly program of flood control planning and construction and navigational improvements throughout our country.

I wish particularly to express my gratitude to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and to the other members of the committee on both sides for the very fine manner in which they received the representations made by the Senators from New York with regard to projects in their State and for the sympathetic consideration and the understanding which they showed for the very great needs in various sections of New York State.

I do feel compelled by conscience, however, to refer again to the inclusion of certain funds in this bill; namely, funds for the oft proposed, oft ignored Allegheny River Reservoir, commonly referred to as the Kinzua Dam. I have no illusion that my protest will effect a reversal in the appropriation of these funds, but, I cannot in good conscience ignore what I know to be a great injustice.

The Allegheny Reservoir is a proposed project for the upper Allegheny River between Warren, Pa., and Salamanca, N.Y., and is designed to provide flood

control and low water regulation for industrial and domestic water supply and for pollution abatement for the Allegheny and Ohio River Valleys. It will also make available a lake for summer recreation.

There is no question about the need for a flood control program in the Allegheny River Basin. It is essential. However, the best method of accomplishing this objective has been and continues to be the subject of great controversy and bitter disagreement. In essence, the debate revolves around the question of whether the Kinzua site or the alternative Conewango-Cattaraugus site is the more desirable in terms of flood control protection, water storage capacity with resultant low flow regulation potential and cost. The relative merits of this much debated and little examined subject is hidden in a cloud of controversy which must be cleared away before additional funds for this project are appropriated.

I believe now, as I have in the past, that the best interests of the State of New York, the Seneca Nation of Indians within the State and the Federal Government itself, lies in a complete and impartial examination of the relative merits of each plan. Further work on the project should not be authorized or undertaken until the issue is resolved beyond question.

Dr. Arthur Morgan, former TVA Chairman and former chief engineer of the Pueblo project in Colorado, and of the Miami, Ohio, conservancy project, has constantly maintained that—

First. The Conewango project would protect Pittsburgh, Warren, and other Pennsylvania cities from floods from the upper Conewango Creek as well as the Allegheny River. The Kinzua Dam would not affect the upper Conewango.

Second. The Conewango project would provide three times as much water storage as the Kinzua project.

Third. The Conewango project would be cheaper than the Kinzua project.

Fourth. The Conewango project would be simpler to construct and would take 2 years less to complete than the Kinzua project.

Fifth. The Conewango project would amply protect against two and a half to three times as much floodwater as the Kinzua, while the Kinzua project would protect Pennsylvania cities against only half the maximum probable flood.

Sixth. The Conewango project would create a permanent lake 28 square miles in area with a variation in water level of 10 to 20 feet from high water to low water. The Kinzua project would create a lake 4 square miles in area with a fluctuation in water level of 80 to 100 feet.

Dr. Morgan has submitted several detailed and most persuasive statements in explanation and support of the above contentions.

As recently as April of this year, I again contacted Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of Engineers, by joining in a letter with my senior colleague, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, and Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, which requested answers to a number of pointed and indeed very provocative questions which Dr. Morgan had raised in connection with the Kinzua site. Questions ranged from the relative flood protection which might be expected from each site; the water storage capacities of each with resultant low flow regulation potential; the cost of both projects including such factors as the quantity and quality of land to be inundated by the dam; the replacement of existing roadways; the relocation of railroad beds, and so forth.

The answers which the Corps of Engineers supplied, though elaborate and verbose, were not entirely responsive and did not satisfactorily answer our queries. In fact, they raised further questions in my own mind and heightened the disagreements which existed between Dr. Morgan and themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, the questions raised in my letter to the Corps of Engineers dated April 6, 1960, together with General Itschner's answers thereto contained in his reply of May 10, 1960, and detailed comments on General Itschner's response by Dr. Morgan. An examination of this correspondence evidences the sharp differences of opinion between Dr. Morgan and the corps and point up the need for an objective study of the situation.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KEATING. Until such time as a complete and impartial examination of the relative merits of these sites has been made, taking into consideration the multitudinous factors which must be analyzed, I must object most strenuously to appropriating additional funds for a project which might prove to be a white elephant of the worst sort. As I stated previously, I am not unsympathetic to or ignorant of the flood control situation in Pennsylvania; nor do I claim that Dr. Morgan's Conewango-Cattaraugus alternative site is necessarily the answer to their problem. It is simply my feeling that a project of the scope and magnitude of the Kinzua Dam costing over $100 million should not be undertaken until all factors and possible alternatives have been thoroughly examined.

Of equal, if not greater, importance is the fact that the Kinzua site would inundate the heartland of the Seneca Nation—property which was the subject of a treaty signed in 1794 by George Washington with the Seneca Nation. Under that treaty the United States agreed never to claim the same, nor disturb the Seneca Nation in the free use thereof. Should we now dishonor this treaty without clear and unequivocal proof that this is the only way to end the floods along the Allegheny River? I think not.

The Seneca Indians have repeatedly stated that if the Kinzua Dam were the only reasonable solution to the flood control problem along the Allegheny River—they would withdraw their objections to its construction and suffer the loss of their community with a realistic resignation to the more compelling needs of others. The rational propriety of this position should be evident to all. However, it would appear that even this limited appeal is to be disregarded.

I do not feel that alternate plans have been adequately considered or studied, and I share the Senecas sincere belief that alternative measures are plausible.

Until this conviction is factually refuted we should not break our solemn obligation to the Seneca Nation. The particular project may be local, but the principle involved is a moral one of national scope.

EXHIBIT 1

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED IN LETTER OF APRIL 6, 1960, FROM SENATORS JACOB K. JAVITS AND KENNETH B. KEATING AND CONGRESSMAN CHARLES E. GOODELL TO LT. GEN. E. C. ITSCHNER, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, U.S. ARMY

Question 1. I. Dr. Morgan contends that the Kinzua Dam would provide full protection for substantially less than one-half of the flood which will result from the maximum spring rainfall in the upper Allegheny River watershed, as determined by the U.S. Weather Bureau, in contrast to the Conewango-Cattaraugus alternative plan, which would fully protect Pittsburgh against three times as great a flood. With respect to this contention, we have the following questions:

(1) Is it true that Kinzua Dam will protect against precipitation less than one-half as great as the probable maximum rainfall, and that the storage capacity of the project cannot be increased without flooding a portion of Salamanca, N.Y.?

Answer. The Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with the U.S. Weather Bureau, since 1938 has carried on an extensive storm-study program under which more than 800 storms have been analyzed. Hydrometeorological experts of the Weather Bureau have studied each of these storms in detail to determine the adjustments necessary to represent the maximum rainfall potential in different areas of the country. The spillway design storm (probable maximum precipitation) has been selected from these studies. It represents the most severe storm condition that could conceivably develop over the Allegheny River Basin.

The most severe storm rainfall is assumed for design of the height of dam and size of spillway to assure protection against failure of the dam under any possible flood condition. It does not follow that a reservoir should be designed to provide complete control of a flood of this magnitude. Such a degree of control is considered as beyond reasonable approach, except in very unusual circumstances. Through experience gained over many years, the Corps of Engineers has developed what it terms as the "standard project flood" as the reasonable maximum goal toward flood control development. While such a flood would be substantially less in magnitude than the spillway design flood, in this instance it still would be one of rare probability and it would exceed any floods that have occurred in the area. The "standard project flood" for the Allegheny Basin has been adopted as the design flood for determination of flood storage requirements. It would have a natural peak discharge at the dam site of 116,000 cubic feet per second, compared with the maximum discharge of 60,500 cubic feet per second during the flood of record which occurred in March 1956.

The Allegheny Reservoir, had it been in operation, would have completely controlled all floods of record in the upper Allegheny River Basin. The maximum storage would have been required for regulation of the March 1936 flood. The total flood control storage available at the beginning of that flood would have been 867,000 acre-feet. The flood would have filled 644,000 acre-feet, leaving an unused capacity of 223,000 acre-feet.

Storage allocations in the Allegheny Reservoir are as follows:

	Winter and spring, Nov. 1–Feb. 15		Summer and fall, May 1–June 20	
	Thousand acre-feet	Elevation	Thousand acre-feet	Elevation
Dead storage	24	1,240	24	1,240
Storage for low-flow regulation	216	1,292	549	1,328
Flood control storage	940	1,365	607	1,365
Total	1,180	--------	1,180	--------

The total storage capacity of Allegheny Reservoir could not be increased without affecting portions of Salamanca. However, as pointed out herein, the reservoir design flood which this reservoir is designed to control is a reasonable maximum goal for purposes of flood control operation of the project.

It is recognized that the project will not control the spillway design flood, nor is it an objective of the project to do so. If the spillway design flood occurred with the flood control pool approximately half full, the maximum reservoir release would be about 137,000 cubic feet per second. If this flood occurred with the flood control pool empty, however, the estimated maximum flood control release would be reduced to about 77,000 cubic feet per second, or to less than 30 percent of the peak reservoir inflow. Releases for lesser floods, ranging between the spillway design flood and the reservoir design flood, would be correspondingly less, down to the minimum release of 3,000 cubic feet per second for the reservoir design flood.

Proposals for diverting floodwaters into Lake Erie, or for providing more storage in a reservoir in the Conewango Valley, would not be controlling in obtaining a large factor of safety from floods at Pittsburgh. The channel capacity at Pittsburgh at nondamaging stage is equal to about 210,000 cubic feet per second, and a higher discharge could be passed without major damage. The relatively high degree of control provided by other reservoirs above Pittsburgh greatly reduces the chance of local flood peaks coinciding with peak spillway releases from the Allegheny Reservoir. In view of the extremely low probability of occurrence of the spillway design flood, the average annual damages attributable to such an occurrence of the spillway design flood, the average annual damages attributable to such an occurrence would be very low.

Comment on question 1 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "The corps' answers to this question does not deny that Kinzua will protect against less than one-half of the maximum probable precipitation. Even if 'maximum probable precipitation' were more than must be protected against, 40 percent of that, which is what the corps' 'analysis' and the Tippetts reports show (see corps analysis of April 1959, p. 2, par. 3) is much too little.

"The expression, 'It represents the most severe storm conditions that could conceivably develop over the Allegheny River Basin,' is ill advised. The corps has a letter from the Weather Bureau advising against such an expression, and advising use of the term 'probable maximum precipitation,' which is very different. U.S. Weather Bureau Report No. 33 discusses the reason for using the term 'maximum probable precipitation,' not 'maximum possible precipitation.' The Weather Bureau itself, after the great storm of 5 years ago, stopped using that expression, and wrote the Engineer Corps, September 28, 1956, that it was revising its estimates upward. This change occurred several years after the supposedly conclusive study mentioned in the answer to question 1, when actual rainfall changed their minds. The fact is that our history is too short for us to have probably experienced a maximum flood. The expression that the reservoir flood 'would exceed any floods that have occurred in this area' should be modified by adding 'during the relatively short period of record.'

"The Weather Bureau has made it explicitly clear that while it has estimated rainfall, it has not estimated how great a flood could result from that rainfall. Its wording on this point is: 'It is not within the scope of this study to make determination of infiltration rates or runoff coefficients.' The size of the flood would depend on the amount of snow on the ground, how wet the ground was at the time of the rainfall, whether or not the ground was frozen, the proportion of the rain running off, etc. The Engineer Corps has overlooked or greatly minimized such possibilities as snow on the ground, the possibility of frozen ground from which practically all water would run off, and particularly the fallibility of flood forecasting.

"As has clearly been pointed out by the Pennsylvania Department of Forests and Waters in cooperation with the U.S. Geological Survey, in their report on floods of March 1936 in Pennsylvania, the flood forecasting which may be fairly dependable for moderately large floods, such as 1936, may fail greatly in case of a very great storm. There are various risks and uncertainties which are beyond calculation. Good engineering, if possible, provides excess capacity as margins of safety for such uncertainties. The capacity of Kinzua is absolutely limited, and cannot be given a margin of safety. Therefore, we say that taking reasonable factors of safety into account, Kinzua has barely a third the capacity needed for the maximum probable flood, to say nothing of 'the most severe storm that could conceivably develop over the Allegheny River Basin.' It should have somewhere about double its capacity to be even reasonably secure against very large floods.

"As to the hydrometrical studies referred to, they were made years after the site of Kinzua was selected. No increase in Kinzua could be made as a result of those studies, for the reason that the corps was already planning to use all the capacity Kinzua was capable of; and regardless of what the studies might show, they could not increase that capacity. The studies showed the need for greater capacity, but the reasoning of the corps had to come around to the capacity they had, not what they needed.

"Concerning the last paragraph on page 1, which says, 'Such a degree of control is considered beyond reasonable approach, except in very unusual circumstances.' We do have unusual circumstances here. Such remarkably favorable circumstances for getting rid of all excess floodwater, no matter how great the flood, probably do not occur once in several hundred times. Why lose them when they do occur? Especially is this true when a great city like Pittsburgh can be protected from the greatest possible flood at no greater cost.

" 'Through experience gained over many years' (incidentally, Morgan has been building flood-control reservoirs twice as long as has the corps. When he was planning the Miami River dams the Army engineer in charge of the Ohio River Division issued a special publication condemning flood control reservoirs in general and the Miami system in particular) the corps has arrived at a rule-of-thumb standard that a 'standard project flood' shall be half as large as the maximum probable flood. The Tippetts firm made that rule clear in their report. Is it not miraculous that one-half, the simplest of all fractions, should be just what is necessary? Or is it very rough-and-ready rule of thumb? And should the rule be the same where the safety of a great city is at stake as in ordinary circumstances, as on the Cumberland, where the risk to life and property is very small in comparison? In this case, because of the rigidly limited capacity of Kinzua, the one-half of the probable maximum could not be reached, even with inadequate consideration of such risks as snow on the ground, frozen soil, and so forth.

"[From p. 2]: 'The Allegheny Reservoir, had it been in operation would have completely controlled all floods of record in the upper Allegheny Basin.' The history of our country is so short that such statements mean little as to flood possibilities. The Miami River at Dayton, Ohio, has almost the same drainage area as the Allegheny above Kinzua (2,550 square miles above Dayton as against 2,180 above Kinzua). Aside from the 1913 flood, the greatest flood in 150 years had been about 90,000 cubic feet per second. The 1913 flood had a discharge of 250,000 cubic feet per second, from relatively flat Ohio farmland. That was about 98 second-feet per square mile as against about 50 second-feet per square mile for the 'standard project flood' for Kinzua. And the Dayton flood is not considered the maximum. The cities below are protected against a flood 40 percent greater than that of 1913, much greater than the spillway flood estimated by the corps. The corps estimates that 67 percent of the rain would run off the steep mountainsides. In the case of the Dayton flood, 91 percent ran off from the relatively flat farmland, even with no snow on the ground to add to the flood, and with the ground not frozen.

"The corps starts with the greatly inadequate capacity of Kinzua, and must make the figures come out so that it will seem large enough. Why not take advantage of the 'very unusual circumstances' which seldom occur, but do occur here? An engineer who overlooks unusual circumstances when they do occur has failed as an engineer.

"The next to the last paragraph under question No. 1 simply states that the smaller the flood and the more favorable the circumstances, the less damage would result.

"The first sentence on page 3 (question 1) is a flat, obvious misstatement. The rest of the paragraph is wishful thinking. The assumptions about the sequence and length of very unusual storms are largely sheer guesswork. Very great storms are unusual in more ways than sheer size. Also, as is customary, this paragraph discusses the maximum or spillway flood as though there were nothing between that and the standard design flood. If a rain half as great as the probable maximum should fall on heavy snow, which is entirely possible as stated in the report by the U.S. Geological Survey and the Pennsylvania Department of Forests and Waters, referred to above, a flood could occur about as great as the estimated spillway flood.

"The contention in this last paragraph under question 1, that 'Proposals for diverting floodwaters into Lake Erie, or for providing more storage in a reservoir in the Conewango Valley, would not be controlling in obtaining a large factor of safety from floods at Pittsburgh,' is not sound. With all proposed reservoirs above Pittsburgh constructed, half the watershed above Pittsburgh still would be uncontrolled, and a major flood could, and probably will, occur. Full protection from the upper Allegheny, such as would be provided by Conewango-Cattaraugus and not by Kinzua, would add a substantial element of additional safety."

Question 2. (2) In calculating the size of the flood against which Kinzua Dam is designed to protect, what consideration was given to the possibility of a lesser storm before major rainfall; what percentage of the latter precipitation was estimated as runoff; and what allowance was made for snow on the ground? Is the Corps of Engineers

aware of the Weather Bureau prediction that a typical major storm would be preceded by a smaller storm within such a short period that the flood storage portion of the reservoir could not be wholly emptied? Is there experience to show that a runoff of as much as 90 percent is possible, even without snow in areas comparable to the Allegheny Valley?

Answer. The Corps of Engineers is aware of the Weather Bureau's determination that a typical major storm could be preceded by a smaller storm within a period of a few days. Such a condition was assumed in routing the maximum probable storm rainfall through the reservoir to determine the required spillway capacity for the dam. The assumption of such an antecedent storm is a factor of safety which is considered justified when dealing with the spillway design flood, for the purpose of assuring the safety of the structure, but not necessarily in the case of the reservoir design flood. A factor of safety is inherent in the manner in which the reservoir design flood was routed through the reservoir, since the reservoir pool elevation at the beginning of the flood was assumed to be at the upper limit of the summer pool. The flood control capacity of the Allegheny Reservoir would be adequate to control all floods of record in the Allegheny River Basin, several of which had more than one peak.

The runoff to be expected from the reservoir design flood was not determined by taking an arbitrary percentage of the rainfall but was established by computing the rate of absorption or infiltration into the soil, based on studies of past major storms of the same general type. The reservoir design flood would be one of the heavy summer-fall variety. The greatest storm of this type that has occurred in the vicinity of the upper Allegheny Basin and the eastern United States was that of July 1942. This storm occurred over western New York and Pennsylvania. Although the intensity of this storm has been exceeded at some time on the U.S. mainland, it is certain that its maximum 12-hour and 24-hour intensities are the highest for these durations that have been measured within the continental limits of the United States, with the possible exception of the immediate gulf coast, even though the locale of the storm is not in a portion of the country most susceptible to greatest rainfall. The storm area embraced portions of the upper Allegheny, Susquehanna, and Genessee River Basins, and resulted in rainfall averaging 7.3 inches over an area of about 4,000 square miles. Within this area, rainfall far greater than the average occurred in many places. The rainfall losses to percolation, transpiration, and evaporation during the July 1942 storm, were as much as 5 inches. In comparison, the losses assumed for the reservoir design flood were 3.7 inches. While a runoff-rainfall ratio as high as 90 percent could occur during storms of other types, it would not be applicable to the severe late summer or fall storm that has been adopted for the reservoir design flood. Snow on the ground as an additional source of runoff obviously would not be compatible with the occurrence of the reservoir design flood. A maximum winter-type storm with snowmelt would not result in as critical flood storage conditions as would the summer-fall type storm.

Comment on question 2 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "The answer to this question is a devious recognition of the fact that the reservoir flood against which Kinzua is supposed to protect, is not half the maximum flood, but only half the second peak of that flood. The multitude of words does not cover up that admission.

"Here again there is reference to the fact that Kinzua would control all floods of record. As in the case of the Dayton flood and of some others, a flood may occur two or three times as great as any that has occurred for a century; and that occurrence may be next year, or many years from now. Pittsburgh can have complete protection against the very greatest possible flood, and at no more cost. Is it not assuming a heavy responsibility to take less?

"Note first sentence of page 4. The Weather Bureau studies show that any one of four major types of storm can occur over the upper Allegheny.

"The latter part of the first paragraph on page 4 makes a clear admission of what we had suspected, but were not sure of. The answer speaks of 'the severe late summer or fall storm that has been adopted for the "reservoir design flood".' The answer mentions winter type storms and summer type storms. It is neither of these which causes the great floods, but the storms of March and April. Three quarters of the floods, including the largest, occur in those 2 months. March or April rains may fall on heavy snow, and March floods on frozen ground. Snow may add 50 percent as much water as a very heavy rain, and the water-soaked ground may also greatly increase runoff. Storm rainfall in March probably cannot be quite as extreme as that of August, but snow and wet ground make a far greater difference. The summer type of storm used for Kinzua would result in a far smaller flood than a March or early April storm.

"The choice of a late summer or fall storm largely discredits the estimates of possible floods. I repeat, most of the large floods in that area occur in March or April, not in either summer or winter, which are the seasons referred to in the answer. A 'reservoir flood' with snow on the ground and a much larger portion of the rain running off than in summer, could have approximately twice the runoff of a summer storm of a relative size for its type."

Question 3. Do the plans for operation of Kinzua Dam call for the discharge of temporary impounded water into the Allegheny River during the flood season in order to prepare for storing the water of the next storm? If so, what is the possibility that, through human error in weather forecasting, the released water will contribute to downstream flooding at or below Pittsburgh?

Answer. The storage allocated for flood control in the Allegheny Reservoir is the amount determined to be required to regulate the standard project flood to a uniform outflow rate equal to the bank-full channel capacity of 25,000 cubic feet per second beginning on the fourth day. The 4-day lag is provided to insure that all possibility of flooding at Warren, Pa., has passed. This analysis is based on the most severe flood control requirements that could be imposed on the reservoir during the occurrence of such a flood. Under normal operations, not more than about 3,000 cubic feet per second would be released from the reservoir during a flood. Storage would be continued until the upper Allegheny had crested, the lower Allegheny was nearing its crest, and the Ohio River at Pittsburgh was expected to crest and recede below 21 feet within 18 hours. Consideration of time and distance factors in relation to storm patterns involving a widespread area of the United States leaves little likelihood that releases from the Allegheny Reservoir would contribute to flood peaks farther downstream on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

Comment on question 3 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "The answer given to this question, if intelligently and critically examined, shows either crude ignorance or intent to mislead.

"After large floods it would take 2 to 4 weeks to empty the flood-control portion of the Kinzua Reservoir. This would mean that for 2 to 4 weeks during a flood season which lasts for 3 months there would be an additional 25,000 cubic feet per second of water in the river all the way from Kinzua to the gulf, to add to any flood crest it might meet along the way. Great floods tend to be general floods in seasons of floods. According to statements and records of the Corps of Engineers, expenditures of up to $100 to $200 million are in prospect to accomplish no more than would be accomplished by the diversion of upper Allegheny floodwater to Lake Erie.

"Such expressions as 'is expected to crest' and 'there is little likelihood' represent guesses as to how storms will behave. Members of the Corps of Engineers in the past have pointed out the disadvantages of this type of control, and have stated that in some circumstances such release of water might actually raise flood crests at Pittsburgh. The corps has an imaginary picture as to how storm rainfall will proceed. Especially in great floods, storm rainfall does not proceed according to expectation.

"Conewango, by diverting all floodflow to Lake Erie, would entirely eliminate this disadvantage of Kinzua. For that one superiority alone, Conewango would be worth more than its full cost. Both projects are not needed.

"An interjection: Lake Erie is so large that if a total spillway or maximum flood should be discharged into it, with no storage in Conewango, the lake would be raised about as much as though a mild half-inch rain had fallen on its surface."

Question 4. (4) Assuming that protection against the maximum probable flood is not practical in all situations, shouldn't the corps' objective be to obtain the maximum protection feasible? Is the Conewango-Cattaraugus alernative plan both feasible and capable of controlling at least three-fourths of the maximum probable flood? If so, what value was assigned to this feature of the plan in calculating cost-benefit ratios in comparison to the Kinzua project?

Answer. It is the objective of the Corps of Engineers to provide the maximum degree of flood protection that can be economically justified. In view of the extremely low probability of occurrence of a flood of the magnitude of the spillway design flood, the average annual damages attributable to such an occurrence would be very low and would not justify the additional cost of providing the added protection.

In its consideration of alternative plans, the Corps of Engineers engaged the engineering firm of Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton to develop engineering alternatives in comparison with the authorized Allegheny Reservoir. The engineering firm studied five plans which covered the principal possibilities for storage in the Conewango Basin and for diversion into Lake Erie. One of the plans studied (plan 5) included a reservoir on Conewango Creek which would be large enough to store the spillway design flood. According to the estimates of the engineering firm, that plan would cost 38 percent more than the authorized project, would require the taking of 108 percent more land, and would require the dislocation of 180 percent more people. It was concluded that the added cost involved in providing a reservoir capable of storing the spillway design flood could not be justified on the basis of the small amount of annual benefits that would result therefrom.

The plan proposed by Dr. Morgan in his October 1958 report would not control a flood three-fourths of the maximum probable flood. In fact, table 1 of that report shows Dr. Morgan's reservoir design flood to be approximately equal in volume to that for the Allegheny Reservoir. Control of even this flood would require releases into Cattaraugus Creek much in excess of its capacity and probably at a time when high flow conditions exist in the stream from runoff generated by its natural drainage area. Since the reservoir design flood provided for in Dr. Morgan's

plan is not greater than that for Allegheny Reservoir, no additional flood control benefits can be realized. Also, flood damages in Cattaraugus Creek must be recognized.

Comment on question 4 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "Here the corps mentions the rare possibility of a spillway flood. The fact that in March or April a flood half as great could do about as much damage is ignored. By holding attention to the flood following a maximum rainfall—which would be in summer with no snow and low runoff—the corps avoids attention to all the stages of floods in between, and of greater frequency, when very great damage could result from much smaller rainfalls.

"The answer states that the Tippetts firm employed by the corps 'studied five alternative plans which covered the principal possibilities for storage in the Conewango Basin and for diversion into Lake Erie.' This statement is false. This firm made no study whatever of two such possibilities, either of which would be far superior to anything they did study. When they were beginning their work I wrote them:

" 'The earlier fieldwork and calculations for this study were largely made by my longtime friend and associate, Barton M. Jones. On his sudden death a few weeks ago I located such of his papers as I could and have continued the study. He commented frequently that the project has such a variety of promising alternatives that when the possibilities and economies are fully worked out the plans may have little resemblance to the ones he has prepared. * * * It is hoped that as Tippetts-Abbott-McCarthy-Stratton make their study with more adequate resources they will not simply determine the feasibility of the elements we propose, but will be alert to see further possibilities and economies, as well as any weak spots in our proposals.'

"The firm made no such study, and only looked into suggestions I was able to make at the time they began. When I found they would not make such a search and had no time to consider any further suggestions, I continued the search, and turned up Conewango-Cattaraugus. That plan would be far superior to any they studied, and would avoid most of the disadvantages they pointed out, and would cost $20 million less than the least expensive plan they studied. The assertion in this answer that Conewango-Cattaraugus would probably cost no less than the three modifications of one diversion plan studied by Tippetts is sheer, irresponsible and inaccurate presumption which should be beneath the self-respect of a great public agency. Such irresponsible assertions have greatly clouded and confused this issue.

"The Tippetts report makes it clear that any of the three modifications of the diversion plan they studied would fully and completely control, not only the reservoir flood by the maximum or spillway flood, by diverting the excess to Lake Erie. The Tippetts report is explicit on that, and until the answer to this question, the corps has never questioned it. The corps assertion to the contrary controverts the definite and explicit finding of its consultants.

"The further answer to the question is totally and obviously irresponsible, and could scarcely be made in good faith. The statement reads: 'One of the plans studied (plan 5) included a reservoir on Conewango Creek which would be large enough to store the spillway design flood,' implying that the other plans would not control such a flood. This, in fact, was a study to show what would be possible with the Conewango Reservoir without diversion, and without turning water down the Allegheny during the flood period. The study showed that Conewango Reservoir would hold the total spillway design flood on top of the total reservoir design flood with no discharge in any direction. Of course, the value of diversion would be in making great flood storage unnecessary.

"A discussion of cost, land taken and people dislocated by such a very large reservoir has no bearing on the situation, as the study showed that method to be far inferior to the others studied. To bring that study into the picture indicates willingness to cloud the issue. That statement confuses storage of the spillway flood and controlling it by diversion.

"The further statement, 'The plan proposed by Dr. Morgan in his 1958 report would not control a flood three-fourths of the maximum possible flood,' is explicitly inaccurate. It would protect the Allegheny River and Pittsburgh against the full spillway or maximum flood, just as would any of the diversion plan studies made by Tippetts. The Tippetts report states explicitly that in case of the spillway design flood no flood water would pass down the Allegheny River. That would have the advantage of fully and completely protecting Pittsburgh and Warren from up to three times the flood which Kinzua would fully protect against, and of entirely removing all upper Allegheny floodflow from the Allegheny, Ohio and Mississippi Rivers under all conditions. The Tippetts report clearly draws attention to that enormous advantage in the body of the report, but not in the summary. That advantage, which Kinzua lacks, would be worth not less than $100 million in saving other flood control reservoir construction. The Conewango-Cattaraugus plan has all the advantages of any of the Tippetts diversion plans, and very great advantages and economies in addition.

"As to damages from discharging into the Cattaraugus Channel, the cost of protection against damage is included in the estimated cost. Where Conewango would discharge into Cattaraugus the latter is a rock gorge 300 feet deep, with sheer rock walls 100 feet or more high. For most of the distance from Gowanda to Lake Erie there is a 300-foot rock slope on one side and a valley on the other. Here a levee would be needed on one or both sides. The cost of that is included in the estimate. That levee would protect the valley land from flooding which is now experienced, and is greatly desired by landowners in the valley. Of course, a large flow down the Cattaraugus would be very infrequent."

Question 5. II. Dr. Morgan contends that the Conewango Reservoir site possesses a far larger storage capacity than the Kinzua Dam and, accordingly, could provide a greater flow of water from winter storage for improvement of public and industrial water supplies and other downstream benefits during the dry summer months. This contention, we understand, is conceded by the Corps of Engineers. A 1957 report of the U.S. Public Health Service concerning low-flow regulation on the Allegheny River shows that additional water in the stream will result in proportionately greater benefits.

Assuming a continued growth in population and industrial activity along the Allegheny River, will not the greater capacity of the Conewango Reservoir site constitute an asset of ever-increasing value?

Answer: Allegheny Reservoir would impound 549,000 acre-feet of water for augmentation of low flows, of which 333,000 acre-feet would be seasonal storage. Water would be released during periods of low flow on the lower Allegheny River to dilute industrial and domestic wastes, thereby improving the quality of water in the Pittsburgh area.

The summer low-flow regulation storage requirements were determined from a reservoir operation study covering a 27-year period beginning in May 1929. Also, critical low-water periods outside the 27-year period were investigated. Those studies showed that 521,000 acre-feet should be provided for low-flow augmentation at Natrona, Pa. (24 miles above Pittsburgh), during the worst drought period of 1930–31, and that storage in excess of 450,000 acre-feet would be utilized in 9 out of 12 years in a period comparable with that from 1929 through 1940.

Flow regulation benefits for Allegheny Reservoir, as established by the Public Health Service, are based on (1) improving the quality of water by reducing temperature, corrosiveness, hardness, and manganese content, and (2) estimated reductions in the cost of waste treatment beyond the cost of direct treatment which would be required to provide desirable stream quality standards without any low-flow regulations. Annual benefits attributable to these operations have been estimated as follows:

Public water supplies:	
Manganese reduction	$37,000
Hardness reduction	176,000
Acidity reduction	8,000
Total	221,000
Industrial water supply:	
Hardness reduction	77,000
Temperature reduction	98,000
Total	175,000
Navigation: Acid corrosion reduction	20,000
Organic pollution abatement	730,000
Total	1,146,000

The benefits from low-flow regulation would not increase proportionately to an increase in storage capacity. For example, pollution abatement benefits credited to the authorized Allegheny Reservoir are based on estimated reductions in the cost of waste treatment, beyond the cost of direct treatment that would be needed in any event, to provide desirable stream quality standards without any low-flow regulation. Such pollution abatement benefits are limited to the cost of treatment facilities that can be eliminated and would not be increased by additional flows from a larger storage reservoir. The additional flow that would be provided from a larger reservoir would have some additional value in improving the quality of water under existing conditions of water use (estimated by the corps to be about $130,000 annually, which capitalized at 5 percent would support an added cost of $2,600,000). In addition, it is not practicable under present authorities to assess benefits for conjectural possible future water supply needs as a basis for justifying additional water supply storage. Such additional storage for flow regulation would be provided, when needed, in some instances more economically by regulation of storage on other Ohio River tributaries. According to an estimate by Tippetts, Abbett, McCarthy, Stratton, a reservoir in the Conewango Basin having almost twice the storage for flow regulation provided in Allegheny Reservoir would cost over $40 million more.

The storage provided in any reservoir is recognized as an asset of ever-increasing value. However, the additional investment that would be required cannot be justified on the basis of the benefits that can now be evaluated. It should be noted that Dr. Morgan's proposed plan provided a storage reservation for flow regulation of 520,000 acre-feet, as compared with 549,000 acre-feet of storage for this purpose in the authorized Allegheny Reservoir. Obviously, this would produce a slightly smaller benefit than the authorized project.

Comment on question 5 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "The answer here is substantially that 'the benefits from low-flow regulation do not increase proportionately to an increase in storage capacity.' This is exactly opposite to the finding of the study by the U.S. Public Health Service included in the official Kinzua report. The table quoted in the answer is abstracted from a larger table which shows the opposite. That larger table is attached hereto. The extrapolations on the right side of the vertical line are sound.

"The most controversial item in this table is $730,000 for saving construction of additional sewage treatment facilities. The fact is that completed construction was made without reference to Kinzua, and there are no further definite plans and no official demand or commitment for further construction which Kinzua would obviate, and it may never be needed. This information is received directly from official sources. (The department of health at Harrisburg and the Ohio River Sanitary Commission.) Therefore the $730,000 annual benefit is not justified.

"As to benefits from storage for low water increase, as with all public improvement, future growth is anticipated. Seldom is a bridge or a dam or a navigation improvement built just for existing use. Growth is anticipated and prepared for. General Itschner, Chief of Engineers, stated in a public address last October:

" 'It has been estimated that by 1980 the use of water in this valley (less Cumberland and Tennessee) will be about 3.5 times the present use. Allowing for the reuse of water, the total demand in 1980 is expected to be some 13 times greater than the present dependable discharge of the lower Ohio River. * * *

" 'Opportunities now at hand to provide against the occurrence of water shortages by this method (multiple-purpose reservoirs) are slipping away from us for want of adequate recognition of the problem.'

"The Corps of Engineers answer (last paragraph) includes the statement: 'It should be noted that Dr. Morgan's proposed plan provided a storage reservoir for low flow regulation of 520,000 acre-feet, as compared with 549,000 acre-feet of storage for this purpose in the authorized Allegheny Reservoir. Obviously this would produce a slightly smaller benefit than the authorized project.' As the engineers of the corps would know if they studied the Tippetts report, this is not my plan in detail, but the Tippetts plan, made after my general suggestions. However, the comment is misleading. The authorized plan has a minimum pool capacity of 20,000 acre-feet. For the alternative plan the Tippetts engineers saw fit to provide a minimum pool capacity of 180,000 acre-feet. By assigning 30,000 acre-feet of this Conewango minimum pool for low water control, the low water storage would be the same for both, leaving 150,000 acre-feet of minimum lake for Conewango-Cattaraugus as against 20,000 acre-feet of minimum lake for Kinzua."

Question 6. III. Dr. Morgan contends that the Kinzua Dam will flood, and thus destroy, a valuable existing recreation area, including hundreds of cottages and part of the Allegheny National Forest, while the Conewango–Cattaraugus alternatives plan will create a new recreation area out of lands now largely unusable: (1) Will the water impounded by Kinzua Dam flood an existing recreational area? Will the level of the Kinzua pool fluctuate each year about 60 feet? If so, will this fluctuation in the shoreline cause the northern end of the lake to recede approximately 10 miles downstream between high and low water, thus leaving mud flats or similar unsightly and unusable land in much of the affected area in New York?

Answer. The land acreage lying below the reservoir-full elevation of Allegheny Reservoir may be classified as follows:

	Pennsylvania	New York	Total
Cornplanter Reservation	644	--------	644
Allegheny National Forest	1,604	--------	1,604
Private lands	6,807	1,317	8,124
Allegany Reservation	--------	9,077	9,077
Allegany State Park	--------	84	84
Total	9,055	10,478	19,533

There are no known recreation developments on the Cornplanter and Allegany Reservations. The portion of Allegany State Park within the reservoir is undeveloped woodland. The Allegheny National Forest has a development in the Kinzua Creek area known as Camp Cornplanter, which will be somewhat affected by the reservoir. This development consists of good camp facilities leased by the Warren County Association for Retarded Children. The principal facilities lie above the reservoir, but certain adjustments will be required, such as the access road and electric power service line which dip into the reservoir. The Forest Service also maintains nine wooden picnic tables within the reservoir. The only other known recreation facility within the reservoir is a privately owned nine-hole golf course in the village of Kinzua.

As is evident from the above table most of the affected land in Pennsylvania is in private ownership. As is true of most of the Allegheny River Valley and tributary valleys above the Pittsburgh industrial area, the streams are attractive to fisherman, and hunting is popular in the Allegheny National Forest and the other woodland areas. Numerous hunting and fishing cottages are located along these streams practically throughout the undeveloped region of Pennsylvania.

Allegheny Reservoir will have a normal yearly fluctuation of about 60 feet, but most of the fluctuation will occur before or after the principal water-use recreation season, June, July, and August.

Retraction of the reservoir length occurs as indicated as a consequence of draft on flow regulation storage and Dr. Morgan implies that unsightly mud flats will result. Experience at other reservoirs in this district has not developed any problems of such nature. In any event it should be noted that complete evacuation of the total low-flow regulation storage volumes, 549,000 acre-feet in the Allegheny Reservoir and 520,000 acre-feet in the Conewango Reservoir according to Dr. Morgan's plan 6, will result in retracting the surface areas of the reservoirs in the amount of 10,150 and 13,000 acres respectively. That is plan 6 will expose more land. Furthermore, while much of the Allegheny Reservoir is contained within steep hillsides which indicates good drainage, much of the soil in the Conewango Basin is glacial till (a fine silty gravel) and lake sediment or agricultural "muck," as it is referred to locally, both of which have poor drainage characteristics. Much of the portion of the Allegheny Reservoir in New York is quite flat, but generally the shoreline is composed of glacial outwash gravels and sand well suited to the development of beach conditions. From the standpoints of both areal exposure and soil conditions, Allegheny Reservoir is believed to be superior to the Conewango Basin with respect to the mud-flat question raised by Dr. Morgan.

Comment on question 6 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "The answer given here is strikingly contrary to the statements of the study by the Fish and Wildlife Service, by legal requirement included in the Corps of Engineers report on Kinzua. That report covers in detail an impressive list of losses and damages which would result from building Kinzua. A few quotations will illustrate:

" 'Within the project site many structures associated with recreational uses are found. These structures include cabins and summer homes used for short- or long-term vacations by owners or lessees. Within the maximum reservoir elevation, excluding the Cornplanter Indian Reservation in Pennsylvania, the Allegheny State Park, and the Allegany Indian Reservation in New York, at least 239 cabins of this nature have been counted.

" 'The area attracts people from a wide radius, including the population centers of Buffalo, Erie, and Pittsburgh. Many anglers come from the Pittsburgh region in particular. People are also attracted to the site from other States, principally Ohio. A factor contributing to the value of the fishery is the large amount of fishable water readily accessible to the angler.

" 'Many segments of the human population, indivduals, and groups, living within, near, and generally within a radius of 200 miles of the project area have interest in the site of the proposed project in its present condition.

" 'The Allegheny River and its tributaries within the project site is a very popular fishing area for both warm- and cold-water species. Hunting in the project area is popular and many hunters utilize the area each year.

" 'Approximately 42 miles of stream, of which 20 miles are considered good trout streams, will be inundated by the maximum summer low water regulation pool.

" 'A well-utilized area of distinct natural productivity and uncommon attractiveness will be destroyed.

" 'It does not seem reasonable at this time to expect that the major losses to the fish and wildlife resources can be fully compensated.

" 'The esthetics of the area will suffer from the annual appearance of a muddy, unsightly shoreline, especially in New York, where extensive acreages of gradual gradients are found. Moreover, a prime ingredient in determining the relative value of this pool is a full appreciation of the production and esthetically attractive qualities of the main-stem river and its tributary streams as they presently exist.'

"The Engineer Corps sums up the situation as follows:

" '81. Replacement of fish and wildlife resources of the same nature as now exist is indicated in the report as unattainable; however, development of a general plan pursuant to section 3 of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1090) is recommended. Such a plan would be designed to replace present resources with resources of an entirely different nature but would result in an overall enhancement of the area by increasing the variety of fish and wildlife resources.'

"The law referred to requires that the cost of compensating for damages shall be a part of the cost of the project. The report states that a final report will be issued on or about April 30, 1958. Inquiry indicates that this report is being held up by some understanding with the Corps of Engineers. The types of improvement indicated will run into a good many millions of dollars for resources of an entirely different nature. Here, as in the case of forest improvement, it may be claimed that the expenditures are not really compensation for Kinzua damages, as they are resources of an entirely different nature. A very considerable element of cost of Kinzua is being hidden until the work is begun. Then appropriations will be asked for which will increase the cost of Kinzua, probably to

more than even the very inflated estimates of the Tippetts report for Conewango.

"The last paragraph of the reply to question 6 gives an inaccurate view of the situation. Kinzua Reservoir has exceedingly steep side slopes, stated by the corps report to be 1½ horizontal to 1 vertical. It is generally inaccessible, except along the valley bottom, along which the lake shore would retreat 10 to 15 miles each year.

"Conewango Reservoir has a flat area at the north end which, in the necessary construction of road and railroad fills, could be given a uniform water level throughout the year. This kind of treatment is not possible for Kinzua because the entire upper Allegheny River flows down the valley, and would wash out any low level dikes. Because of its greater area, Conewango would have a change in elevation, due to storage for low water control, of only 20 feet as against 88 feet for Kinzua. As contrasted to a shoreline retreat down the valley of more than 10 miles between the two elevations of summer storage and low water pool, the fairly uniform retreat around the shores of Conewango would be less than 400 feet; and—as with Kinzua—'most of the fluctuation will occur before or after the principal water-use recreation season, June, July, and August.' "

Question 7. (2) The U.S. Forestry Service has estimated the cost of reconstituting recreation projects in connection with Kinzua Dam at $15 million. Was this expense taken into account in determining the cost-benefit ratio of the project?

Answer. The plan of the U.S. Forest Service for recreational development in and adjacent to the Allegheny National Forest is not for the purpose of reconstituting recreation projects destroyed by Allegheny Reservoir. Conversely, it is basically a program of improvement which the Forest Service envisions will be required to accommodate the great increase in visitation to the area which is expected as a consequence of the attraction of the reservoir. This program is not part of the authorized purpose of the reservoir project and except in relatively minor part, principally adjustment of forest roads for which adequate provision is made in the approved estimate for the reservoir project, would not be a charge against the reservoir nor financed from appropriations for the reservoir. The Allegheny National Forest contains approximately 480,000 acres, only 1,604 of which will lie within the limits of Allegheny Reservoir. The approved estimate for Allegheny Reservoir includes $500,000 for recreational development to serve the normal public needs. The project benefit-cost ratio includes a nominal annual benefit of $25,000 for recreation or a ratio of 1 to 1 for the proposed $500,000 expenditure. The U.S. Forest Service report estimates that benefits for the recreational development program proposed by it would exceed cost in a ratio of 6 to 1.

Comment on question 7 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "The answer to this question states: 'The plan of the U.S. Forest Service for recreational development is not for the purpose of reconstituting recreation projects destroyed by the Allegheny project.' (We did not imply the destruction of recreation projects, but of recreation resources.) The following facts speak for themselves.

"Several thousand acres of forest will be cut along the rivers and mountain sides in creating the reservoir. The stumps would not be removed. As stated in the answer to question 12, 'The type of clearing contemplated, that is to leave the stumps intact to minimize disturbance to existing ground cover,' would leave 25 miles of stumps on each side of the reservoir.

"The law required that a report of the Fish and Wildlife Service be included and made a part of the report on the project. As to the conditions existing 'without the project,' we refer to the quotations from that report given in the comment on question 6. Concerning the means and measures that should be adopted to prevent loss and damage to wildlife resources, the law in question (sec. 2) states:

" 'The cost for planning and construction or installation and maintenance of any such means and measures shall be included in and shall constitute an integral part of the cost of such projects.'

"As the shoreline of the reservoir retreats down river 10 to 15 miles each summer leaving behind on the river banks and mountain sides thousands of acres of dead stumps where there had been natural forests, some consideration must be given to the requirement of the law that effort be made to compensate for such damage, at the cost of the project, though as the Engineer Corps report states, replacement of resources of the same nature is unattainable and replacement must be made with resources of an entirely different nature. Under these circumstances is it not an interesting coincidence that a forestry program which in a limited degree would compensate for these losses by resources of a somewhat different nature should be entirely unrelated to the losses, and would not be a charge against the reservoir nor financed from appropriations for the reservoir?"

Question 8. (3) Has the Corps of Engineers studied the recreational potential of the Conewango-Cattaraugus alternative plan? If so, what were its findings and what value was assigned to such potential in calculating cost-benefit ratios in comparison to the Kinzua Dam? If not, what is the basis used by the Corps of Engineers for comparing the effect of the two proposed projects on recreational facilities?

Answer. No study of recreational potential of Conewango-Cattaraugus has been made since the Conewango plan is considered less desirable than that for the authorized Allegheny Reservoir. The Allegheny Reservoir site is considered to have a greater recreational potential. The forest fringed setting of the reservoir would be an attraction not provided by the Conewango area. Further discussion of the comparative recreational values is contained in response to question 6.

Comment on question 8 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "Conewango, by virtue of its relatively stable water level (10- to 20-foot variation, compared to 60 to 80 for Kinzua), by virtue of a well-defined shoreline and ready access from all directions, and by virtue of its much larger minimum pool area (27 square miles against 3 for Kinzua) would have vastly greater recreation potential."

Question 9. IV. We are informed that one of the reasons given by the Corps of Engineers for preferring Kinzua Dam is that Dr. Morgan's Conewango-Cattaraugus alternative project would require more land. In terms of land acquisition by the Government, it is submitted, cost or value is a far more important consideration than acreage.

In this regard, has the Corps of Engineers made estimates of the value of lands, including Federal lands, needed for the Kinzua Dam and the Conewango-Cattaraugus project? If so, what were these estimates and upon which basis were the appraisals made?

Answer. The evaluations of lands for both projects were made in accordance with professional real estate appraisal methods. The investigations included a compilation of recent sales and interviews with public officials, business firms, utility companies and private owners. Visual appraisal of rural and urban dwellings, business establishments and other enterprises and improvements was made by qualified appraisers. The appraisal of Indian reservation lands was made by a well qualified appraiser of Indian lands. Federal lands in the Allegheny National Forest were not included in the real estate cost. There of 1,604 acres involved, only 805 of which would be below the conservation pool level. The cost estimates for the Allegheny Reservoir and the various diversion plans including Dr. Morgan's recommended plan 6 are contained in table 2 with Dr. Morgan's report. The estimate for Allegheny Reservoir is $8,344,000. The estimate presented by Dr. Morgan for his plan 6 is $16,474,000, which compares with an estimated cost of $16,766,000 prepared by the engineering firm for plan 1. The much greater cost of all of the diversion plans results from the far larger number of improvements which are affected.

Comment on question 9 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "The answer to this question neglects to show that in estimating the cost of Conewango the total cost of all municipal or village property was included, regardless of whether a considerable part of the municipality would be undisturbed. Nor does the answer reveal the fact that by far the greater part of the estimated cost is in these villages, and that they need not be destroyed, as is the case with Kinzua villages, but that the low portions could be relocated on higher land in the same village."

Question 10. V. Dr. Morgan contends that the Kinzua Reservoir will eliminate the only water level highway through the mountains in that region, one of the finest highway locations in Pennsylvania, and that there will be substituted a steep, two-lane highway along the precipitous mountainside, with grades of 10 percent with sharp curves.

1. Is this specific contention correct? How will the substitute road rate, if measured by the minimum standards for through highways established by the American Society of Highway Officials? Apart from actual construction costs, how was the lessening of quality of highways figured in the cost-benefit ratio of the Kinzua project?

Answer. The highway route in the Allegheny River Valley which Dr. Morgan refers to as a water level route and one of the finest highway locations in Pennsylvania consists of Pennsylvania Route 59 from the dam site to Sugar Run, Pa., Route 346 from Sugar Run to Corydon, Pa., and Pennsylvania Legislative Route 630 from Corydon to the Pennsylvania-New York State line. Only Route 59 is a primary highway. Route 59 in the affected reach contains 8 curves sharper than the maximum acceptable 9° for modern standards for a highway of this class and these 8 curves average 40°. It also crosses the Salamanca Branch of the Pennsylvania Railroad at grade at two locations. Similarly, Route 346 contains 23 curves averaging 23° and involves four railroad grade crossings and poor sight distances. The alinement and grades of the affected portion of Legislative Route 630 (1.6 miles) are good but the road is of narrow width and low quality.

The substitute roads in the Allegheny Reservoir will be constructed to A.A.S.H.O. standards for the classes of roads involved, which would limit maximum curvature to 9° and grades to 7 percent on Routes 59 and 346. The Pennsylvania Department of Highways has requested that the relocation of Legislative Route 630 be constructed to recreation road standards which will provide increased width but will permit curvature up to 15° and grades up to 10 percent. This relocation will not be a part of a primary system.

There is no lessening in quality of highways to be relocated for Allegheny Reservoir. The basic criterion for road relocations is to provide an equivalent substitute for the existing system, and it should be evident that no highway department will accept a system inferior to that which it now has. The relocated Route 59 will be a much more direct and shorter connection between the communities served than the existing route. The alinement of the Route 346 relocation

has not been finally determined but the amount allotted thereto in the project estimate is far the most costly of any of the alternatives under consideration.

Comment on question 10 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "It is not the present highway surface, but the highway route that is greatly superior. The reason why this very excellent water level route through the mountains is not now well developed is that the threat of Kinzua prevented. It is by far the best water level highway route through the mountains for a considerable distance. This is made clear in the Engineer Corps report. which states that the roads in the Allegheny River Valley are 'located on generally flat lying areas, adjacent to the stream bed, with only minor grades, with exceptionally good sight distances, and where maintenance problems are normal.' The report draws attention to the inferior location of the relocated road.

"When I showed sections of the profile for the new or relocated road to the Chief of Engineers, he said indignantly that they were not Engineer Corps roads, that the corps would never plan such roads. Yet he was looking at the profiles of the road planned to take the place of the water level route, with grades up to 10 percent, and with 13 miles of extra distance between Warren and Salamanca.

"Of course this relocated road cannot be a part of any primary system, for the quality would be too low. Nor does the answer draw attention to the fact that this steep crooked road would have only two lanes, except in one short stretch. To be made a decent road, especially for winter travel, it would need three or four lanes, which would require a vast amount of rock excavation and would cost $25 million to $50 million additional. That expense is avoided at present and left to the future.

"The answer to this question confuses and belabors the issue, but in no way faces it."

Question 11. 2. Does the Conewango-Cattaraugus alternative plan require any comparable shift from a superior to an inferior road? If not, was this advantage weighed in calculating the relative merits of the two proposals?

Answer. The Allegheny Reservoir will not involve a shift from a superior to an inferior road system nor would any diminution in quality be acceptable to the highway department for the road system involved in the Conewango-Cattaraugus plan.

Comment on question 11 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "The answer to this question is directly misleading. The present road has not been modernized because of the expectation that it would be moved. The route of this road, which is excellent, would be replaced by an extremely inferior route as explained above."

Question 12. VI. Dr. Morgan contends that the Corps of Engineers has inflated its estimates for carrying out the Conewango-Cattaraugus alternative plan in the following respects, among others: (1) by applying the same unit costs for construction in a mountainous area for the Kinzua Dam to construction in a level area for the Conewango-Cattaraugus alternative project; (2) by adding over $8 million in unnecessary costs for the raising of the roadbed of the Pennsylvania Railroad; and (3) by adding the cost of rebuilding highways in excess of needs:

In calculating the expense of highway relocation, did the Corps of Engineers apply the unit costs for steep mountainside rock and earth excavation, as needed in the Kinzua project, without change to excavation on flatland where there is no rock, as would be required for the Conewango-Cattaraugus alternative? Did the Corps of Engineers apply the unit costs for clearing timber on mountainsides and along a river bank (Kinzua), without change, to land-clearing operations in a level, easily accessible area (Conewango-Cattaraugus)?

Answer. In estimating the expense of high relocations for the Conewango diversion plans, prices per mile for the three classifications of highway involved were established from data furnished by the New York State Department of Public Works and from cost records for road construction in comparable terrain. Estimates for major structures have been prepared on a cost-per-square-foot basis for similar type structures. The same unit costs were not used in estimating costs of highway construction for Allegheny Reservoir and the Conewango diversion plans studied by TAMS.[1] Excluding the cost of structures and crossings, the cost per mile for Allegheny Reservoir highway relocations is 23 percent higher for State-Federal aid routes, 37 percent higher for country roads, and 50 percent higher for town roads than was used in the TAMS report for the diversion plans, indicating the effect of topography on road construction costs. Highway clearing costs are included in these figures. For large highway structures, which predominate in the Conewango plans, the estimate of structure cost per square foot is 54 percent higher for Allegheny Reservoir than was estimated by TAMS for the Conewango plans.

The same unit prices for reservoir clearing were used in estimating the cost of this item for both Allegheny Reservoir and the Conewango Reservoir. The type of clearing contemplated, that is to leave stumps intact to minimize disturbance to existing ground cover to avoid erosion, and to salvage merchantable timber, would be the same for both reservoirs. Use of heavy equipment to uproot trees and stumps is not proposed. Timber to be cleared in the Conewango Basin is not as heavily concentrated as in the Allegheny Reservoir is less extensive. The greater amount of clearing in the Allegheny Reservoir tends to be more suitable to efficient use of the salvage techniques. Much more wet-bottom conditions are involved in the Conewango area. Overall it is believed that the unit costs in the two areas would be reasonably comparable.

Comment on question 12 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "The answer states: 'The same unit costs were not used in estimating cost for highway construction for Allegheny Reservoir and the Conewango diversion plans studied by TAMS.' The question related to excavation costs on steep rocky mountainsides of the Kinzua project and for the flat land, with practically no rock, in Conewango.

"On the Kinzua project the estimated cost of excavation for rock and earth on the steep, rocky mountainsides is $1 per cubic yard. The major volume of excavation for Conewango is on level, firm land where there is no rock. Its unit cost is stated in the report to be the same as for dams and dikes. The estimated unit cost given in the report for dams and dikes is $1 per cubic yard. Thus this answer is explicitly inaccurate.

"With reference to land clearing costs, the statement of facts in the answer is so inaccurate and the conclusions so unreasonable as to be meaningless. The conditions for clearing on the flat, very firm bottom lands of Conewango are almost ideal for heavy clearing equipment. Nearly all the Conewango timber clearing is in solid blocks of one or more square miles. The Kinzua clearing is mostly on very steep, rocky slopes, or on the more than 100 miles of river banks and island shores, where trees fall into the water when cut, and have to be dragged out individually.

"The statement, 'The type of clearing contemplated, that is to leave stumps intact to minimize disturbance to existing ground cover,' and to salvage merchantable timber, 'would be the same in both,' would be inaccurate if intelligence should be used in clearing. The very flat Conewango bottoms would not suffer erosion. Large-scale land clearing operations removing the entire tree would cost less than half as much as the method prescribed for Kinzua, even if both were on flat ground. Considering the method indicated for Kinzua, Conewango clearing would probably cost not more than a third as much, and the saving would probably be much greater than the $2 million estimated. Merchantable timber would be removed ahead of the land clearing operation.

"This item, where the overestimate is about $2 million, is so clear that any effort to cover up the difference is obvious to anyone familiar with the conditions."

Question 13. 2. Although alleging that Dr. Morgan's proposal for relocation of the Pennsylvania Railroad "cannot be accepted as a sound practice" for estimating costs in comparison to the Kinzua project, has not the Corps of Engineers in fact accepted a substantially similar proposal for relocation of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad in connection with the Fishtrap Reservoir project?

Answer. The Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad operates a spur track between its mainline at Millard, Ky., and the mining town of Dunlap, Ky., in the valley to be occupied by the proposed Fishtrap Reservoir. The principal customer on this line is also served by the Norfolk & Western Railroad. Since the C. & O. line generally operates only 1 train a day on this spur to deliver from 25 to 30 empty cars and pick up an equal number of loads, and because the line is presently subject to flooding annually, the Corps of Engineers proposed abandonment and purchase of the property in lieu of relocation. The railroad has requested consideration of a plan whereby the line would be relocated to about the 8-year flood frequency level in the reservoir with a tunnel through the dam at the 14-year flood frequency level employing a 1.5-percent grade to attain this level at the dam. Fishtrap Dam will be a concrete structure and only a short tunnel would be required. Track settlement would not be a problem and the arrangement would be readily adapted to installation of a gated structure for closure during floods. The Corps of Engineers has agreed to consider the railroad's proposal provided it can be shown that the cost of relocation is not substantially in excess of the cost of abandonment and purchase and contingent upon receipt of suitable release from future claims against the Government for flooding due to operation of the reservoir.

On the other hand, the Salamanca Branch of the Pennsylvania Railroad, to which Dr. Morgan compares the Fishtrap situation, is a part of a railroad facility providing through freight traffic between Pittsburgh, Buffalo, and Rochester. This railroad operates the Salamanca Branch as a northbound one-way track for through traffic, and for local freights both ways. Considering the length of tunnel required (a minimum of 210 feet), the special construction treatment to assure stability of the structure, as well as the need for costly facilities to maintain traffic during construction, it is apparent that Fishtrap situation is not substantially similar, nor is the estimate used by Dr. Morgan for this feature considered to be representative of the work involved. From our experience in railroad relocations, there is no reason to anticipate that a scheme to pass the railroad through the dam, which would in effect provide the railroad with a lesser facility than is now available, would be acceptable to the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Comment on question 13 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "As to railroad relocation, the answer shows that the writer wholly misunderstands the situation. There would be practically no interference with traffic, as the new location would be parallel to the present track and just far enough away to prevent

[1] Tippetts, Abbett, McCarthy, Stratton.

any interruption of operation. The crossing through the dam would be on solid rock. There would be no more problem than carrying a railroad track between two walls conveniently spaced. The error of more than $8 million is so clear as to be unmistakable. The Tippetts estimate is more than 10 times higher than that made by one of the most experienced railroad relocation men in America.

"This is a striking instance of using a confusion of words to cover up an obvious error. When I brought the more economical treatment to the attention of the young man who made the estimate for the Engineer Corps consultants, his response was, 'I never thought of that.'"

Question 14. 3. Do the Corps of Engineers figures for highway relocation under the Conewango-Cattaraugus alternative include the cost of building a farm highway (M-14), serving about 30 families, to a higher standard than U.S. Route No. 62, approximately parallel and a quarter of a mile away? Do these figures also include cost for rebuilding several miles of another highway (H-31)? Would such rebuilding of H-31 be necessary if a low fill of 300 feet were made along the reservoir flow line?

Answer. The relocation plans for the roads for the Conewango plans were developed with the cooperation of the New York Department of Public Works and the supervisors of the affected county and town road systems and are based on data concerning traffic use, standard of road construction and traffic management. Undoubtedly some adjustments in highway relocations for the Conewango diversion plans could be made through negotiations with the owning agencies on the basis of further detailed engineering planning. However, such modification in plan as might result therefrom are not usually of significant overall effect. Adjustments in plan have a tendency to be offsetting, that is both increases and decreases result from detail planning. In the case of the two examples of possible savings cited in this question the following situation exists:

(a) Road H-14 is required to replace several local roads leading toward the Conewango Valley which would be inundated by the Conewango Reservoir plans. The standard of construction assumed is that published by the county and town having jurisdiction over the affected roads. This standard is not higher than that of U.S. Route 62 as alleged. A minor adjustment might be possible if more detail topography were available to justify a shorter tie-in to the existing road on an acceptable grade.

(b) Rebuilding or improving several miles of H-31 is necessary and could not be avoided by construction of 300 feet of low fill. Consideration must be give to the fact that the Conewango plans affect a well-developed road net where seven roads cross the reservoir area east to west and five roads run north to south and provide connections with the east-west crossings. This system would be completely destroyed by the Conewango plans with resultant pressure on remaining and relocated roads to handle necessary concentrations of traffic at certain points and a general change in traffic pattern. It is frequently necessary in reservoir projects to improve an existing road not within the water area to accommodate traffic previously carried by roads within the reservoir which are not relocated.

Comment on question 14 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "The answer contains many words to cover up extreme carelessness or intentional loading up of highway costs. The answer states, for instance, with reference to a local road serving about 30 families: 'This stand is not higher than that of U.S. Route No. 62 as alleged.' Personal examination on the ground makes certain that U.S. Route No. 62 running parallel and a few hundred feet distant, is of a standard far lower than that specified for this farm road serving 30 families.

"As to route H-31, the proposed relocated road would intersect the same roads as the existing road and only a small fraction of a mile away. The only point at which the reservoir would touch the existing road is a stretch of about 300 feet where it crosses a small draw. The several miles of new road parallel to the existing road, at about half a million dollars a mile, are wholly unjustified. None of the conditions mentioned as requiring this proposed expense of several million dollars exist in this case. Only a few little-traveled roads in this area would be affected, except the road in question. The answer is patently an effort to cover up a grossly improper expense. Of course, the State highway authorties would accept a gift of several millions of dollars of free highway, built by standards exceeding anything existing in that region.

Question 15. VII. We would appreciate being furnished a copy of the cost-benefit figures determined by the Corps of Engineers for the Conewango-Cattaraugus alternative plan before that proposal was rejected by the Corps of Engineers. In this connection, what value, if any was assigned, under Dr. Morgan's proposal, to the protection provided by such proposal from floods of the cities and towns along lower Conewango Creek, including Kennedy, Russell and Warren?"

Answer. Pasic data are not available to the Corps of Engineers to support a reasonable estimate of cost for the Conewango-Cattaraugus alternative proposed by Dr. Morgan, and accordingly it has not been possible to determine a firm benefit-cost ratio for that plan. To develop an accurate cost estimate for such a complex scheme involving large quantities and widely dispersed hydraulic structures and channels, many underground explorations with associated tests, and accurate surveys for use in hydraulic studies would be needed. The material included in Dr. Morgan's report provides no valid basis for a reduction in the engineering firm's estimate for plan 1 which Dr. Morgan states is the same as his plan 6 except for the outlet channel to Lake Erie. The engineering firm's estimate for plan 1 was over $142 million, or over $31 million more than the then current estimate for the authorized Allegheny Reservoir. Further refinement in that estimate which would require extensive engineering investigations is not considered to be necessary to arrive at an appraisal of Dr. Morgan's plan in relation to the authorized Allegheny Reservoir.

Dr. Morgan derives his estimate of benefits as follows:

(a) He takes all benefits estimated for Allegheny Reservoir as applicable to his plan after reducing them by a 6-percent factor to compensate for the lesser drainage area control provided by his plan. Allegheny Reservoir controls 2,180 square miles of the Allegheny River. Dr. Morgan's plan would control 1,770 square miles of Allegheny River and 280 square miles of Conewango Creek drainage area for a total of 2,050 square miles. Assuming that control in Conewango Valley is fully equivalent to an equal area in the Allegheny River (it is not, since in its present state the Conewango Valley is a natural retarding basis which produces a low flat flood crest at its confluence with the Allegheny River in contrast to the much sharper crest of the latter), the areal relationship would (as stated by Dr. Morgan) be 2,050÷2,180=94 percent.

(b) He accepts an annual benefit of $230,000 for hydroelectric power energy value from the section of the TAMS report which discusses advantages and disadvantages of the alternative plans without adjustment for the loss of 36 square miles of drainage area resulting from his upstream movement of the site of the Allegheny River diversion dam.

(c) He dervies a flood control benefit of $725,000 annually for the Ohio-Mississippi system below the mouth of the Cumberland River by assuming that discharge from Allegheny Reservoir "probably would be added to any flood in the lower river." His derivation assumes a holdout of 25,000 cubic feet per second at a unit value of $27 which is escalated to reflect price level increase to obtain his benefit of $725,000 annually. The $27 value used is the unit value of a reduction of one cubic foot per second on the crest discharge of a project flood at Cairo, Ill. This data was furnished Dr. Morgan by the Corps of Engineers and is quoted in his report of October 1958.

Dr. Morgan's derivation must assume either that continuous releases of 25,000 cubic feet per second are made from Allegheny Reservoir throughout the flood season or that releases of flood storage in that volume after individual floods would be undiminished and would coincide with flood crests in the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. Neither assumption is tenable. Examination of discharge records reveals that in essentially all major Mississippi River flood periods the releases of flood storage from Allegheny Reservoir would reach the Mississippi River on the recession side of Mississippi River floods. Moreover, the Allegheny Reservoir releases would be substantially reduced in magnitude in the 1,200-mile travel to the Mississippi. Dr. Morgan's estimate of $725,000 for benefits to his Conewango diversion plan due to "elimination" of an adverse effect of Allegheny Reservoir on the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers therefore is not realistic and cannot be recognized. If this is eliminated from his total estimated annual benefits of $6,135,000, there remains a total of $5,410,000, which is $100,000 less than the estimated benefits from the Allegheny Reservoir.

Owning to the minor nature of flood damages along lower Conewango Creek, the prevention of such damages has not been evaluated. At Kennedy, N.Y., flood damage during the maximum flood of record was limited to road flooding. At Russell, Pa., 7 dwelling units and about 20 cottages were flooded. No report of damage was made to the U.S. Weather Bureau which normally obtains such information after each flood. It is evident, therefore, that flood damage is not extensive. At Warren, the flood problem along the Conewango Creek section of the city results from the effects of backwater from Allegheny River. With Allegheny River controlled by a dam at the Kinzua site there would be no flood damages in the city of Warren from any Conewango Creek discharge of record. With Dr. Morgan's plan 6 as proposed, the small value of protecting the lower Conewango Valley would be far outweighed by increased damages to Cattaraugus Creek caused by discharge.

Comments on question 15 by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan: "To adequately discuss the many assumptions made in the answer to this question would demand excessive time and space. The benefits claimed by the corps for reservoir capacity have great limitations not existing for those described for removal of floodwater from the Ohio and Mississippi. The corps now contemplates the expenditure of many hundreds of millions of dollars for reservoir construction for reducing flood flows on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. The removal of all upper Allegheny flood flow from the Allegheny, Ohio and Mississippi Rivers would reduce the need for expenditures for such reservoirs by probably between $100 million and $200 million.

"The estimates of value from this source which earlier have been indicated for Conewango are very conservative, and probably should be tripled."

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

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like fully to support and identify myself with the very fine expression, so ably made, as is his wont, by my colleague, Senator KEATING. I, too, have been very deeply concerned by the situation, particularly as it is reflected in the Seneca Reservation, which involves an enormous amount of local concern, and properly so.

The United States has a treaty with the Seneca Nation, the Pickering Treaty, which guarantees title to this land and also provides expressly that the Senecas shall not be disturbed in their possession of the land. To follow through with this project would be to abrogate what is one of our oldest treaties.

It is true that there are a great many local reasons, but I do not make my argument upon local grounds at all, or even upon moral grounds, although they are important considerations in deciding what plan should be adopted for this situation, which affects also our neighbor and sister State.

I know that my colleague from New York, Senator KEATING, has raised a good many questions in addition to the question of the Seneca Indians, especially with reference to the plan of Dr. Arthur Morgan. We feel very deeply and sincerely that many questions have not been satisfactorily resolved, such as which of the two plans would displace fewer people, which would usurp the most land, and which would cost more. There are also other questions which have not been fully answered. There is the elementary question of whether there are any known recreational developments which would be affected. There are other questions, also.

Therefore, we have felt that further investigation, under the House joint resolution which is pending in the matter, was a good way to obtain that information. We are faced with a reality, as my colleague from New York has said, and apparently the time has gone by for these protests. Hence, my colleague and I make a further suggestion. Of course, Senator KEATING and I have been constantly active together in this matter. The suggestion is that, notwithstanding the proposed appropriations, which undoubtedly will be made, the Corps of Engineers at our request will review the elements of Dr. Morgan's plan, in the hope—and I know my colleague shares my view in this—that if they cannot accept the main parts of it—and obviously that question is decided in this appropriation bill—they may take some parts of it.

I should like to say also that my colleague from New York has been a most important factor in this fight, as is shown by his excellent speech today. I have tried to do my part, too. I can pledge to the people of that area, and to the Senecas, that we will attempt to do all we can to at least alleviate if not obviate the great disadvantages and difficulties which they contemplate from this situation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am grateful to my distinguished colleague for his remarks. He has been in the forefront of the effort to prevent this injustice to the Seneca Nation, and to bring about a solution of this problem in a manner which would be in the best interest of the Seneca Nation, the State of New York and our country.

The suggestion he has made is most worthy and I will be happy to join with him in further representations to the Corps of Engineers. They have proved to be reasonable men in the many dealings I have had with them. I have a very high regard for the Corps of Engineers. I served in the Army under a man whom I naturally believe to be the greatest Chief of Engineers of all time, Raymond A. Wheeler, sometimes known as "Spec" Wheeler. I have a very deep affection and a great admiration for him. He represents to me the Corps of Engineers at its best. I am always unhappy when I find myself in disagreement with the conclusions they have reached.

My colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has made a suggestion which he and I should follow up, and will follow up. Knowing the chairman and members of the committee as I do, I am sure the committee is anxious to arrive at the best answer. If the Corps of Engineers decides that a portion of the Conewango-Cattaraugus plan, combined with the other, is the right answer, I am certain they will be sympathetic to the report of the Corps of Engineers.

I am grateful to my colleague from New York for the great help he has been, and for the fine statement he has made on the floor of the Senate.

I am now happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the junior Senator from New York if it is true that the plan of the celebrated engineer, Arthur E. Morgan, calls for the diversion of water from the Allegheny-Ohio-Mississippi Basin into Lake Erie and thence out over Niagara Falls through the St. Lawrence?

Mr. KEATING. It is my understanding that it does.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is an extremely good suggestion, and we from Illinois would be prepared to support it, not only on its own merits, but because with added water going into Lake Erie and over Niagara Falls, generating additional power both there and along the St. Lawrence, it would help the Chicago lake diversion plan to go through.

Under those circumstances I would think that the opposition of my two good friends from New York State, which has been very heated and very effective, against lake diversion at Chicago, would be removed, because they would then have the water for the purpose they have espoused, and this would make good any loss of water to the Great Lakes system at Chicago. I wonder if my good friends will not agree that if their plan goes through, they should join us on the lake diversion plan at Chicago.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I think it would be better to consider that problem if and when it comes up.

At the moment, in view of the fact that the Kinzua site, and not the Conewango-Cattaraugus site, is virtually assured of approval, I feel that the question poses a mere academic situation.

But I assure the Senator from Illinois that any bill, which he has relating to diversion in Illinois, and, which does not, in my judgment, adversely affect New York, will always receive the most careful and sympathetic consideration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from New York to say that he wants for New York the existing flow of water plus the water which he would divert into Lake Erie—that he wants all this and heaven too?

Mr. KEATING. If the Senator from New York were of a purely selfish nature, which I know the Senator from Illinois would not charge him with being——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would not charge him with it.

Mr. KEATING. He would say, "Yes, he would like all the water he could get, with this exception: The Senator from New York also realizes that too high a water level in the Great Lakes—Lake Ontario, particularly—might cause great damage to some of the lakeshore owners. But the Senator from New York would like to have that thing done which would be best for New York, just as the Senator from Illinois does so forcefully look after the interests of his own State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that I think generally, it is a good thing to divert water from the Ohio-Mississippi system into the Lake Erie-St. Lawrence system, because the floods on the Ohio and Mississippi are very real. That basin has too much water. I think it would therefore be a distinct advantage to get this proposed flow into Lake Erie. It would also be a distinct benefit to the State of New York and our sister country to the north—Canada—in the added production of power.

Since the Senator's State of New York would be getting, under this plan, an added flow of water, he should certainly wish to share the benefits, should he not, with other States, and would permit Illinois to have an added thousand cubic feet of water per second, at Chicago for sanitary purposes? It would not affect the lake levels because, as a matter of fact, Lake Erie would, I believe, be getting more than a thousand cubic feet of water per second in this way, so the lake levels would not be adversely affected, and there would be a backup, and Lake Huron and Lake Michigan would not be hurt. On the contrary their levels would also rise.

I see the distinguished Senator from Ohio in the Chamber. He is interested in the level of Lake Erie. So this seems like a very happy circumstance in which the various States can get together, provided we of Illinois know that we will not be shortchanged in the process.

Mr. KEATING. With the concurrence of my distinguished senior colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I extend a cordial invitation to the Senator from Illinois to join with us in the letter to the Chief of Engineers, urging a reconsideration of this matter. Then we can cross the other bridge when we come to it. If New York has more water than it can use, there is no State with which we would rather share that water than the great State of Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that it is a good idea to have the various decisions synchronized, so that all who are interested may proceed simultaneously,

rather than simply to secure for New York additional quantities of water, and have no understanding as to the possibility of Chicago and Illinois getting needed water.

Mr. KEATING. That is true; but I know that none of us—least of all, the distinguished Senator from Illinois—would want to appear to be making any deal here.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; it would simply be an understanding; not a deal, but an understanding.

Mr. KEATING. We would not have it appear that any agreement was being entered into with respect to water to get support for our project. That would be the farthest from our thoughts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a disciple of Woodrow Wilson, I believe in open covenants, openly arrived at.

I make this statement on the floor because I think it will help to reconcile the interests of the lake States. The Senator's proposal will put water in the lake system, into the Niagara, and into the St. Lawrence. Since there is to be an addition there, there can also be a subtraction at the Chicago River. I bring this matter to the attention of the Senator from New York because I think these are constructive questions which he has raised, but they become clearly desirable only on condition that all may share in the benefits, and that the rest of the Nation is not to be regarded as a mere tributary to the State of New York which will be benefited.

Mr. KEATING. The statement which I believe is implicit in the remarks of the Senator from Illinois is one the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I would be glad to include in our letter to the Chief of Engineers. I will be pleased to submit a draft of our letter to the Senator from Illinois for his perusal with the hope that he will find it desirable to join with us in our endeavor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Some months ago I asked the Engineers to go into this matter. I did it out of sympathy for the Seneca Nation and also out of some anticipation that we might get a better distribution of water for the benefit of the Great Lakes system and for Chicago.

Mr. KEATING. If we were to enlist the help of the Senator from Illinois, I am sure it would be useful.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, with the permission of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I should like to make a brief statement on another aspect of the bill which affects New York. I asked the Senator from Louisiana about this, and he is agreeable to my proceeding on this subject.

Mr. President, the consideration by the Senate of the bill appropriating funds for the operation of the executive branch of the Federal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, affords an appropriate opportunity to record a deep and growing concern on my part and on the part of my colleagues representing the State of New York in Congress regarding the increasingly apparent trend affecting both the Nation and particularly that part of the Nation which lies along the eastern seaboard.

The trend is simply this: A disproportionate flow to the western part of the country of federally sponsored scientific and defense projects, in the form of contracts and Government-owned facilities. This includes military projects, contracts related to the exploration of space, and atomic energy facilities and installations. Even more disturbing to me is that this is a trend which is accelerating.

I fully appreciate and respect the competence and fairness of the judgments which are brought to bear by officials of the executive branch of the Government in the selection of the location of individual contracts and projects, and I do not dispute in the main the technical considerations which govern these individual actions. I am not, therefore, questioning the wisdom or justification of any individual action of any agency of the executive branch of the Government. I do, however, suggest that the cumulative effect of all of these project location actions during the past several years has resulted in a flow of Federal business to the western as opposed to the eastern part of the Nation.

There are undoubtedly many excellent reasons why this has been the case, among them the consideration that many defense-oriented industries are situated in less populous and open spaces of the west where experimental scientific work can be conveniently pursued.

I do not wish to suggest any diminution in the importance of the technical and economic criteria which are taken into account in the location of any specific project. Nevertheless, that there is perhaps another equally important criterion that should apply in those instances where purely technical and economic considerations do not in themselves suggest a clear answer to the question of the location of any particular project or work. This vital criterion is the impact of Federal procurement on our overall national interest. Such a criterion is nothing more than a realization that Federal contracts and federally owned facilities affect the health and vigor of the overall national economy.

I have in mind in this connection a specific provision of the appropriations bill which is now before this body. This provision appropriates funds for a $24 million nuclear test reactor facility to be constructed by the Atomic Energy Commission. That is dealt with in this bill.

The State of New York, in accordance with its official atomic development program, proposed to the Atomic Energy Commission that this facility, to perform atomic energy irradiation services for private industry as well as the Federal Government, be constructed in the northeastern United States where no such facility now exists. To help make this possible, the State of New York proposed that it acquire and make available a site within the State at which the proposed facility could be located, or, alternatively, proposed that the State participate financially in the project to the extent of the cost of a site if the project were located at an already existing Federal installation within the State.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York speak louder?

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry; I was trying to move along quickly, in deference to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand; but the Senator was referring to the construction of works in Idaho. There are strong reasons why they should be built in Idaho.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall bring the Senator up to date.

The main point is that we believe there are other criteria where there is not such a clear indication as with respect to the scientific and economic criteria, and that they ought, more and more, to come into consideration in an effort, at least, to moderate the tremendous flow West which has taken place with respect to the location of particular installations and the investment of particular procurements.

In this respect, we gave as an example—and that is what I was just saying—the nuclear test reactor facility to be constructed by the AEC—a $24 million reactor. I was about to point out that the State of New York, which has an official atomic energy development program of its own, propose to the Atomic Energy Commission that this particular nuclear reactor facility be constructed in the Northeastern United States. The State of New York offered to make available a site within the State, or, alternatively, proposed that the State of New York participate financially in the project. In other words, we offered a site or to share the cost of the installation if it was placed on the site of another Federal installation already in the State.

The New York congressional delegation—as is true of other State delegations—operates in matters of this kind regardless of party, and has endorsed and supported this proposal unanimously.

The Atomic Energy Commission has notified us that it intends to proceed with the construction of the proposed project at its established reservation in the State of Idaho, where two similar facilities, serving private industry, as well as the Federal Government, are already in being.

The Atomic Energy Commission, in the opinion of our people in New York—and we have a program there with a commissioner and an organization—has given logical reasons in justification for locating this facility in Idaho. We do not wish to take issue with the Commission with respect to those reasons. However, we are concerned with the effect of the decision, when taken together with the effect of a series of related decisions, on the prospects of permitting the substantial industry in the northeast to play an equitable role in atomic development in the Nation.

Recently we have seen the Atomic Energy Commission begin the construction of a $15 million atomic power prototype reactor of advanced experimental design at the Commission's reservation in the

State of Washington. We have seen also the commencement of construction of an $18.5 million submarine reactor prototype at the Commission's reservation at Idaho, and we have seen the commencement of work on a $145 million plutonium production reactor, convertible to electric power generation in the amount of 700,000 kilowatts, in the State of Washington. Congress in this session has received a request for authorization of a $115 million nuclear particle accelerator in California—an authorization that has not been passed, but which probably will be reconsidered next year.

In an equivalent period in the field of atomic energy, only a handful of relatively small projects have been initiated in the east—totaling millions of dollars in estimated cost.

We are calling attention to the trend represented by these instances. We do not challenge the individual decisions. The source of our concern and that of our colleagues is the trend; and it is likewise the source of the concern of eastern industry. It goes well beyond the example I have used in regard to atomic energy installations, for this trend affects many other aspects of Federal military and scienttfic endeavors, as well.

I call attention to this trend at this time, in making this statement on the floor of the Senate, as an invitation to thoughtful consideration by Members of the Congress, including the very distinguished and able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who has been so great a leader in this field, and also by the scientific and military agencies of the Federal Government.

I think some agencies of the Federal Government make too little effort to make suggestions which will result in having our people sharpen their pencils and use their best brains and organize the industries in their own States in such a way as to come abreast of the increasing tendency to remove to the West, rather than to "give a break" to the Northeast and to New York. This is nothing but a caveat, as we lawyers say—a plea in that regard, and pointing out that the trend is accelerating. That is the purpose of these remarks.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course I appreciate the way in which the Senator from New York has presented this matter. When the matter of the reactor in Idaho came up, I am sure the Commission took into consideration the fact that it had two other installations there which would work in harmony with this one, and that the Navy already was active in the area, with facilities which would require the use of this reactor.

Let me say to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], who is now in the Chamber, and who is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, that he passed on this item, as did others, without regard to where the installation might be located. So far as I know, he did not suggest that it be located in Idaho. It has been located there because the Atomic Energy Commission, after surveying all the facilities, thought that was the proper place. I am happy that the Senator recognizes that that was the determining factor on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the head of our New York Office of Atomic Development is Oliver Townsend, an extremely competent person, and today I have been expressing his views. He is very highly respected.

I am very glad the Senator spoke so temperately on this question, and I hope he will give some consideration to the policy question we have raised.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I hope New York will allow its power authority to work with the Commission. Thus far, it has dealt with private industry.

Mr. JAVITS. I certainly will communicate with our people on that subject, and then will communicate directly with the Senator as to their reply.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I want to express my complete approval of and agreement with the remarks made by my distinguished colleague.

It is not for us to substitute our judgment for that of those who have so thoroughly studied this problem as regards the location of this specific plant. But we do feel strongly that atomic development is a subject with respect to which geographical considerations should, to an appropriate degree, enter into our decisions.

As my colleague knows, the entire subject of defense projects and contracts for other types of Federal installations has concerned me very deeply ever since I first came to the Senate. So far as New York has been concerned, the amounts of our defense contracts have declined over a period of 4 years, until now all of us agree that something must be done to try to reverse the continuing trend. I agree with my colleague that the word "trend" is the key to this entire issue.

Perhaps by our joint efforts, we have at least stemmed the tide, for there has been some improvement in the situation, insofar as our State is concerned, over the past several years.

I do not wish to be understood as considering this matter entirely from a parochial point of view. Once or twice several of my colleagues from California have indicated that they feel this is our point of view. I do not wish to be understood as saying that any contracts for these installations should be let on a solely geographical basis. That would not be appropriate. But I do believe that it is entirely proper for us to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate, as my distinguished colleague has again done; and by doing so I believe he has performed a definite service to the people of the State of New York and to all the rest of us.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President——

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I appreciate the alertness of and the interest displayed by the Senators from New York, in trying to get larger participation by the State of New York in the development of atomic energy.

But I wish to point out that a few years ago, when the National Testing Reactor Station was established on the sagebrush plains in isolated sections of Idaho, the site was selected primarily because of its isolation from the congested population areas of the country. It was then recognized, as it is today, that many hazards are involved in the development of atomic energy; and that is probably the basic reasons why so many of these reactors are being located in Idaho.

I want to associate myself with the comments made by my colleague from New Mexico that political considerations probably play a very minor part in the selection of sites for the building of reactors. In the case of the one to which reference has been made in the debate, approval was given and funds were provided by the appropriate committees without knowing in advance where the location would be. The fact that subsequently Idaho was selected for the building of that particular reactor was not the result of any political pressure or geographical considerations, but primarily because of the need of building such reactors in an area far removed from the congested centers of population.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure the representations made by the distinguished Senator from Idaho are correct, but I would not want them to downgrade in any way his very great effectiveness as a U.S. Senator, which I appreciate, whether it benefits or does not benefit the particular interests of my State.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been examining my mail, and I have a letter which has some pertinency to the subject. I shall not identify the names involved, but the letter reads:

> The May 25 issue of ---------- newspaper quoted Senator X as stating that since 1936 his State received $700 million in Federal grants in return for tax contributions by the same State of only $312 million. God forbid that this information be kept from the national public. Should our leadership permit this type of thing to continue we are worthy of no more than national bankruptcy. Even if this information is only 50 percent correct, as the result of political expediency, it is still criminal that it should apply.

I may say it does not apply to Idaho.

Mr. KEATING. Nor would it apply to New York.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Nor does it apply to New York.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, New York, like Ohio, I believe, always pays more taxes than it receives from the Federal Government. Many times that has been a source of great concern to the Senators from New York. It is why in connection with all Federal aid projects we must face conflicting considerations, as does the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, I understand. I think our States are alike in that respect.

Mr. KEATING. They are alike, except it is worse for New York.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded, for purposes of amendment, as original text, and that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by agreement to this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 18, after the word "construction", to strike out "$10,895,800" and insert "$13,062,800".

On page 4, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "$662,622,300" and insert "$737,884,600", and in line 20, after the word "appropriated", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That not to exceed $200,000 of the funds herein or hereafter provided for 'Construction, general,' shall be available for the construction of necessary bank stabilization and other protective measures on Red River in the vicinity of the St. Louis Southwestern Railroad and the Arkansas State highway bridges at Garland City, Arkansas".

On page 6, line 18, after "(33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g-1)", to strike out "$4,575,000" and insert "$74,896,000".

On page 8, line 20, after the word "expended", to strike out "$4,575,000" and insert "$5,376,000", and at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "$3,375,000" and insert "$4,426,000".

On page 9, after line 8, to insert:

"GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (SPECIAL CURRENCY PROGRAM)

"For purchase of foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104(k) of that Act, to remain available until expended, $4,522,000, which shall be available to purchase only those currencies which the Treasury Department shall determine to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

On page 9, line 22, after the word "expended", to strike out "$166,444,880" and insert "$173,855,200", and on page 10, line 11, after the word "customer", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That not to exceed $25,000 shall be available toward investigation and the emergency rehabilitation of the Dalton Gardens, Avondale, and Hayden Lake Unit, Rathdrum Prairie Irrigation Projects, Idaho, to be repaid in full under conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior."

On page 10, line 22, after the word "law", to strike out "$31,000,000" and insert "$31,443,000".

On page 11, line 15, after the word "program", to strike out "$9,742,825" and insert "$11,642,825".

On page 12, line 2, after the word "Reclamation", to strike out "$4,200,000" and insert "$4,320,000".

On page 16, after line 21, to insert:

"After July 31, 1960, the position of Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation shall have the same annual rate of compensation as that provided for positions listed in 5 U.S.C. 2205(b), so long as held by the present incumbent."

On page 17, line 11, after the word "energy", to strike out "$10,750,000" and insert "$10,850,000".

On page 19, line 2, after the word "only", to strike out "$1,200,000" and insert "$1,250,000".

On page 21, line 9, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$2,450,560,000" and insert "$2,452,960,000", and on page 22, line 11, after the word "annum", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That not more than $58,000,000 shall be used for the airplane propulsion reactor program".

On page 22, line 21, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$208,500,000" and insert "$223,000,000", and on page 23, line 11, after the word "program", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That not to exceed $13,000,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to the appropriation "Other Procurement, Navy", solely for construction of power reactor plants for the Antarctic."

On page 25, line 20, to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,600,000".

On page 26, line 3, after the numerals "1962", to strike out "$1,200,000" and insert "$1,300,000".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Appropriations. As is customary, the Subcommittee on Public Works divided itself into three subcommittees for the consideration of the pending bill. The portion of the public works appropriation bill dealing with reclamation and the power-marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior was handled by my good and able friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is also the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The portion of the bill covering the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority was handled by my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I handled the portion of the bill dealing with the civil functions of the Department of the Army.

The hearings on this bill started on February 16 and continued through June 16. The subcommittee held 40 sessions for the purpose of taking testimony, and 5 executive sessions for the purpose of marking up the bill. The subcommittee heard 1,223 witnesses, which included representatives of various organizations; 868 of the witnesses appeared before the subcommittee dealing with civil functions; all but 30 of the remaining witnesses appeared before the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Arizona. The hearings comprise four volumes, which contain 3,642 pages of testimony.

Mr. President, before marking up the civil functions portion of this bill, I reviewed every project that was presented to the subcommittee, budgeted or unbudgeted. I went through every single request made for planning or construction. After all the requests were made, I called the engineers back to obtain their views on the projects presented to the subcommittee. The purpose was to find out whether all the requests which were made by outside witnesses could be handled economically by the Corps of Engineers and whether the corps had the capability to undertake the projects submitted for consideration.

In order to balance the bill, and in order to take care of many worthy areas not previously included in the bill, I recommended to the subcommittee the inclusion of a number of projects that had been requested by witnesses from all over the country, and by Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I hope that the Senate will agree to the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations and that it will be possible to retain the majority of the projects in the conference with the House.

The House committee added 3 unbudgeted construction projects, 2 resumption of construction projects, and 17 unbudgeted planning items; and increased the amount recommended for planning on 1 project. The House sent us a bill which on its face was under the budget, but in order to attain that goal the House reduced or eliminated funds requested in the budget on 20 items for a total reduction of $51,440,700, including a reduction in the estimate for slippage and savings from $40 million to $60 million. The committee was requested to restore $45,424,000 of the House reduction. During the hearings the Engineers offered reductions in the budget estimates of $6,016,700, which accounts for the difference between the House reduction in the budget and the amount the Senate committee was requested to restore.

In order to present a bill below the budget, the House committee recommended appropriations less than the budget estimate for many of the projects for which the Corps of Engineers has requested restoration. These restorations are part of the increases recommended in the bill now before the Senate. Based on past experience on large construction projects, the Corps of Engineers finds that it is safe to underfinance these projects by about 5 percent. These slippages result, for example, where because of bad weather or for other reasons, a contractor may not be able to do all of the work on schedule.

The House further underfinanced the program by an additional $20 million, which has the effect of reducing all appropriations by a proportionate amount which may average about 3 percent. Of course, that is in addition to the 5 percent underfinancing provided in the budget recommendations.

The House committee provided for three new construction starts which involve a future commitment of $10,690,000. The 34 additional new construction starts recommended by the Senate involve a future commitment of $523,312,000. The bill as reported to the Senate, therefore, represents a future commitment above the budget recommendation of $534,002,000. This amount is less than the amount recommended by the President for construction for fiscal year 1961 and is about 1 year's construction program.

Except for the fact that for the past several years the Congress has added un-

budgeted new starts, the construction program of the Corps of Engineers would have dried up.

Considering the present active program of the Corps of Engineers, the budget estimate provides for the completion of 48 projects, for the initiation of 26 new construction starts, and 7 reimbursements to local interests. The future commitment of the projects recommended in the bill, I repeat, is therefore, about 1 year's construction at the rate recommended in the budget. The bill as reported by the House would contemplate a material reduction in the number of continuing projects which would carry over into fiscal year 1962, at a time when the tempo of the water resource program should be accelerated to meet the water requirements of the 1975–80 period.

Last year when the committee recommended an accelerated program of water resources, it had an estimate from the Department of Commerce which predicted a population of 216 million by 1975. The Department's current estimate is for a population of 230 million by 1980 and of about 226 million in 1975. The Department's current estimate of the water requirement of the United States is 322.9 billion gallons per day for 1960, 449.7 billion gallons per day for 1975, and 494.1 billion gallons per day by 1980. These predictions are based on the assumption that increased productivity per man-hour will be partially balanced by fewer working hours per week; that a larger part of the increased productivity per man-hour will be accomplished by automation, which will increase unit requirements for electric power and water; and that many new products will be produced which are more water demanding. This upward trend in water requirements, however, will be largely balanced by a growing practice of recirculation and reuse and an increased use of brackish water, which will reduce fresh water requirements.

The estimates of the Department of Commerce are definitely conservative, and any revision of the estimates undoubtedly would be upward. It is apparent, therefore, that with respect to water resource projects it is no longer a question of, Can we afford them? It is a question of, Can we afford to delay any longer an increase in the rate of construction to meet the known requirements of the next 15 to 20 years?

The pending bill is a fair bill that deserves the support of the Senate and of the Congress.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list showing the new construction starts added by the Senate under "Construction, general." I wish to say that the total future commitment added by the Senate for these projects is $473,889,000. One project, the Lower Monumental lock and dam, in the State of Washington, accounts for $145,415,000 of that amount. We shall try to get the House to agree to accept this most important project.

There are two or three other projects which account for the major portion of the future commitment recommended by the Senate committee. For instance, there are the Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. The committee in previous years have recommended funds to start quite a few locks and dams along the Ohio River. Some of those projects have advanced to the point where we have improved the navigation prospects of the Ohio River greatly. I am very hopeful that we can now start building some locks on the Monongahela River, which will improve transportation to many parts of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and the States along the Ohio River.

Another project which we added was the Fishtrap Reservoir in Kentucky; this is a very important project. This project accounts for over $40 million, of the $473,889,000 to which I referred a moment ago.

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

New construction starts added by the Senate

Project	Estimated cost	Appropriated to date	Recommended	Balance to complete
Holt lock and dam, Alabama	$33,600,000	$226,000	$549,000	$32,825,000
Juneau Harbor, Alaska	1,970,000	12,000	1,958,000	
Gila River-Camelsback Reservoirs, Ariz	1,700,000	189,000	150,000	1,361,000
Arkansas River bank stabilization	68,797,000	354,000	4,000,000	64,443,000
Millwood Reservoir, Ark	54,400,000	546,000	500,000	53,354,000
Red River at Garland City	1,750,000		200,000	1,300,000
Bodega Bay, Calif	480,000		405,000	75,000
Kahului Harbor, Hawaii	962,000	154,000	808,000	
Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind. (Cargill docks)	225,000		225,000	
Mason J. Niblack levee, Indiana	3,300,000	130,000	100,000	3,070,000
Salamonie Reservoir, Ind	16,400,000	174,000	400,000	15,770,000
West Terre Haute, Ind	502,000	34,000	100,000	368,000
Fishtrap Reservoir, Ky	41,700,000	326,000	300,000	40,725,000
Eastport Harbor, Maine	605,000	10,000	300,000	295,000
York Harbor, Maine	401,000	10,000	391,000	
Hammond Bay Harbor, Mich	1,170,000	43,000	200,000	927,000
Pascagoula Harbor, Miss	850,000		850,000	
Salt Creek and tributaries	17,200,000	158,000	500,000	16,380,000
New York Harbor, Ocean to Bayside Channel, N.Y	1,880,000	13,000	500,000	1,367,000
Ocracoke Inlet, N.C	4,648,000	25,000	185,000	4,438,000
Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	57,600,000	174,000	500,000	56,926,000
Broken Bow Reservoir, Okla	10,700,000	287,000	500,000	9,913,000
Rainier Drainage District, Oregon	612,000	43,000	200,000	369,000
Sauvie Island Drainage District, Oregon	460,000	65,000	150,000	245,000
Stillhouse Hollow Dam, Tex	32,400,000	380,000	500,000	31,520,000
Lower Monumental lock and dam, Washington	151,000,000	2,085,000	3,500,000	145,415,000
Opekiska lock and dam, West Virginia	24,100,000	272,000	500,000	23,328,000
Siuslaw River south jetty, Oregon	1,100,000		150,000	950,000
Umpqua River, Oreg	1,500,000		150,000	1,350,000
Small navigation projects			250,000	
Total		17,567,000		473,889,000

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing the amounts recommended by the committee for construction, whether budgeted or unbudgeted, the amount allowed by the House and the budget estimate for each project under "Construction, general"; flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries; construction and rehabilitation, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation; the loan program; and Upper Colorado River Basin fund.

Mr. President, the bill as reported to the Senate amounts to $4,030,010,605. It exceeds the budget estimates by $25,869,425, and exceeds the amount recommended by the House by $115,211,620.

Mr. President, when the budget estimate was sent to the Congress by the President, the omnibus bill had not been passed, and consequently recommendations for funds for many worthy projects in that bill were not presented to him. I feel confident that many of the projects which have been considered by the committee and which have been recommended to the Senate would no doubt have been included in the original estimates of the President, if they had been presented. As I said, including all the additions made by both the House and Senate, the bill as a whole exceeds the budget estimates by only $25,869,425.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE I.—*Army, civil functions, Corps of Engineers, construction, general, fiscal year 1961*

	Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		Amount allowed by House		Amount recommended by committee	
				Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Alabama:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N)	Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	$14,400,000	$1,808,000	$3,325,000		$3,325,000		$3,325,000	
(N)	*Holt lock and dam*	33,600,000	226,000		$378,000		$549,000	149,000	$400,000
(N)	*Jackson lock and dam	21,200,000	16,791,000	4,409,000		4,238,000		4,238,000	
(P)	*Millers Ferry lock and dam*	53,200,000	249,000				200,000		200,000
(P)	Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	87,000,000	34,587,000	20,178,000		20,178,000		20,178,000	
	Alaska:								
(N)	*Douglas Harbor*	370,000	[1] 6,000					(2)	
(FC)	*Fairbanks*	10,800,000	[1] 60,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	*Homer Harbor, small-boat harbor	550,000	[1] 8,000	542,000				542,000	
(N)	*Juneau Harbor*	1,970,000	[1] 12,000					1,958,000	
(N)	*Ninilchik Harbor*	234,000	[1] 5,000					(2)	
(N)	*Seldovia Harbor— small-boat harbor	568,000	[1] 20,000	548,000		548,000		548,000	
	Arizona:								
(FC)	*Alamo Reservoir*	10,800,000	350,000		175,000		175,000		175,000
(FC)	*Gila River-Camelsback Reservoir*	1,700,000	189,000					150,000	
(FC)	*Tucson*	4,740,000	111,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
	Arkansas:								
(N)	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:								
	(a) Emergency bank stabilization	37,103,000	32,103,000	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
	(b) *Other bank stabilization*	68,797,000	354,000					4,000,000	
(N)	*Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma (general studies)*	3,358,000	2,977,000		381,000		381,000		381,000
(N)	*Arkansas River and tributaries, navigation locks and dams, Arkansas and Oklahoma*	489,000,000	422,000						200,000
(P)	Beaver Reservoir	56,100,000	2,854,000	2,800,000		2,800,000		2,800,000	
(P)	Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 5 and 6), Ark. and Mo	6,830,000	1,755,000	3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000	
(P)	*Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 7 and 8), Ark. and Mo*	7,900,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(P)	Dardanelle lock and dam	94,600,000	7,799,000	6,100,000		6,100,000		6,100,000	
(P)	*DeGray Reservoir*	33,700,000	311,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
(FC)	*Gillham Reservoir*	10,100,000	84,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(P)	Greers Ferry Reservoir	50,300,000	13,988,000	14,143,000		14,143,000		14,143,000	
(FC)	*McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark., and Tex	1,390,000	722,000	668,000		668,000		668,000	
(FC)	*Millwood Reservoir*	54,400,000	546,000					500,000	
(N)	*Ouachita River, 9-foot project, Arkansas and Louisiana* [3]	43,590,000	240,000						150,000
(FC)	*Red River at Garland City* [3]	1,750,000						200,000	
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex	10,000,000	8,128,000	700,000		700,000		700,000	
	Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Missouri.)								
	California:								
(FC)	*Bear Creek*	2,600,000	23,000		70,000		70,000		70,000
(FC)	Black Butte Reservoir	18,000,000	3,462,000	5,900,000		5,900,000		5,900,000	
(R)	*Bodega Bay*	480,000						405,000	
(FC)	*Carbon Canyon Dam and channels	5,150,000	3,943,000	1,207,000		1,207,000		1,207,000	
(FC)	Devil, East Twin, Warm, and Lytle Creeks	7,800,000	4,808,000	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(N)	Halfmoon Bay Harbor (Pillar Point)	5,210,000	2,149,000	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	318,000,000	207,509,000	13,100,000		13,100,000		13,100,000	
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	13,100,000	3,832,000	1,260,000		1,260,000		1,260,000	
(FC)	Middle Creek	3,310,000	1,559,000	403,000		403,000		403,000	
(FC)	*Mill Creek levees	910,000	407,000	503,000		503,000		503,000	
(FC)	*Mojave River Reservoir* [3]	3,200,000	[1] 130,000						50,000
(FC)	New Hogan Reservoir	17,600,000	1,760,000	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(N)	*Noyo River and Harbor (breakwater)*	2,390,000	14,000						(56,000)
(FC)	*Oroville Reservoir*	50,000,000	104,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Pine Flat Reservoir	40,850,000	39,131,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N)	Playa Del Rey Inlet and Harbor	2,320,000	1,642,000	154,000		154,000		154,000	
(N)	*Port Hueneme Harbor	5,500,000	3,078,000	2,422,000		2,422,000		2,422,000	
(FC)	Russian River Reservoir	14,002,000	11,483,000	400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River	78,200,000	64,009,000	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	24,200,000	4,715,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	*Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff*	1,850,000	[1] 8,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(N)	Sacramento River deep-water ship channel	43,400,000	21,331,000	8,000,000		5,000,000		8,000,000	
(FC)	*San Antonio and Chino Creeks	10,900,000	9,564,000	1,336,000		1,336,000		1,336,000	
(FC)	San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek	4,040,000	434,000	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	*San Lorenzo Creek	5,150,000	3,542,000	1,608,000		1,608,000		1,608,000	
(FC)	*Santa Clara River	2,140,000	1,835,000	305,000		305,000		305,000	
(N)	*Santa Cruz Harbor*	1,860,000	110,000	300,000				300,000	
(FC)	Santa Maria Valley levees	7,190,000	2,379,000	1,850,000		1,850,000		1,850,000	
(FC)	Success Reservoir	14,200,000	11,612,000	2,588,000		2,588,000		2,588,000	
(FC)	Terminus Reservoir	21,500,000	11,488,000	6,300,000		6,300,000		6,300,000	
	Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada. (See Nevada.)								
(FC)	*Tuolumne River Reservoir (new Don Pedro)*	3,170,000	64,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
	Colorado:								
(FC)	*Trinidad Reservoir*	20,400,000	168,000		185,000		185,000		185,000
	Connecticut:								
(FC)	*Black Rock Reservoir, Branch Brook* [3]	3,550,000	[1] 10,000						75,000
(N)	*Bridgeport Harbor 1958 Act (35-foot main harbor)*	3,513,000	[1] 15,000	750,000		750,000		750,000	
(FC)	*East Branch Reservoir*	2,010,000	[1] 20,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Hall Meadow Brook Reservoir	2,210,000	264,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	*Hancock Brook Reservoir* [3]	2,520,000	[1] 20,000						75,000
(FC)	Mad River Reservoir	5,970,000	286,000	870,000		870,000		870,000	
(FC)	*Northfield Brook Reservoir* [3]	1,620,000	[1] 10,000						60,000
(FC)	*Pawcatuck* [3]	419,000	[1] 10,000						38,000
(FC)	*Thomaston Reservoir	14,400,000	12,853,000	1,547,000		1,547,000		1,547,000	
	Delaware:								
(N)	Inland Waterway Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland:								
	Canal improvement (part II)	98,840,000	377,000		103,000		103,000		103,000
(BE)	*Rehoboth Beach to Indian River Inlet (reimbursement)*	519,000	[1] 5,000	75,000		75,000		75,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Army, civil functions, Corps of Engineers, construction, general, fiscal year 1961*—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		Amount allowed by House		Amount recommended by committee	
				Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Florida:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	Central and Southern Florida	$244,200,000	$57,312,000	$10,000,000		$10,000,000		$11,500,000	
(N)	*Cross Florida Barge Canal*	168,000,000	1,505,000						$160,000
(N)	Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	8,800,000	935,000	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami	19,800,000	7,584,000					400,000	
(BE)	*Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach County (reimbursement)*	410,000	[1] 27,000	118,200		118,200		118,200	
(N)	*Little Manatee River (deferred for restudy)*	158,000			($12,000)		($12,000)		(12,000)
(N)	*Port Everglades Harbor, 1958 act*	8,330,000	66,000	750,000		750,000		750,000	
(N)	*Tampa Harbor, 30-, 34-, and 36-foot channels	14,220,000	14,103,000	117,000		117,000		117,000	
	Georgia:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(P)	*Carters Dam*	38,000,000	[1] 49,000						150,000
	Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
(P)	Hartwell Reservoir, Georgia and South Carolina	94,600,000	54,815,000	21,375,000		21,375,000		21,375,000	
(—)	Savannah River below Augusta	3,710,000	2,073,000	900,000		900,000		900,000	
	Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
	Hawaii:								
(N)	*Hilo Harbor* [3]	7,000,000							100,000
(N)	*Honolulu Harbor	3,810,000	2,594,000	1,216,000		1,216,000		1,216,000	
(N)	Kahului Harbor [3]	962,000	154,000					808,000	
(FC)	*Kawainui Swamp*	1,090,000	84,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
	Idaho:								
(P)	*Bruces Eddy Reservoir (construction not yet authorized)*	132,000,000	1,380,000						600,000
(FC)	Columbia River local protection: *Blackfoot River*	340,000	66,000					(3)	
	Illinois:								
(FC)	Beardstown	5,970,000	2,900,000	700,000		700,000		700,000	
(N)	*Calumet Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (includes work not yet authorized)*	7,720,000	[1] 27,000						70,000
(R)	*Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana (breakwater)*	2,200,000			(31,000)		(31,000)		(31,000)
(N)	*Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind. (Cargill docks only)*	225,000						225,000	
(FC)	*Campbells Island*	512,000	60,000	175,000				175,000	
(FC)	Carlyle Reservoir	40,700,000	4,379,000	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(BA)	Chicago, Burlington & Quincy RR. bridge, including channel change	3,420,000	2,517,000	752,000		752,000		752,000	
(FC)	Clear Creek drainage and levee district	4,934,000	4,404,000	270,000		270,000		270,000	
(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity	23,700,000	13,451,000	2,476,000		2,476,000		2,476,000	
(FC)	*Freeport (deferred for restudy)*	1,090,000	48,000		(10,000)		(10,000)		(10,000)
(FC)	*Henderson County Drainage District No. 2*	930,000	[1] 2,000						50,000
(FC)	Hunt Drainage District and Lima Lake Drainage District	5,680,000	1,080,000	900,000		900,000		900,000	
(N)	Illinois Waterway Calumet Sag Channel (part I)	89,600,000	32,432,000	9,500,000		7,500,000		9,500,000	
(BE)	*Kenilworth (reimbursement)*	12,000	[1] 1,000	5,200		5,200		5,200	
(N)	Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and lock and dam 26, dam 27, Illinois and Missouri	6,640,000	1,345,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(N)	Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.: Regulating works	62,500,000	45,397,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(R)	*Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers (repair dikes and revetments)*	4,641,000			(20,000)		(20,000)		(20,000)
(N)	Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.:								
	*Rectification of damages	5,123,000	2,463,000	2,660,000		2,660,000		2,660,000	
(FC)	*Shelbyville Reservoir*	18,500,000	147,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC)	*Sny Island Levee District*	8,880,000	[1] 4,000						100,000
(FC)	*Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Drainage and Levee District*	4,400,000	59,000		111,000		111,000		111,000
(FC)	The Sny Basin	22,500,000	1,866,000	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	Wood River drainage and levee district	15,600,000	12,226,000	1,180,000		1,180,000		1,180,000	
	Indiana:								
	Calumet Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)								
(N)	*Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky*	68,400,000	[1] 71,000				150,000		150,000
(FC)	Evansville	13,600,000	2,627,000	450,000		100,000		100,000	
(FC)	*Huntington Reservoir*	15,100,000	52,000		125,000		125,000		125,000
(N)	*Indiana Harbor* [3]	986,000	[1] 12,000						25,000
(FC)	*Levee Unit No. 5, Wabash River*	10,500,000	96,000						25,000
	Louisville lock and dam—Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)								
	Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(FC)	*Mason J. Niblack levee*	3,300,000	130,000					100,000	
(FC)	*Mississinewa Reservoir*	23,300,000	174,000		156,000		156,000		156,000
(FC)	*Monroe Reservoir*	5,260,000	134,000	275,000		275,000		275,000	
(FC)	*Salamonie Reservoir*	16,400,000	174,000		56,000		56,000	400,000	56,000
(FC)	*Sugar Creek levee*	398,000	18,000		15,000		15,000		15,000
(FC)	*West Terre Haute*	502,000	34,000					100,000	
	Iowa:								
(N)	*Decatur Bend Cutoff, Iowa and Nebraska* [3]	155,000				155,000		155,000	
(N)	*Dubuque Harbor* [3]	40,000	[1] 2,000					(3)	
(FC)	*Floyd River and tributaries*	10,400,000	289,000	791,900		791,900		791,900	
(FC)	*Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2*	1,570,000	75,000		45,000		45,000		45,000
(FC)	Little Sioux River	15,500,000	9,197,000	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska (active portion only)	26,880,000	26,880,000				175,000		175,000
(N)	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:								
	(*a*) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr	112,000,000	65,022,000	5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000	
	(*b*) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	115,000,000	102,546,000	2,800,000		2,800,000		2,800,000	
	(*c*) Kansas City to the mouth	123,000,000	115,095,000	3,475,000		3,475,000		3,475,000	
	*Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota. (See Nebraska.)								
(FC)	Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13	4,000,000	1,231,000	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC)	*Rathbun Reservoir*	21,000,000	86,000				130,000		130,000
(FC)	Red Rock Reservoir	72,000,000	2,730,000	3,600,000		3,600,000		3,600,000	
(FC)	*Saylorville Reservoir*	49,300,000	280,000		165,000		165,000		165,000

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Army, civil functions, Corps of Engineers, construction, general, fiscal year 1961*—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		Amount allowed by House		Amount recommended by committee	
				Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Kansas:								
(FC)	Council Grove Reservoir	$13,700,000	$571,000	$2,000,000		$2,000,000		$2,000,000	
(FC)	*Frankfort*	1,130,000	60,000		$20,000		$20,000		$20,000
(FC)	John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir	32,800,000	2,162,000	3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC)	Kansas City, Kans. and Mo	44,100,000	39,364,000					500,000	
(FC)	*Lawrence*	3,150,000	[1] 7,000						50,000
(FC)	Manhattan	3,100,000	538,000	800,000		800,000		800,000	
(FC)	*Marion Reservoir*	8,240,000	45,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	*Milford Reservoir*	60,600,000	522,000	1,000,000			250,000	500,000	
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC)	Ottawa	4,660,000	2,564,000	940,000		940,000		940,000	
(FC)	*Perry Reservoir*	19,300,000	310,000		175,000		175,000		175,000
(FC)	Pomona Reservoir	14,100,000	2,408,000	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Topeka	18,400,000	6,464,000	1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
(FC)	Tuttle Creek Reservoir	83,700,000	58,078,000	16,500,000		16,500,000		16,500,000	
(FC)	Wilson Reservoir	18,800,000	903,000	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Kentucky:								
(P)	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn	182,000,000	32,700,000	17,100,000		3,300,000		17,100,000	
	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
(N)	Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam (New Richmond), Kentucky and Ohio	77,100,000	12,759,000	15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000	
(FC)	*Fishtrap Reservoir*	41,700,000	326,000		349,000		349,000	300,000	349,000
(N)	*Greenup locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	54,600,000	44,641,000	9,959,000		9,959,000		9,959,000	
(N)	Louisville locks and dam (lock and dam No. 41), Indiana and Kentucky	48,000,000	19,897,000	9,215,000		9,215,000		9,215,000	
(N)	Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio	65,300,000	34,934,000	12,600,000		12,600,000		12,600,000	
	Newburg locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
(FC)	Nolin Reservoir	14,800,000	2,589,000	2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000	
(FC)	No. 2 Barren Reservoir	22,200,000	1,204,000	2,275,000		2,175,000		2,175,000	
(FC)	*No. 2 Green Reservoir*	8,980,000	66,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
	Louisiana:								
(N)	Aquatic plant control, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, and Louisiana	6,196,000	841,000	700,000		700,000		700,000	
(N)	*Barataria Bay Waterway	1,680,000	564,000	1,116,000		1,116,000		1,116,000	
(FC)	*Bayou Chevreuil	556,000	54,000	502,000		502,000		502,000	
(N)	*Bayou Lafourche* [3]	4,664,000							90,000
(N)	*Calcasieu River and Pass* [3]	16,995,000	[1] 40,000						100,000
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway:								
	(a) *Freshwater Bayou* [3]	7,530,000	[1] 45,000						90,000
	*(b) Plaquemine-Morgan City alternate route	27,706,000	23,540,000	4,166,000		4,166,000		4,166,000	
(N)	*Lake Providence Channel (small navigation project)* [2]	(4)						(4)	
(N)	Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico	8,300,000	1,601,000	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	Mississippi River, gulf outlet	105,000,000	10,394,000	8,750,000		8,750,000		8,750,000	
(N)	*Petit Anse, Tigre and Carlin Bayous* [3]	106,000						(2)	
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. (See Arkansas.)								
	Maine:								
(N)	*Eastport Harbor* [3]	605,000	[1] 10,000					300,000	
(N)	Scarboro River	327,000	210,000					118,000	
(N)	*Southwest Harbor* [3]	261,000	[1] 11,000					(2)	
(N)	*Stonington Harbor* [3]	217,000	[1] 10,000					(2)	
(N)	*York Harbor* [3]	401,000	[1] 10,000					391,000	
	Maryland:								
(N)	*Baltimore Harbor and Channel, 42 feet, 1958 act*	30,000,000	[1] 28,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		2,500,000	
	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware, and Maryland, canal improvement. (See *Delaware.*)								
	Massachusetts:								
(BA)	*Chelsea Bridge*	242,000		242,000		242,000		242,000	
(FC)	*Littlesville Reservoir*	5,490,000	116,000		154,000		154,000		154,000
(BE)	*Quincy shore (reimbursement)	649,000	[1] 4,000	645,000		645,000		645,000	
(FC)	*West Hill Reservoir	2,230,000	1,497,000	733,000		733,000		733,000	
(FC)	Westville Reservoir	6,760,000	1,968,000	2,660,000		2,660,000		2,660,000	
	Michigan:								
(FC)	Battle Creek	6,930,000	4,198,000	250,000		250,000		250,000	
(R)	*Grand Haven Harbor (revetment)*	2,625,000			(27,000)		(27,000)		(27,000)
(N)	*Grand Marais Harbor	1,010,000	278,000	732,000		732,000		732,000	
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels	146,000,000	70,043,000	30,000,000		30,000,000		30,000,000	
(N)	*Hammond Bay Harbor*	1,170,000	43,000					200,000	
(N)	*Manistee Harbor* [3]	1,747,000	[1] 12,000						75,000
(R)	*Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis. (south pier and north pier)*	1,450,000			($31,500)		(31,500)		(31,500)
(N)	*Presque Isle Harbor* [3]	233,000	[1] 8,000						10,000
(N)	St. Marys River:								
	New Poe Lock	42,300,000	725,000	1,350,000		1,350,000		1,350,000	
(R)	*St. Joseph Harbor*	2,745,000					84,000		84,000
(R)	*South Haven Harbor*	2,085,000					63,000		63,000
(N)	*Trenton Channel Harbor* [3]	8,800,000	[1] 25,000				90,000		90,000
	Minnesota:								
(N)	*Duluth-Superior Harbor, outer harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin* [3]	2,375,000	[1] 11,000						60,000
(N)	*Duluth-Superior Harbor, inner harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin* [3]	2,536,000	[1] 23,000						50,000
(N)	*Minnesota River, 9-foot channel*	2,860,000	83,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
	Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., *Rectification of damages. (See Illinois.)								
(FC)	*Red River of the North, Minn. and N. Dak	6,200,000	5,832,000	368,000		368,000		368,000	
(FC)	*Redwood River at Marshall* [3]	2,318,000	[1] 66,000				60,000		60,000
(FC)	*Rushford*	971,000	[1] 25,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(N)	St. Anthony Falls	31,600,000	15,870,000	4,900,000		4,900,000		4,900,000	
(FC)	*St. Paul and South St. Paul*	7,070,000	428,000			500,000		500,000	
(N)	*Two Harbors* [3]	170,000	[1] 8,000						6,000
(FC)	*Winona*	1,970,000	[1] 38,000		80,000		80,000		80,000

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Army, civil functions, Corps of Engineers, construction, general, fiscal year 1961*—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		Amount allowed by House		Amount recommended by committee	
			Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Mississippi:								
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N) *Pascagoula Harbor, 33-foot main channel* [3]	$850,000						$850,000	
Missouri:								
Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 5, 6, 7, and 8), Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC) *Fabius River Drainage District	1,619,000	$1,269,000	$350,000		$350,000		350,000	
(FC) *Joanna Reservoir* [3]	58,900,000					$100,000		$100,000
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)								
(FC) *Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir*	106,000,000	268,000		$400,000		400,000		400,000
Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and lock and dam 26, Illinois and Missouri, dam 27. (See Illinois.)								
Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.: Regulating works. (See Illinois.)								
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC) Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts, 1, 2, and 3	7,060,000	5,315,000			75,000		75,000	
(FC) Pomme de Terre Reservoir	16,100,000	10,133,000	3,600,000		3,600,000		3,600,000	
(FC) *South River Drainage District*	2,030,000	[1] 4,000				60,000		60,000
(FC) St. Louis	120,000,000	7,033,000	6,250,000		6,250,000		6,250,000	
(P) *Stockton Reservoir*	43,000,000	282,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(P) Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo	66,100,000	64,715,000	600,000		600,000		600,000	
Montana:								
(P) Fort Peck Dam (2d powerplant)	26,000,000	17,979,000	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
Nebraska:								
Decatur Bend Cutoff, Iowa and Nebr. [3] (*See Iowa.*)								
(FC) Gering Valley	1,470,000	386,000	530,000				530,000	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC) *Missouri River (Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, including Miners Bend), Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak	11,300,000	10,530,000	770,000		770,000		770,000	
(FC) *Salt Creek and tributaries*	17,200,000	158,000		162,000		162,000	500,000	162,000
(FC) *Shell Creek and tributaries*	2,400,000	[1] 35,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
Nevada:								
(FC) *Gleason Creek (Keystone Reservoir)* [3]	520,000	[1] 45,000						40,000
(FC) *Las Vegas Wash* [3]	13,530,000	[1] 120,000						100,000
(FC) Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada	1,200,000	801,000	154,000		154,000		154,000	
New Hampshire:								
(FC) Hopkinton-Everett Reservoirs	25,700,000	6,035,000	8,370,000		8,370,000		8,370,000	
New Jersey:								
(N) Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Base to Trenton, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey	80,000,000	38,702,000	11,700,000		11,700,000		11,700,000	
*New York Harbor—New Jersey Pierhead Line, New York and New Jersey. (See New York.)								
(BE) *Ocean City (reimbursement)*	223,000	103,000	50,000		50,000		50,000	
New Mexico:								
(FC) Abiquiu Reservoir	17,900,000	9,919,000	4,600,000		4,600,000		4,600,000	
(FC) *Cochiti Reservoir* [3]	43,442,000	[1] 34,000						100,000
(FC) *Galisteo Reservoir* [3]	14,920,000	[1] 33,000						50,000
(FC) Rio Grande Floodway—Conchiti to Rio Puerco	4,400,000	870,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,200,000	
(FC) *Socorro*	3,510,000	153,000		157,000		157,000		157,000
(FC) Two Rivers Reservoir	6,900,000	463,000	400,000		400,000		400,000	
New York:								
Allegheny River Reservoir, Pennsylvania and New York. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(N) Buffalo Harbor, north entrance	11,500,000	8,400,000	1,900,000		1,900,000		1,900,000	
(N) *Buffalo Harbor, south entrance* [3]	2,630,000	[1] 18,000				16,000		16,000
(FC) *Endicott Johnson City, and Vestal	6,000,000	5,665,000	335,000		335,000		335,000	
(N) Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	38,950,000	24,573,000	400,000		400,000		400,000	
(R) *Great Sodus Bay Harbor (east and west piers)*	840,000			(32,000)		(32,000)		(32,000)
(N) Hudson River, New York City to Albany, 32-foot channel	37,200,000	520,000	1,880,000		1,880,000		1,880,000	
(N) Jamaica Bay	3,483,000	2,237,000					700,000	
(N) *New York Harbor—New Jersey Pierhead Line, New York and New Jersey	5,770,000	4,884,000	886,000		886,000		886,000	
(N) *New York Harbor, ocean to Bayside Channel*	1,880,000	[1] 13,000					500,000	
(FC) *Nichols*	820,000	49,000		51,000		51,000		51,000
(BA) Ohio Street Bridge, Buffalo River	3,000,000	1,520,000	800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N) *Rochester Harbor* [3]	2,468,000	[1] 23,000						25,000
(BE) *Selkirk Shores State Park (reimbursement)*	160,000	[1] 3,500	18,700		18,700		18,700	
(FC) *South Amsterdam*	1,500,000	[1] 7,000		70,000		70,000		70,000
North Carolina:								
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N) *Morehead City Harbor	1,500,000	558,000	942,000		942,000		942,000	
(N) *Ocracoke Inlet* [3]	4,648,000	[1] 25,000					185,000	
(FC) *Pantego and Cucklers Creek	536,000	63,000	473,000		473,000		473,000	
(FC) Wilkesboro Reservoir	8,500,000	1,296,000	3,300,000		3,300,000		3,300,000	
North Dakota:								
(P) Garrison Reservoir	294,000,000	284,510,000	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC) *Lower Heart River	2,200,000	1,364,000	836,000		836,000		836,000	
*Red River of the North, Minnesota and North Dakota. (See Minnesota.)								
Ohio:								
(N) *Ashtabula Harbor* [3]	4,470,000	[1] 18,000						40,000
(N) *Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia*	57,600,000	174,000		250,000		250,000	500,000	250,000
Captain Anthony Meldall locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(N) *Cleveland Harbor* [3]	2,760,000	[1] 15,000						20,000
(N) *Cleveland Harbor (1958 modification)*	17,400,000	[1] 26,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(R) *Cleveland Harbor (east and west breakwater)*	615,000			(20,000)		(20,000)		(20,000)
(FC) *Dillon Reservoir	30,700,000	26,477,000	4,223,000		4,223,000		4,223,000	
*Greenup locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Army, civil functions, Corps of Engineers, construction, general, fiscal year 1961*—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		Amount allowed by House		Amount recommended by committee	
				Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Ohio—Continued								
(N)	*Lorain Harbor* [3]	$20,800,000	[1] $52,000				$300,000		$300,000
	Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(N)	*New Cumberland locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	40,150,000	33,970,000	$6,180,000		$6,180,000		$6,180,000	
(N)	Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	61,700,000	4,531,000	9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000	
(N)	*Sandusky Harbor* [3]	6,240,000	[1] 17,000				53,000		53,000
	Shenango River Reservoir, Pa. and Ohio. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(N)	*Toledo Harbor* [3]	15,700,000	[1] 30,000						60,000
(FC)	West Branch Mahoning River Reservoir	9,320,000	760,000	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
	Oklahoma:								
	Arkansas River and tributaries, emergency bank stabilization, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
	Arkansas River and tributaries, general studies, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC)	*Broken Bow Reservoir*	10,700,000	287,000					500,000	
(R)	*Canton Reservoir*	525,000			($7,500)		(7,500)		(7,500)
(P)	Eufaula Reservoir	141,000,000	21,323,000	20,700,000		20,700,000		20,700,000	
(FC)	Keystone Reservoir	111,000,000	20,841,000	17,400,000		14,630,000		17,400,000	
(FC)	Oologah Reservoir	35,100,000	30,196,000	3,700,000		3,700,000		3,700,000	
	Ouachita River 9-foot project, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.) [3]								
(FC)	*Pine Creek Reservoir*	15,400,000	87,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
	Oregon:								
(FC)	*Blue River Reservoir*	16,900,000	539,000		136,000		136,000		136,000
(R)	*Columbia River at the mouth, south jetty*	6,590,000			(50,000)		(50,000)		(50,000)
(FC)	Columbia River local protection:								
	*Malheur River-Vale Unit	423,000	311,000	112,000		112,000		112,000	
(N)	*Coos and Millicoma Rivers*	546,000	[1] 7,000		23,000				23,000
(R)	*Coos Bay, south jetty*	2,800,000			(50,000)		(50,000)		(50,000)
(P)	Cougar Reservoir	49,200,000	19,590,000	12,300,000		12,300,000		12,300,000	
(P)	*Green Peter Reservoir*	64,000,000	1,104,000	1,400,000		1,400,000		2,000,000	
(P)	Hills Creek Reservoir	46,100,000	32,889,000	10,500,000		10,500,000		10,500,000	
(P)	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	418,000,000	30,345,000	37,000,000		33,344,300		33,344,300	
(FC)	*Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington*	8,600,000	65,000	400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works:								
	*(a) Multnomah County Drainage District	1,740,000	1,150,000	590,000		590,000		590,000	
	(b) *Rainier Drainage District*	612,000	43,000					200,000	
	(c) *Sauvie Island Drainage District*	460,000	65,000					150,000	
(N)	*Rogue River Harbor at Gold Beach	4,220,000	2,202,000	2,018,000		2,018,000		2,018,000	
(R)	*Siuslaw River, south jetty*	1,100,000			(30,000)		(30,000)	150,000	(30,000)
(P)	The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	250,000,000	245,496,000	1,900,000		1,900,000		1,900,000	
(R)	*Umpqua River*	1,500,000						150,000	(30,000)
(FC)	Willamette River Basin bank protection	12,400,000	7,820,000	500,000		500,000		500,000,	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin channel improvement and major drainage:								
	(a) *Area east of Albany*	771,000	[1] 3,000						10,000
	(b) *West Muddy and Marys River*	2,960,000	[1] 10,000						35,000
(N)	*Yaquina Bay and Harbor*	23,600,000	116,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
	Pennsylvania:								
(FC)	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.	119,000,000	4,098,000	4,530,000		4,530,000		4,530,000	
(FC)	*Bear Creek Reservoir	11,100,000	10,033,000	1,067,000		1,067,000		1,067,000	
(FC)	Bethlehem	9,300,000	1,108,000	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	*Bradford	8,000,000	6,623,000	1,377,000		1,377,000		1,377,000	
(FC)	Brookville	1,420,000	569,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	*Butler, Connoquenessing Creek* [3]	1,730,000	[1] 61,000						25,000
(FC)	*Curwensville Reservoir*	22,500,000	499,000		280,000		280,000		280,000
(N)	*Dam 4 Monongahela River*	9,480,000	[1] 20,000		130,000		130,000		130,000
(FC)	*Elkland*	1,440,000	[1] 20,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(N)	*Erie Harbor* [3]	1,860,000	[1] 13,000				27,000		27,000
(FC)	Kettle Creek Reservoir	6,600,000	3,007,000	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
(N)	*Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River*	32,200,000	463,000	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC)	*Ridgway*	644,000	46,000			200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Shenango River Reservoir, Pa., and Ohio	29,400,000	912,000	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC)	*Stillwater Reservoir	5,900,000	5,445,000	455,000		455,000		455,000	
(FC)	*Turtle Creek*	15,300,000	119,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	*Tyrone*	9,400,000	249,000		111,000		111,000		111,000
(FC)	*Washington*	1,540,000	139,000	400,000		400,000		400,000	
	Puerto Rico:								
(N)	*San Juan Harbor—1958 act*	7,200,000	[1] 15,000		70,000		70,000		70,000
	Rhode Island:								
(FC)	*Fox Point Barrier*	11,426,000	895,000	800,000		800,000		800,000	
(R)	*Point Judith Harbor of Refuge (breakwaters)*	1,050,000			(13,000)		(13,000)		(13,000)
	South Carolina:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
	Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S.C. (See Georgia.)								
	South Dakota:								
(P)	Big Bend Reservoir	137,500,000	2,985,000	10,000,000		10,000,000		10,000,000	
(P)	Fort Randall Reservoir	193,000,000	188,471,000	400,000		400,000		400,000	
	*Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr. and S. Dak. (See Nebraska.)								
(P)	Oahe Reservoir	380,000,000	203,873,000	53,500,000		53,500,000		53,500,000	
(FC)	Sioux Falls	5,395,000	5,395,000						50,000
(FC)	*Vermillion River* [3]	6,580,000	[1] 50,000						75,000
	Tennessee:								
	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)								
(P)	*Cordell Hull Dam*	45,800,000	206,000				50,000		50,000
(P)	*J. Percy Priest Reservoir (deferred for restudy)*	31,100,000	426,000				10,000		
	Texas:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	*Bardwell Reservoir*	8,950,000	[1] 20,000				125,000		125,000
(N)	*Brazos Island Harbor	4,760,000	4,660,000	100,000		100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	52,100,000	22,625,000	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Canyon Reservoir)	16,700,000	4,821,000	2,900,000		2,900,000		3,100,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Army, civil functions, Corps of Engineers, construction, general, fiscal year 1961*—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		Amount allowed by House		Amount recommended by committee	
			Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Texas—Continued								
(FC) Cooper Reservoir and channels	$15,200,000	$2,322,000	$1,000,000		$250,000		$250,000	
(BA) *Corpus Christi Bridge	4,866,000	4,354,000	512,000		512,000		512,000	
(P) Denison Dam and Reservoir (Lake Texoma) (additional recreational facilities)	4,310,000	885,000			200,000		200,000	
(N) *Freeport Harbor 36- and 38-feet channel and realinement of outer bar channel	920,000	[1] 21,000	899,000				899,000	
(R) *Galveston Harbor (jetties)*	6,100,000			($85,000)		($85,000)		($85,000)
(N) Galveston Harbor and channel: Seawall	6,320,000	3,240,000	2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000	
(N) Gulf Intracoastal Waterway:								
(a) Channel to Port Mansfield	3,740,000	161,000	1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
*(b) Colorado River channel	1,400,000	444,000	956,000		956,000		956,000	
(c) Guadalupe River channel to Victoria	8,240,000	1,990,000	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
(N) Houston ship channel: *40-foot project (bend easing and widening to 36 foot only)*	10,200,000	[1] 8,000	1,240,000		1,240,000		1,240,000	
(N) Matagorda ship channel: *36- and 38-foot channel—1958 act*	12,000,000	179,000		266,000		266,000		266,000
(P) McGee Bend Dam	57,400,000	15,877,000	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,500,000	
*McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC) Navarro Mills Reservoir	10,100,000	1,243,000	3,100,000		3,100,000		3,500,000	
(FC) *Pecos*	2,660,000	109,000		51,000		51,000		51,000
(N) Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway: 36-foot channel	6,320,000	3,442,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC) Proctor Reservoir	18,000,000	618,000	1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)								
(N) Sabine-Neches Waterway	11,600,000	4,035,000	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC) San Antonio Channel	16,800,000	2,812,000	1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC) *Somerville Reservoir*	15,900,000	180,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC) *Stillhouse Hollow Dam*	32,400,000	380,000					500,000	
(FC) *Texas City, Galveston Bay*	6,280,000	171,000		169,000		169,000		169,000
(FC) Waco Reservoir	37,300,000	5,424,000	11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000	
Utah:								
(*FC*) *Little Dell Reservoir* [3]	6,135,000	[1] 75,000						50,000
(FC) *Weber River and tributaries*	728,000	[1] 40,000		35,000		35,000		35,000
Vermont:								
(FC) *Ball Mountain Reservoir	10,300,000	8,077,000	2,223,000		2,223,000		2,223,000	
(R) *Burlington Harbor*	950,000							50,000
(FC) *North Hartland Reservoir	6,610,000	5,875,000	735,000		735,000		735,000	
(FC) *North Springfield Reservoir	6,580,000	6,049,000	531,000		531,000		531,000	
(FC) *Townshend Reservoir	7,070,000	5,516,000	1,554,000		1,554,000		1,554,000	
Virginia:								
(FC) John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir	19,200,000	1,732,000	3,100,000		3,100,000		3,100,000	
(*FC*) *North Fork Reservoir* [3]	4,160,000	[1] 8,000						25,000
Washington:								
(P) Chief Joseph Dam	148,000,000	144,490,000	300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC) *Colfax*	3,200,000	260,700	425,000		425,000		425,000	
(FC) *Dayton*	739,000	20,000						26,300
(FC) Howard A. Hanson (Eagle Gorge) Reservoir	35,500,000	29,037,000	4,400,000		4,400,000		4,400,000	
(P) Ice Harbor lock and dam	125,000,000	85,987,000	30,000,000		30,000,000		30,000,000	
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(P) *Little Goose lock and dam*	139,000,000	659,000		550,000		550,000		550,000
Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(P) *Lower Monumental lock and dam*	151,000,000	2,085,000					3,500,000	
(FC) *Sammamish River*	1,120,000	[1] 22,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(N) *Snohomish River*	3,011,000	[1] 18,000						35,000
The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash. (See Oregon.)								
West Virginia:								
Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC) *East Rainelle	950,000	546,000	404,000		404,000		404,000	
*New Cumberland locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(N) *Opekiska lock and dam*	24,100,000	272,000					500,000	
Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC) *Princeton	912,000	562,000	350,000		350,000		350,000	
(FC) Summersville Reservoir	50,800,000	2,635,000	4,400,000		4,400,000		4,400,000	
(FC) *Williamson*	723,000	73,000	300,000		300,000		300,000	
Wisconsin:								
(N) *Ashland Harbor* [3]	1,503,000	[1] 8,000						34,000
Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis. (See Minnesota.) [3]								
(FC) *Eau Galle River*	7,740,000	153,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(N) *Kewaunee Harbor* [3]	86,000	[1] 4,000					(2)	
Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis. (See Michigan.) [3]								
(R) *Milwaukee Harbor (north breakwater and north pier)*	4,000,000			(71,000)		(71,000)		(71,000)
(N) *Milwaukee Harbor—outer harbor (reimbursement)*	132,000	[1] 2,000	7,000		7,000		7,000	
(R) *Sheboygan Harbor (north stub pier and south pier)*	1,342,000			(32,000)		(32,000)		(32,000)
Wyoming:								
(FC) Jackson Hole	2,480,000	1,436,000	150,000		150,000		150,000	
(FC) Sheridan	1,800,000	740,000	340,000					
(FC) Emergency bank protection			300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC) Local protection projects not requiring specific legislation			2,000,000		1,500,000		2,000,000	
(N) Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation (not yet authorized)							250,000	
(FC) Snagging and clearing			300,000		300,000		300,000	
Projects deferred for restudy				22,000		22,000		22,000
Recreation facilities, completed projects			2,500,000		2,365,000		2,500,000	
Small authorized projects			2,000,000		2,000,000		3,750,000	
Fish and wildlife (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)			500,000		500,000		500,000	
Rehabilitation of existing projects:								
(*a*) Advance engineering and design				500,000		647,000		700,000
(*b*) Construction small rehabilitation projects under $400,000			2,500,000		2,000,000		2,500,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Army, civil functions, Corps of Engineers, construction, general, fiscal year 1961*—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		Amount allowed by House		Amount recommended by committee	
			Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Wyoming—Continued								
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages			−$40,000,000		−$60,000,000		−$40,000,000	
Total			700,203,000	$9,216,000	649,915,300	$11,307,000	722,054,300	$14,430,300
Lower Columbia River Fish Sanctuary program (Fish and Wildlife Service)	$28,000,000	$18,121,000	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
Grand total, construction, general			701,603,000	9,216,000	651,315,300	11,307,000	723,454,300	14,430,300
			(710,819,000)		(662,622,300)		(737,884,600)	

[1] Amount shown is costs incurred for preauthorization studies only.
[2] Eligible for selection under a lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects.
[3] Not yet authorized.
[4] Eligible for selection under small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation (not yet authorized).

*Projects indicated by asterisk are those projects to be completed with the amount in the approved budget estimate.

NOTE.—Projects shown in italic are new projects or modifications of projects on which construction has not started.

TABLE II.—*Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1961*

Projects	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		House allowance		Amount recommended by committee	
			Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1. General investigations:								
(a) Examinations and surveys		$1,788,112	$60,000		$60,000		$60,000	
(b) Collection and study of basic data		[1] 399,750	55,000		55,000		55,000	
Subtotal, general investigations		2,187,862	115,000		115,000		115,000	
2. Construction and planning:								
Mississippi River levees [2]	$221,000,000	196,858,000	$2,760,000		$2,760,000		$3,686,000	
Channel improvement	472,000,000	412,880,000	22,000,000		22,000,000		25,000,000	
Section 6 levees	3,931,400	3,678,000	0					
Memphis Harbor	18,200,000	14,232,000	640,000		640,000		640,000	
Greenville Harbor	2,650,000	70,000	0		150,000		150,000	
Vicksburg Harbor [3]	4,790,000	3,420,000	1,370,000		1,370,000		1,370,000	
Baton Rouge Harbor	3,100,000	769,000	0					
Old River control	70,000,000	39,288,000	8,400,000		8,400,000		8,400,000	
St. Francis Basin	86,700,000	36,792,000	4,600,000		4,600,000		4,600,000	
Lower White River [4]	13,000,000	9,572,000	150,000		150,000		150,000	
Reelfoot Lake	652,000	538,000	0					
Cache Basin	24,300,000	5,000	0					
L'Anguille Basin	5,620,000	23,000	0					
West Tennessee tributaries	8,400,000	230,000	400,000		400,000		400,000	
Wolf River and tributaries	2,050,000	243,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
Grand Prairie-Bayou Meto	34,700,000	99,000	0					
Lower Arkansas	25,400,000	19,899,000	530,000		530,000		600,000	
Tensas Basin:								
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc.[4]	23,500,000	[5] 16,111,000	1,090,000		1,090,000		1,150,000	
Red River backwater	8,200,000	8,015,000	25,000		25,000		25,000	
Yazoo Basin:								
Sardis Reservoir	12,500,000	11,749,000	50,000		50,000		50,000	
Enid Reservoir	16,100,000	[6] 15,056,000	50,000		50,000		50,000	
Arkabutla Reservoir	13,200,000	[7] 11,943,000	70,000		70,000		70,000	
Grenada Reservoir	31,900,000	31,314,000	30,000		30,000		30,000	
Greenwood	5,400,000	2,323,000	0					
Belzoni	320,000	320,000	0					
Yazoo City	2,210,000	2,210,000	0					
Lower auxiliary channels	11,800,000	8,306,000	1,555,000		1,555,000		1,955,000	
Upper auxiliary channels	13,460,000	27,000						
Main stem	20,100,000	6,881,000	1,040,000		1,040,000		1,040,000	
Tributaries	27,900,000	5,587,000	450,000		450,000		450,000	
Big Sunflower River, etc	8,510,000	4,740,000	820,000		820,000		820,000	
Yazoo backwater	31,600,000	327,000	325,000		325,000		325,000	
Lower Red River	8,990,000	8,147,000	0					
Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries	4,300,000	3,386,000	0					
Atchafalaya Basin	120,000,000	100,565,000	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,500,000	
Amite River	70,000	0	0					
Lake Pontchartrain	6,340,000	3,922,000	660,000		660,000		700,000	
Completed work [8]	[9] 129,069,000	129,069,000	0					
Subtotal, construction and planning			53,515,000		53,665,000		58,661,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages			−1,380,000		−1,470,000		−1,380,000	
Total, construction and planning	1,491,962,400	1,108,594,000	52,135,000		52,195,000		57,281,000	
3. Maintenance			17,250,000		17,250,000		17,500,000	
4. Flood control emergencies	25,000,000	14,900,300						
Grand total	1,516,962,400	1,125,682,162	69,500,000		69,560,000		74,896,000	

[1] Includes $111,000 transferred to fish and wildlife.
[2] Includes new Madrid floodgate.
[3] Project to be completed with amount in fiscal year 1961 approved budget estimate.
[4] Modifications authorized by the act of July 3, 1958, are included in the cost estimates.
[5] Exclusive of $202,000 transferred to Harrisonburg to Little River levee (sec. 6).
[6] Includes permanent transfer of $12,300 to this unit of the project.
[7] Excludes permanent transfer of $12,300 from this unit of the project.
[8] Costs of preauthorization studies ($2,642,900) are included in the total estimated Federal cost. However, only those amounts totaling $2,126,000 which are chargeable against project limitations are included in the amount appropriated to date. These amounts were transferred to the individual projects from S.G. & O. previously included in the feature "Completed work."
[9] Total includes $459,000 in preauthorization studies not chargeable against project limitations.

TABLE III.—*Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation*

Project	Budget program	House program	Recommended program
Advance planning	$254,000	$254,000	$404,000
Gila project, Arizona	4,219,000	4,219,000	4,219,000
Colorado River front work and levee system, Arizona-California	769,500	769,500	869,500
Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada	2,857,000	2,857,000	2,857,000
Central Valley project, California	61,306,100	61,138,100	61,635,300
Collbran project, Colorado	5,140,000	5,140,000	5,140,000
Minidoka project, north side pumping division, Idaho	429,000	429,000	429,000
Palisades project, Burns Creek Dam and powerplant, Idaho	(1)	(1)	(1)
Washoe project, Nevada-California	3,137,000	3,137,000	3,137,000
McMillan Delta project, New Mexico	100,000	100,000	100,000
Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico	1,729,000	1,729,000	1,729,000
Washita Basin project, Oklahoma	6,960,000	6,960,000	6,960,000
Crooked River project, Oregon	2,235,000	2,235,000	2,235,000
Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Oregon	2,450,000	2,450,000	2,450,000
Vale project, Bully Creek extension, Oregon	173,000	121,000	173,000
Klamath project, Oregon-California	868,000	868,000	868,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, La Feria division, Texas	500,000	500,000	500,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division, Texas	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
San Angelo project, Texas	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Provo River project, Utah	825,000	825,000	825,000
Weber Basin project, Utah	8,283,000	8,183,000	8,283,000
Chief Joseph project, Greater Wenatchee division, Washington	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	6,100,000	4,606,000	6,100,000
Drainage and minor construction	921,120	800,000	946,120
Rehabilitation and betterment	3,609,000	3,609,000	3,609,000
Missouri River Basin project:			
Ainsworth unit, Nebraska	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Almena unit, Kansas	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas	821,000	821,000	821,000
Cedar Bluff unit, Kansas	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
East Bench unit, Montana	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
Farwell unit, Nebraska	7,700,000	7,700,000	7,700,000
Frenchman Cambridge division, Nebraska	5,439,000	5,439,000	5,439,000
Glendo unit, Wyoming	775,280	775,280	775,280
Helena Valley unit, Montana	565,000	565,000	565,000
Owl Creek unit, Wyoming	455,000	455,000	455,000
Transmission division, various	24,415,000	24,415,000	24,415,000
Webster unit, Kansas	617,000	617,000	617,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Drainage and minor construction	598,000	598,000	598,000
Investigations	656,000	656,000	782,000
Advance planning	1,344,000	1,124,000	1,519,000
Subtotal, Missouri River Basin, Bureau of Reclamation	52,885,280	52,365,280	52,866,280
Other Department of the Interior agencies	3,000,000	2,650,000	3,000,000
Total, Missouri River Basin	55,585,280	55,015,280	55,886,280
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation	183,950,000	181,444,880	184,855,200
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−10,000,000	−15,000,000	−11,000,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation	173,950,000	166,444,880	173,855,200

[1] $487,500 of previously appropriated funds are available, if legislation authorizing its construction is enacted.

Table IV.—Loan program

Project	Budget estimate [1]	House program [2]	Recommended program [2]
Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District, California	$2,487,000	$810,000	$810,000
Pleasant Valley County Water District, California	1,651,750	1,651,750	1,651,750
Georgetown Divide Public Utility District, California	2,261,175	750,000	1,250,000
Jackson Valley Irrigation District, California	927,000	927,000	927,000
Weber-Box Elder Conservation District, Utah	302,000	302,000	302,000
Haights Creek Irrigation Co., Utah	212,000	212,000	212,000
Donna Irrigation District, Hidalgo County No. 1, Texas	4,061,000	2,050,000	2,050,000
San Benito County Water Conservation and Flood Control District, California	1,420,000	1,420,000	1,420,000
South San Joaquin Irrigation District, California	4,895,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
Brown's Valley Irrigation District, California			700,000
South Sutter Water District, California			700,000
Administration	220,075	220,075	220,075
Total	18,437,000	9,742,825	11,642,825

[1] Based on full financing. [2] Based on annual financing.

TABLE V.—*Upper Colorado Basin fund*

Project and State	Budget program	House program	Recommended program
Colorado River storage projects:			
Curecanti unit, Colorado	$1,400,000	$1,400,000	$1,400,000
Flaming Gorge unit, Utah-Wyoming	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Glen Canyon unit, Arizona-Utah	27,035,000	23,535,000	23,535,000
Navajo unit, Colorado-New Mexico	11,776,000	11,776,000	11,776,000
Transmission division	[1] 5,318,000	5,318,000	5,318,000
Participating projects:			
Central Utah project, Vernal unit, Utah	2,189,000	2,189,000	2,189,000
Florida project, Colorado	750,000	750,000	750,000
Hammond project, New Mexico	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Paonia project, Colorado	903,000	903,000	903,000
Seedskadee project, Wyoming	[2] 2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Smith Fork project, Wyoming	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Advance planning	938,000	938,000	938,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated savings and slippage	−2,209,000	−2,209,000	−2,209,000
Total	[3] 64,900,000	61,400,000	61,400,000

[1] Includes $4,800,000 requested in S. Doc. 106.
[2] Reflects $3,000,000 reduction submitted in S. Doc. 106.
[3] Reflects net increase of $1,800,000 requested in S. Doc. 106.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have concluded my statement. If there are any questions any Senators would like to ask, I shall be glad to attempt to answer them.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. SCHOEPPEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder if my good friend from Louisiana will permit me at this time to offer an amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is in order, Mr. President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 20, after the colon, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That of the funds herein made available for the Illinois Waterway Calumet-Sag Channel, not to exceed $900,000 shall be available for the Western Avenue Highway Bridge.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to the Senator that at the time the bill was marked up I was under a misapprehension as to exactly what was proposed in the budget estimate. The Senate will recall that last year the Corps of Engineers requested funds in the budget for reconstruction of the Western Avenue Highway Bridge, and stressed the urgency of proceeding with the relocation of the highway bridge prior to the relocation of the Chicago, Rock Island, and Pacific Railroad Bridge because of the difficulties involved in detouring the large volume of highway traffic.

When the committee restored the budget estimate for the Illinois Waterway project, I was under the impression that the Western Avenue Highway Bridge relocation was being provided for. I now find that in view of the action of the conferees last year in deleting funds for the Western Avenue Highway Bridge relocation, the Corps of Engineers did not request funds for this work in fiscal year 1961.

Since the relocation of this bridge is urgently needed, is authorized by law, and the Corps of Engineers is ready to proceed, I will accept the Senator's amendment and take it to conference, inasmuch as it would not increase the amount recommended by the committee but is in the nature of a clarification of work which can be undertaken with the funds made available.

This action is consistent with the Senate committee's recommendation last year, which was concurred in by the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank my good friend from Louisiana for his willingness to accept the amendment.

As the Senator says, the amendment would not increase the total appropriation by a single dollar, but would merely earmark $900,000 of the existing appropriation of $9½ million for this specific purpose.

It would do so for a bridge which has already been authorized by the Congress, an appropriation for which was also recommended by the committee last year. It is in accordance with the 1952 amendment to the Truman-Hobbs Act, which permitted the sharing of costs on local highway bridges as well as on railroad bridges. It is also in line with the specific authorization of the highway bridges over this project in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1958.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared dealing with this matter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT TO H.R. 12326 TO PROVIDE $900,000 FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE WESTERN AVENUE HIGHWAY BRIDGE AS PART OF THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY CAL-SAG CHANNEL PROJECT

The purpose of this amendment is to permit the commencement of construction of the Western Avenue Highway Bridge, an essential and authorized part of the Illinois Waterway Cal-Sag Channel project.

The amendment has been drafted so that it does not increase the total appropriation recommended by the committee. It merely permits not to exceed $900,000 to be expended for this highway bridge out of the total figure of $9,500,000 appropriated by this bill for the continuing work on the Cal-Sag project. The total figure for this project is thus left also within the budget estimate.

As members will recall, this Cal-Sag Channel is a key link in the connection between the Great Lakes and the Illinois-Mississippi River Waterway system. The rebuilding of the existing railroad and highway bridges, which obstruct the channel's clearances, is essential to the full realization of the project's benefits. The controversy over and deferment of the highway bridges is the main reason for delays in the scheduled completion of this project.

This amendment would help to resolve that controversy and enable the construction of the principal highway bridge over this channel to proceed as previously authorized by Congress.

REAL ISSUE: ALLOCATION OF COSTS OF HIGHWAY BRIDGES ALTERATION

I want frankly to acknowledge that there has been a sharp controversy over the question of how the costs of relocating these highway bridges should be borne. Last year and again this year a majority of the House Appropriations Committee were of the opinion that local interests, and not the Federal Government, should pay fully for these highway bridge relocations. But for the reasons I shall outline briefly, I hope the Senate will approve this amendment which under the Truman-Hobbs Act as amended and a later specific authorization by Congress, calls for the Federal Government to bear the main share of these bridge costs, and I hope the House on further review will also see the equity of this decision.

1952 AMENDMENT AUTHORIZED LARGER FEDERAL ALLOCATION

1. In 1952 the Truman-Hobbs Act was amended (Public Law 564) to provide for the same apportionment of the costs of altering highway bridges in connection with navigation projects as had previously been authorized under that law for railroad bridges.

This would seem to have resolved the question, but for the fact that the Cal-Sag project had been authorized in 1946, 6 years before.

BOARD OF ENGINEERS RECOMMENDED 1952 AMENDMENT BE APPLIED TO CAL-SAG PROJECT

2. In response to a resolution adopted March 30, 1955, by the House Public Works Committee, therefore, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors reviewed this precise question as to the proper and equitable extent of local cooperation in bearing the costs of the highway bridges on the Cal-Sag project. After extensive study, the Board and the Chief of Engineers in late 1956 approved a recommendation of the district engineer that—

"In view of the predominantly general nature of the benefits accruing from the project and of the major local contributions toward the development of the project * * * it is considered equitable that the allocation of cost of highway bridge alterations be made in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of Public Law 647, 76th Congress (Truman-Hobbs Act), as amended, in a similar manner to that authorized for railroad bridges" (p. 22, H. Doc. No. 45, 85th Cong.).

In the report preceding this conclusion, past expenditures by local interests for related navigation improvements ($87,500,000), for constructing some highway bridges to provide project clearances ($3,503,000), for lands, easements, and rights of way, for relocation of utilities, etc., were acknowledged.

The rapid increase in volume of barge traffic from 43,000 tons in 1935 to 3,762,000 tons in 1954 was also noted. (The Engineers testified early this year, 1960, that it had risen to 6 million tons in 1958.) The conclusion from that and many other factors there set forth was that "the benefits resulting from the estimated transportation savings will accrue largely to a widespread area and are considered national in scope" (p. 21).

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET CONCURRED

The Bureau of the Budget in December 1956, also approved of these recommendations, that the highway bridge costs on this project be allocated in accord with the Truman-Hobbs Act, as amended.

HOUSE AND SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEES APPROVED APPLICATION OF NEW HIGHWAY BRIDGE POLICY TO THIS PROJECT

3. In 1958, the House Committee on Public Works reviewed this same question carefully and came to the same conclusion that the cost-sharing provision of the Truman-Hobbs Act, as amended in 1952, should be applied to this project. (Part I of the project being the only part on which construction was begun, the committee acted only as to it. It said (H. Rept. No. 1894, 85th Cong., p. 70):

"The committee recognizes the importance of the Cal-Sag navigation project as a vital link for through commerce between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi-Ohio Inland Waterway system. It considers that modification of part I to accomplish that portion of the waterway for which funds have been appropriated should be made, and recommends that the highway bridge cost of $9,884,000 in part I of the improvement be borne by the Federal Government" (H. Doc. No. 45, 85th Cong.).

The Senate Committee on Public Works came to the same conclusion. (See S. Rept. No. 1710, 85th Cong., p. 70.)

CONGRESS IN 1958 EXPRESSLY APPLIED NEW POLICY TO THIS PROJECT'S HIGHWAY BRIDGE RELOCATIONS

4. Thereafter in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1958, Congress passed and the President signed legislation (Public Law 85-500) which expressly provided that the Cal-Sag project should be modified to authorize the

recommended allocation of the highway bridge costs. It provided in section 109:

"SEC. 109. The projects for the Illinois Waterway and General Calumet River, Illinois and Indiana (Calumet-Sag navigation project) authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendations in House Document Numbered 45, Eighty-fifth Congress, insofar as they apply to existing highway bridges in Part I, Sag Junction to Lake Calumet, at an estimated additional cost of $9,884,000."

By the general action of Congress in 1952, covering highway bridges as well as railroad bridges which must be altered because of navigation projects, and by its action on Part I of this specific Cal-Sag project in 1958, surely the congressional authorization for this Federal expenditure is firm and clear.

BUREAU OF BUDGET RECOMMENDED THIS BRIDGE APPROPRIATION IN 1959

5. Acting on this authorization, the Bureau of the Budget and Corps of Engineers in 1959 submitted a proposed appropriation of $930,000 for the Western Avenue Highway Bridge as a part of the new funds requested for the Cal-Sag project.

But the House Appropriations Committee in 1959 struck this $930,000 item. The Senate committee reinserted it, but it was then dropped in conference. And in 1960, the House committee cut out even the $2 million proposed appropriation for railroad bridge relocations because with the highway bridge problem unresolved, the project benefits could not be fully realized.

The Senate Appropriations Committee, however, has wisely restored this $2 million to the Cal-Sag appropriation in the bill now before us, but it did not act on the highway bridge issue which my amendment raises.

HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE'S REASONS FOR OPPOSING APPROPRIATION

6. Why then should this Cal-Sag project be denied the benefits of the revised Federal policy on highway bridges?

The House Appropriations Committee based its denial on the grounds that Federal assumption of the main highway bridge costs (a) would relieve local interests of a once-committed contribution, (b) would be a retroactive application of the 1952 policy to a project originally authorized in 1946, and (c) would establish a precedent which would lead to parallel claims for greater Federal contributions on other projects.

ANSWERS TO HOUSE COMMITTEE'S OBJECTIONS

(a) There are two answers to the argument about a prior commitment. First, the district engineer in his report of 1955 (prior to the specific modification of the project in 1958) on the question of local cooperation as required under the authorizing law reported (p. 11, H. Doc. No. 45, 85th Cong.):

"Specific pledges have been received for the requisite items, subject to the qualification that the cost of highway bridge alterations would be borne by local interests only to the extent required by applicable Federal law at the time the bridges are reconstructed."

Second, even if assurances had been given in 1946, the benefit of the change of general Federal policy by the Truman-Hobbs Act amendment of 1952 should not be denied in connection with future construction, at least where the legislation itself did not exclude such application. In 1952, Congress recognized that the owners of highway bridges—mostly public bodies—which had to be altered for navigation projects were just as much entitled to consideration as the railroad companies whose bridge alteration costs were covered in the original Truman-Hobbs Act. It did not state that the resulting benefits should be denied in all cases where projects were previously authorized, but not yet started. And after Congress had acted on this specific Cal-Sag project in 1958, the argument for retaining and enforcing the 1946 conditions seems to me groundless. The Senate Appropriations Committee recognized these two points in its report on the 1959 bill, Senate Report No. 486, 86th Congress, page 23.

(b) True retroactivity would be invoked if the local interests sought to recoup the costs of highway bridges over the Cal-Sag Channel which they have already relocated and modified at their own expense ($3,503,000). But that is not requested. The local interests, the Board of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget have only recommended (and this is the recommendation Congress approved in 1958) that the policy apply prospectively, to highway bridges thereafter relocated.

(c) The action proposed by my amendment is a precedent only to the extent that other projects can show the same factors of highway bridges not yet relocated, of important and widespread national benefits from completion of the project, and of major local contributions (substantially over $90 million—which actually exceeds the total estimated Federal cost for part I of this project) already made for related features of this project.

To the extent that other projects reveal the same factors, I would think them entitled to the same treatment. But there will be few.

CHIEF OF ENGINEERS FINDS NO DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

The Chief of Engineers, Lt. Gen. E. C. Itschner, has spoken directly and authoritatively to this point in his letter of May 17, 1960, to Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN to obtain which I secured the gracious consent of Representative KIRWAN and the Office of the Chief. It summarizes so well the case for applying the Truman-Hobbs Act policy to this project—as Congress has previously authorized—and answers so well the doubts raised by the House committee, that I quote from that letter in full:

MAY 17, 1960.

Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. KIRWAN: In compliance with oral request to me yesterday from Mr. Joseph R. Brennan, engineer-consultant, House Committee on Public Works, this is to confirm that I still believe to be sound the provisions of the 1958 River and Harbor Act modifying the Cal-Sag project by apportioning the costs of altering highway bridges between the United States and the bridge owners, rather than requiring bridge owners or local interests to bear the entire cost as in the previous project.

The previous project provided for apportionment of the costs of altering railroad bridges but not highway bridges because at that time the Truman-Hobbs Act applied only to railroad bridges. Enactment of Public Law 564, 82d Congress, which extended the provisions of the Truman-Hobbs Act to publicly owned highway bridges, indicated a change in congressional policy; and, in equity highway bridges deserved the same treatment accorded railroad bridges under the previous project authorization.

I do not believe the precedent established in the Cal-Sag case has any unusual significance or wide application because I can think of no project comparable to the Cal-Sag project in magnitude or complexity as to bridge alteration. I may add that it is not our thinking that the Truman-Hobbs Act should apply retrocatively to any and all projects that may involve bridge alterations. It is very possible that alteration costs in a particular project, because of the local nature and benefits, might still be found properly a matter of local cooperation. In the Cal-Sag case, because the project was of national scope, the benefits widespread and general in nature, the project itself would attract a large volume of heavy truck traffic, and because local interests had already spent large sums for features of work, it was judged reasonable and equitable that the principles of the Truman-Hobbs Act, as amended, should be applied. You may be assured that each case will be considered on its merits and every case will be reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the Office of the Chief of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and congressional committees.

Funds were requested in the fiscal year 1960 budget to initiate construction on Western Avenue Highway Bridge. These funds were not provided due to the action of the House Committee on Appropriations. In view of the comments in the House committee report on the 1960 budget request, the Corps of Engineers did not renew its request for highway bridge funds for fiscal year 1961.

I trust the foregoing meets your needs and any additional information you may require will be furnished gladly at your request.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ITSCHNER,
Lieutenant General, U.S. Army, Chief of Engineers.

The Chief of Engineers thus reaffirms his belief in the wisdom and equity of proceeding with the highway bridges, which is what my amendment will initiate.

For all these reasons, therefore, and to prevent the further delays on project completion that will result from holding up the highway bridge relocations, I hope the Senate will approve my amendment. And in the event this amendment is adopted, I would further urge my friends and colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee, for whose conscientious devotion to duty I have the greatest respect, to review this matter again, in the light of the facts I have tried to point out, and see if they can now agree that the benefits of the revised Federal policy on highway bridges should be made available through appropriations to this vital link in our Federal waterway system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I also express the hope that my good friend from Louisiana will do his best to have this amendment agreed to by the House members of the conference committee. The difficulty has not been with the Senate committee, but with the House committee on this matter. I hope the Senate conferees will take a very resolute attitude and will stand for this principle. I hope they will convince the reluctant House Members.

Mr. ELLENDER. I assure the Senator, as the chairman-to-be of the conference committee, that I shall do all I can to have the item included in the bill as finally passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation to the able and distinguished chairman of the Senate committee and to all of those associated with him for their helpful and constructive action in respect to several Alaskan projects. The Senate committee added money for small boat harbors at Douglas, at Juneau, at Homer, and at Ninilchik. It is my hope that the Senate will sustain the action of its committee, and that the conferees will agree on

the need for these small boat harbors because they are essential to the important fishing industry of Alaska.

I desire to call attention especially to the proposed small boat harbor for Homer, which was requested in the budget. The funds requested for that project, somewhat in excess of $500,000, were not allowed by the House committee or by the House because of a mistaken belief that there was a controversy existing as to the location of the harbor. Actually that was not the case. There was unanimity on that point. So I would expect that project to be accepted with very little question.

I trust, too, that all the other projects which I have named will be included in the bill as it is finally passed.

I desire to speak especially about the action of the Senate committee in increasing from $100,000, which was the amount requested in the budget, to $350,000, funds for the study of the Rampart hydroelectric project in central Alaska.

There is no power potential in the entire United States having the magnitude of Rampart. It would, upon completion, have an installed capacity of 4,760,000 kilowatts. It would furnish electricity, we hope for as little as two mills, and thus would attract large scale industry. The faster the study is made, the sooner we will know just what we have there, and the action of the committee in this regard is most helpful. If Rampart is to be built, a lake larger than Lake Erie will be created. It is a proposition that challenges the imagination and the vision of the American people. Rampart would be about two and a half times as big as Grand Coulee, the largest existing hydroelectric project in the United States.

Once more I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana and the members of his subcommittee for having taken into account the needs of Alaska and having acted so affirmatively on them.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding briefly to permit me to make an observation.

First, I wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Louisiana and the other members of the committee for the consideration which they have given to projects located in our State of Kansas. I am especially appreciative of the fact that the committee has restored part of the funds which the House deleted from the budget request for the Milford project, which is an important flood control project in our State.

However, I wish to say that I am somewhat deeply disappointed that the committee has not provided funds for the Elk City project. About 20 years ago the Congress authorized the construction of four dams to be located on the Verdigris River and its tributaries. This river flows through one of our most fertile and productive areas of our State. To date two of these projects have been completed. The Fall River Dam was dedicated in 1949, the year I came to the Senate of the United States. I was privileged to be called upon to speak at the dedication of the Toronto Dam on June 18 of that year.

We had high hopes, of course, that this year Congress would appropriate funds so that we could begin construction of the Elk City project. On pages 11 and 12 of the report there are listed all of the Kansas projects.

If my memory serves me correctly, the Congress allowed $100,000 in 1944 for planning purposes and an additional $75,000 in 1947. Since that time the Budget Bureau has not deemed it advisable to recommend funds for the construction of the Elk City project, notwithstanding the fact that the cost-benefit ratio on this project is very favorable.

For the past several years I have gone before the Appropriations Committees and requested that funds be appropriated for this important project, as has my colleague, Senator CARLSON. Recognizing the importance of this project, I am pleased to say that it was by reason of the efforts of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and other members of his subcommittee in 1959, and again in 1960, that the Appropriations Committee added $1 million for this project, but on each occasion the item was lost in conference.

I have prepared an amendment. However, I will say very frankly that after discussing the subject with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who, with the other members of his subcommittee, has done such a fine job on this bill, I shall not offer it because I understand it is the will and desire to hold these projects in line with what has been suggested by the distinguished chairman.

I do understand, and I am hopeful, that we shall have an opportunity in connection with a supplemental appropriation to present matters such as this. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana if that is the case.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my good friend from Kansas that if he will count the number of projects provided for in the bill for Kansas, they aggregate 14, of which 5 are new projects. There are many that could have been included, but in order to have a balanced bill, we could not afford to include every project that Kansas desires. What we did was to include the ones with the highest ratio of cost to benefit and in that way we took care of the five unbudgeted items recommended.

It is my understanding that there will be a new title added to the mutual security bill for the supplemental requests that may be made by the White House. There are also some, I think, that were left over from the supplemental bill that we considered during the closing days of the session before the conventions. It is my purpose to consider certain projects that may be requested, that is, to conduct the usual hearings, and then to call in the Engineers to find out whether or not they have the capability to work on these projects.

The reason I am inclined to do that—and I think the committee will be agreeable to it—is that since Congress recessed in early July the omnibus bill was signed. There are quite a few projects included in the omnibus bill that should receive the attention of the Congress before adjournment. Having that in mind, I shall gladly consider testimony as to such projects in the omnibus bill as Senators or others may desire to submit.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Louisiana. I shall expect that course to be followed. The Senator will recall, of course, that the committee was good enough to include the Elk City project twice, but we lost the project in conference with the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am sure that is one of the reasons why, together with what the Senator has mentioned, he and the members of the subcommittee thought it advisable to leave it out on this occasion; and we shall proceed along the lines suggested.

I again wish to express my appreciation to the Senator and to the members of his subcommitte for the consideration given to the State of Kansas.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, Senator ELLENDER, and the Appropriations Committee for the consideration given my State of West Virginia regarding Public Works projects appropriations for the fiscal year, 1961.

The appropriations earmarked for West Virginia will enable my State to progress further in flood control. Four hundred and four thousand dollars has been approved for construction of a flood control project at East Rainelle, $500,000 for the Opekiska lock and dam near Fairmont, $350,000 for a flood control project at Princeton, and $300,000 for construction at Williamson.

Four million four hundred thousand dollars is included for construction of the Summersville Reservoir, and $500,000 for construction and $250,000 for planning in connection with Belleville locks and dams. Additionally, $6,180,000 is included for construction of the New Cumberland locks and dam. I look upon these appropriations as a worthwhile investment in the future welfare of the country and the people.

The myriad of benefits which accrue from such projects is great. Not only do such projects create jobs, but they also alleviate expensive results of flooding, and serve to preserve the natural assets to be found in the Nation's water supply.

The ultimate control of rivers and streams which presently run unharnessed will enable utilization of lands which, without flood control, are inundated from time to time. This consequently, will mean more available sites for industrial and agricultural development.

My colleague, Senator RANDOLPH, and I have been very interested in the items I have mentioned, and, speaking as a representative of the citizens of West

Virginia, and as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I would like to express gratitude to Senator ELLENDER who, as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee, has shown farsightedness in his awareness of the needs to improve this country's natural water supply.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think a little history on the development of the project for the installation of reactors at our bases in the Antarctic for which this bill provides $13 million, is in order to illustrate a serious deficiency in our budgeting process against which we must continually guard. This deficiency is one which results in increased costs to the Government.

Over a year ago the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy foresaw possible economic advantages in the use of nuclear reactors to supply energy requirements at our remote Government sites by reducing the very costly operation of supplying diesel fuel to these sites. Accordingly, last year, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recommended, and the Congress authorized, a study to obtain up-to-date information on the economic potentials of such applications of nuclear power.

The results of this study, which we received earlier this year, were printed in the Joint Committee hearings on the Atomic Energy Commission's authorization bill, and indicated that there were major economic advantages in the use of nuclear reactors at our remote sites, particularly at our scientific stations in the Antarctic. Accordingly, the Joint Committee added to the Atomic Energy Commission's authorization bill, as submitted to the Congress by the administration, a project authorizing $13 million for the construction of power reactor plants in the Antarctic.

Although the testimony the Joint Committee received clearly indicated the major economic advantages which would accrue to the Government by the use of nuclear reactors in the Antarctic and the reduced risk to human life which would result by the elimination of the very hazardous fuel transportation operation in the Antarctic, the Bureau of the Budget, incomprehensible as it may seem, did not include the project in its request to the Congress for authorization or appropriations.

Although the Congress authorized the Antarctic reactor project earlier this year, the administration took no positive action to carry out this valuable project. By letter dated May 17, 1960, the Bureau of the Budget informed the Joint Committee that the Department of Defense was being asked to review the advantages of nuclear reactors in the Antarctic. This review was being initiated in spite of the fact that a very comprehensive study had just been completed which clearly indicated the advantages of the project.

The Joint Committee foresaw the possibility of another serious delay in this project and directed, on June 14, 1960, letters to the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of the Budget requesting immediate action to carry out the project. In our letter to the Bureau of the Budget we expressed our concern with the lack of initiative and responsibility shown by the Bureau of the Budget in regard to this project.

Finally, on July 19, 1960, the Joint Committee was sent a copy of the Secretary of Defense's letter to the Bureau of the Budget which reported on the review the Bureau of the Budget asked the Department of Defense to make. The review, of course, corroborated the data submitted earlier this year to the Joint Committee by the Atomic Energy Commission.

We still have not received a reply to our June 14, 1960, letter to the Bureau of the Budget although we were informed today by the Atomic Energy Commission that a contractor has been selected to furnish one of the required reactors authorized for the Antarctic. We hope that this action will shortly be followed by the initiation of procurements for the other reactors required in the Antarctic.

The sequence of events on this project illustrates the importance of continually monitoring the budgeting operations of the Government to assure that maximum economies in Government operations are realized.

I would like to place in the RECORD the correspondence I referred to above. In addition, I would like to place in the RECORD a news release issued today by Senator JACKSON on the subject. Senator JACKSON visited the Antarctic and was one of the first to recognize the major advantages of this project. I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence and news releases be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
August 10, 1960.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Please refer to my letter of June 20, 1960, regarding invitations for proposals on the McMurdo Sound nuclear powerplant subject.

Proposals were received on July 18, 1960, from Alco Products, Inc., Combustion Engineering, Inc., and the Martin Co.

This is to advise you that the proposal submitted by the Martin Co. has been selected as a basis for negotiation of a fixed-price contract for a pressurized water type reactor to be constructed at McMurdo Sound. The contract price for the plant and two cores is not to exceed $3,950,678. In addition, the contract includes options for identical plants at McMurdo Sound.

The Commission's schedule calls for the reactor to be delivered to a naval port of embarkation by November 1, 1961, and for commencement of the plant availability test 75 days after the plant is delivered by the Navy to the construction site.

The tight schedule under which this program must be carried out, if we are not to lose a full year, makes it necessary for us to enter into a contract for this project prior to the enactment of the AEC appropriations bill. We have, therefore, made arrangements under which the Department of the Navy has transferred to us $1,500,000 to initiate this work with the understanding that funds expected to be included in the AEC or Navy 1961 appropriations for this purpose will eventually be used. Pending the availability of these funds, any contract which is signed with the Martin Co. will have a ceiling of $1.5 million.

Attached is a copy of the proposed public announcement concerning this award.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. LUEDECKE,
General Manager.

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT: THE MARTIN CO. TO SUPPLY REACTOR FOR MCMURDO SOUND

The Atomic Energy Commission has selected, as a basis for contract negotiations, a proposal of the Martin Co., Baltimore, Md., to supply a packaged nuclear powerplant for McMurdo Sound in Antarctica at a fixed price of not more than $3,950,678. This is the first of several plants which Congress authorized for installation in the Antarctic.

The proposal of the Martin Co. for this project was one of three submitted in response to a Commission invitation issued last June. Proposals were also received from Combustion Engineering, Inc., New York, N.Y., and Alco Products, Inc., Schenectady, N.Y.

Under the terms of the contract, the Martin Co. will design a 1,500-electric-kilowatt reactor and fabricate, assemble, and test operate the plant at McMurdo Sound. The reactor will be a pressurized water type, moderated and cooled with light water. It will be assembled at the factory in packages and shipped to the site for erection.

In selecting the contractor, the Commission has taken cognizance of the provisions of the Antarctic Treaty now pending ratification which relate to radioactive waste from reactor plants. The plant will be so designed and operated that radioactive waste will be handled in conformity with the terms of the treaty.

The contract requires that the reactor, designated PM-3A, shall be tested and be ready for shipment on November 1, 1961, and be in operation by early 1962. This schedule makes possible the use of the maximum time available for construction during the short Antarctic summer season.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1960.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: By letter dated May 17, 1960, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, informed the Secretary of Defense of the Bureau's position on funding for nuclear-powered reactors for Antarctica and requested that the Department of Defense review the advantages of nuclear power at bases there. I understand that a copy of this letter was provided to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I am forwarding a copy of a letter dated July 11, 1960, from the Deputy Secretary of Defense to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, in answer to the above letter, which, I believe, will provide the Department of Defense position on this matter in answer to the joint letter from you, Senator JACKSON and Congressman HOLIFIELD dated June 14, 1960.

Subject to the final approval of a specific appropriation for the powerplants in Antarctica, the Department of Defense will continue to assist the Atomic Energy Commission in their effort to get the construction of the first increment of the McMurdo plant under way in sufficient time to meet the November 1961 delivery date.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT B. LOPER,
Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Atomic Energy).

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1960.

Hon. MAURICE STANS,
Director, Bureau of the Budget.

DEAR MR. STANS: In your letter of May 17, 1960, you requested the Department of Defense to review the advantages of nuclear power in Antarctica, taking into account the anticipated level of scientific and logistic activities. Our review clearly indicates that the use of nuclear power in the Antarctic would substantially improve the quality of the logistic support afforded to the scientific work in that area.

The primary purpose of the effort in the Antarctic is a scientific endeavor. The Department of Defense, by direction of the President, is contributing logistic support. Because of the enormous distances involved, transporting, supplying, and quartering scientific personnel, and their necessary support forces are costing the Defense Department many times the amount actually spent on the scientific effort itself. Long lead times and the difficulty of predicting scientific needs make it highly desirable to rebuild the supporting bases in such a manner as to provide the flexibility required to meet the demands of the scientific effort.

There are only 3 to 4 months during the year when supply and construction work can be conducted in Antarctica. This season is from November through February. Generally major construction requires two seasons, one for site preparation simultaneously with procurement of building material in the United States, and the second for actual construction. Therefore, planning, programing and budgeting must be completed 2 to 3 years prior to the date the project can be put to use.

The operations in the Antarctic are split into two phases: the winter and summer operations. During the summer, resupply is achieved; Seabees and construction personnel are brought in for necessary construction repairs and rehabilitation of the base sites; and an air group is based at McMurdo Sound to conduct logistic flights to the Byrd, South Pole, and other stations. In fiscal year 1962 it is estimated that 750 personnel will be based ashore in the Antarctic during the summer period. Only the scientific observers and a minimum number of Navy support personnel remain on the ice during the Antarctic winter. In fiscal year 1962 it is estimated that 150 persons will be in the Antarctic during the winter period. Thus at all stations it is necessary to provide adequate facilities for the maximum numbers anticipated during the summer seasons as well as permanent facilities for those persons who remain in the Antarctic for the long winter season.

In reviewing the present and anticipated level of scientific and logistic efforts in the Antarctic, it was mutually agreed by representatives of both the National Science Foundation and the Department of Defense that there was a most definite and urgent need for improvement in all facilities at the various U.S. Antarctic stations. The original concept of the design and construction at the old IGY stations was based on a temporary installation, to be used 2 years at the most. The facilities are now 5 years old and must be replaced. In most instances it is much more economical to construct improved facilities rather than to attempt to rehabilitate the old facilities. For example, the present buildings are heated with oil stoves. Fire will always be a tremendous hazard so long as oil-fired space heaters are used; and, owing to the lack of water, firefighting is extremely difficult. Should a barracks building or food storage cache be destroyed by fire during the winter months, the personnel would face a critical problem of survival until help could reach them during the short operating season. In addition, buildings which are tightly closed or located in snow tunnels present a serious personnel hazard from toxic gases escaping from oil-fired heaters.

Nuclear power would permit the electrification of all heating and cooking facilities. It would provide ample power for increased scientific effort, and marked improvements in communications, aircraft operations, and general living conditions to attract more of the top scientific personnel to the work in that area.

The proposed program for installation of nuclear power in the Antarctic provides for plants at McMurdo Sound, the Byrd and South Pole stations. McMurdo Sound is the main base of support operations in the Antarctic. Shiploads of supplies are received here each year. Here the U.S. Navy operates an air facility to support air cargo lift to outlying stations. Here the first nuclear powerplant, a 1,500 kilowatt plant, mounted on piling foundations, would be installed in late 1961. The second nuclear powerplant, an 800–1,000 kilowatt unit, would be installed at Byrd station in 1962. It would be assembled in a snow tunnel similar to that being used by the U.S. Army at Camp Century, Greenland, this summer. In 1963, the third plant would be installed at the South Pole using the same type of nuclear powerplant as used at the Byrd station. The experience gained by the Seabees in installing plants at McMurdo Sound and Byrd station would be essential for the task at the South Pole. In 1964, the second nuclear increment of 1,500 kilowatts would be installed at McMurdo Sound. Thus, at the end of four building seasons, three stations could be rehabilitated and completely electrified.

The Antarctic Treaty provides that no radioactive waste shall be disposed of in the Antarctic. Provisions can be made in the design of the nuclear powerplants for the disposal of radioactive wastes outside of the Continent of Antarctica. Spent reactor cores would be returned to the United States. Spent filters and concentrated, low-level wastes could be shipped either to the Conus or to authorized waste-disposal sites.

The possible effect of nuclear reactors on the scientific investigation of existing radiation levels in the Antarctic is a matter for consideration. Continuous monitoring data taken in the vicinity of the nuclear powerplant at Fort Belvoir since November 1955 indicate no increase in normal background activity levels resulting from operation of this plant, even though this plant has been operating since April 1957 with controlled release of extremely minute amounts of activity to the environment. Accordingly, it appears that the operation of nuclear powerplants would not adversely affect scientific investigations in the Antarctic. Each of the proposed nuclear plant projects would, of course, be reviewed for compliance with appropriate safety criteria by the Atomic Energy Commission's reactor hazards staff.

The Congress has expressed a desire to install nuclear power in Antarctica as soon as possible. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concluded that atomic powerplants in the Antarctic would result in immediate savings in lives and equipment and monetary savings on the order of $80 million over 20 years. They further noted that such plants would enhance our national prestige by developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Antarctic, where the United States is participating in scientific work with 11 other nations. The installation of nuclear power in the Antarctic would be a dramatic demonstration of the President's "Atoms for Peace" program.

In addition, the report for the plan for the use of nuclear power in Antarctica was approved by the National Security Council on May 4, 1960.

Even though the plants planned for use in the Antarctic will be based upon proven technology, considerable care should be taken to assure that the plant designs properly incorporate this technology, and to assure that the plants are the most advanced that can now be built with assurance of reliability. For this reason, the unique experience and capabilities of the Atomic Energy Commission should be utilized to procure these plants. The Navy would transport, install, and operate the plants.

It is our understanding that the Atomic Energy Commission will receive appropriations for the procurement of the reactors. With respect to the plant at McMurdo, the Navy will reprogram within available resources in fiscal year 1961 to buy the material necessary for the construction and installation of the reactors at this location. Navy support requirements for the other two locations will be considered in connection with the fiscal year 1962 budget.

If funds for this project are appropriated, it is recommended that action be taken without further delay to procure such plants in order to avoid the loss of a full year. Such a delay could cost additional lives, put the installations of the powerplants out of phase with the rebuilding program, and could nullify the prestige which the United States stands to gain through such a scientific and engineering effort.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. DOUGLAS, *Deputy.*

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1959.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: With reference to the letter of June 14, 1960, from you, Senator JACKSON, and Representative HOLIFIELD, I am pleased to advise you that as of this date invitations have been extended for proposals on the McMurdo Sound nuclear powerplant project, it being stipulated that contract award is subject to the availability of funds. The invitations call for options until August 15, 1961, on up to two complementary plants for McMurdo Sound in order that we may ascertain through actual bids the effect of multiple orders on nuclear plant price. In the near future, as soon as appropriate technical specifications have been completed, we will invite proposals for plants for the Byrd and Pole Stations.

Because we must have a contractor at work by August 1 at the very latest, in order to give ourselves every opportunity to meet the November 1, 1961, date for shipment of the plant to the Antarctic, we have invited proposals from only those firms which are known to have a capability for fabricating an appropriate prepackaged plant on what will necessarily be an accelerated basis, and which are known to be interested in the McMurdo Sound project.

Our invitation calls for proposals to be submitted by July 18, and although the time allowed for their preparation is extremely limited, we have reason to believe that we will receive at least several adequate proposals from which to make a selection. We hope to negotiate a fixed-price contract with appropriate performance and schedule guarantees.

As discussed by Mr. Ramey and General Luedecke on June 18, the enclosed public announcement of the invitation for proposals will be released here and in New York on June 21, 1960.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. MCCONE,
Chairman.

STATEMENT BY JOINT COMMITTEE MEMBERS ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NUCLEAR POWERPLANT IN THE ANTARCTIC

(From the Office of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy)

Three senior members of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy expressed gratification today that the Atomic Energy Commission has acceded to their request to solicit proposals for atomic powerplants in the Antarctic on an accelerated schedule, it was announced today by Chairman CLINTON P. ANDERSON. Senator ANDERSON was joined by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman of the Military Applications Subcommittee, and Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislation. At the same time copies of letters signed on June 14, 1960, by the three members to the AEC, the Defense Department, and the Bureau of the Budget requesting urgent action on the Antarctic projects were released.

"We are pleased," said the three members, "that the Commission is proceeding to obtain proposals for at least one reactor, and hope that others will follow. We hope that the Commission's action is a signal that the executive branch and especially the Budget Bureau has finally decided to break the logjam on these projects."

The letter of the Joint Committee members to the Atomic Energy Commission stated:

"The history of this project (reactor powerplants for the Antarctic) as brought out during our hearings, gives us a classical example of how delays are developed in getting started on an important project. In order to prevent further serious delays it is obvious that positive action, which will contribute directly to progress of the work on this project, must be taken immediately.

"Accordingly, we strongly urge that the Commission proceed with the solicitation of proposals immediately, including in the solicitation the proviso concerning the appropriation of funds discussed above. We are very interested in seeing this important project proceed on schedule since, as testified to in our hearings, we as a Nation stand to profit so greatly from it economically, from the standpoint of international prestige, and from the standpoint of humanitarian considerations."

In a letter to Mr. Stans, Director of the Budget Bureau, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy members said:

"It is incomprehensible to us that the executive branch has still not formulated definite plans for the project and has not taken any positive action to start work on the plants. We are very much concerned with the lack of initiative and responsibility shown by the Budget Bureau in regard to this project, and with the consequences of the loss of a whole year if responsible action is not taken immediately.

"In any event we urge you to reexamine the plans for this project immediately and take whatever action is necessary to assure that no further delays are incurred in order that the Government can profit to the maximum amount possible from the economies and other benefits which will result."

No reply has as yet been received from Mr. Stans as to the request.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON
ATOMIC ENERGY,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
June 14, 1960.

Hon. JOHN A. MCCONE,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCONE: We are concerned with the possibility of incurring a delay in the initiation of procurement action for nuclear plants for the Antarctic which may result in failure to meet the November 1961 plant completion date.

General Luedecke's May 19, 1960, letter stated that the Commission believes the schedule could be met if the invitation for the nuclear plants can be issued in the next couple of weeks. General Luedecke's letter also stated that the Commission has already prepared an invitation for proposals for a reactor for McMurdo Sound. However, it is stated that the invitations are not being sent out because the Commission does not want to ask industry to spend time and money preparing proposals until there is assurance that funds will be made available for the plants.

You will recall that during the hearings on the Commission's fiscal year 1961 authorization bill the subject of proceeding with the solicitation of proposals prior to completion of congressional authorization and appropriate action was discussed (p. 374 of the hearing record). At that time Senator JACKSON asked Commissioner Floberg if it would not be possible to solicit proposals in advance of final congressional action including in the solicitation a stipulation that action on the proposals would be subject to authorization and appropriation of funds by the Congress. Commissioner Floberg stated that he knew of no legal problem in proceeding in this manner.

As you know, the Antarctic projects have since been authorized by the Congress. The appropriation of funds for the projects are now under consideration by the Congress. However, final action may not be taken on the appropriation bill for a couple of weeks.

In consideration of the above there is a serious possibility that this project may be delayed by a year if solicitation of proposals is not made immediately since if the plants are not ready for shipments during the short Antarctic construction period, starting in November, they must wait for the next year.

This impending delay brings to mind the comments you made after your visit to the Soviet Union last year on the need for cutting down the leadtime of our projects. We wholeheartedly agree with you on the need for eliminating this serious and inefficient situation. The history of the project, as brought out during our hearings, gives us a classical example of how delays are developed in getting started on an important project. In order to prevent further serious delays it is obvious that positive action, which will contribute directly to progress of the work on this project, must be taken immediately.

Accordingly, we strongly urge that the Commission proceed with the solicitation of proposals immediately, including in the solicitation the proviso concerning the appropriation of funds discussed above. We are very interested in seeing this important project proceed on schedule since, as testified to in our hearings, we, as a Nation, stand to profit so greatly from it economically, from the standpoint of international prestige and from the standpoint of humanitarian considerations.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman.
HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Military Applications Subcommittee.
CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Legislation.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON
ATOMIC ENERGY,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
June 14, 1960.

The Honorable THOMAS S. GATES,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Attached is a copy of a letter, dated June 14, 1960, which we have sent to the Atomic Energy Commission expressing our concern about delays in getting started on the nuclear reactor plants for the Antarctic and urging the Commission to take steps immediately to obtain proposals for construction of the plants subject to obtaining appropriations.

As you know, a comprehensive study of the use of reactor plants in the Antarctic and other remote sites was made by the Atomic Energy Commission for the Joint Committee. This study was based on information furnished by the Department of Defense and the U.S. Antarctic Projects Office. The study clearly showed the advantages of nuclear power applications at our bases in the Antarctic.

In March and April of this year, extensive hearings were held on the use of reactor plants in the Antarctic. In correspondence from the Department of Defense, and testimony by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Navy, and the U.S. Antarctic Project Office, all concurred in the advantages of this application.

Testimony by the Atomic Energy Commission made it clear that the solicitation of contractors for the plants must proceed immediately if the schedules stated in the March 31, 1960, letter from James H. Douglas, Acting Secretary of Defense, are to be met.

Accordingly, your cooperation is requested in carrying out the action requested of the Atomic Energy Commission in the attached letter. We are seriously concerned with the administrative delays which have already been incurred in initiating positive action to carry out this valuable project and with the imminent possibility of losing a whole year if action is not taken immediately.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman.
HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Military Applications Subcommittee.
CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Legislation.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON
ATOMIC ENERGY,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
June 14, 1960.

Hon. MAURICE H. STANS,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANS: Attached are copies of our letters to the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense, dated June 14, 1960, urging immediate action on the solicitation of proposals for the construction of Antarctic reactor plants subject to obtaining appropriations.

It is incomprehensible to us that the executive branch has still not formulated definite plans for the project and has not taken any positive action to start work on the plants. We are very much concerned with the lack of initiative and responsibility shown by the Budget Bureau in regard to this project, and with the consequences of the loss of a whole year if responsible action is not taken immediately.

Our Senate Members are taking steps with Senate Appropriations Committee to enable funds appropriated to AEC for this project to be transferred to the Defense Department. We hope you can see your way clear to support this approach.

In any event we urge you to reexamine the plans for this project immediately and take whatever action is necessary to assure that no further delays are incurred in order that the Government can profit to the maximum

amount possible from the economies and other benefits which will result.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Military Applications Subcommittee.

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Legislation.

COMMENT ON ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION RELEASE SCHEDULED FOR 1 P.M. CONCERNING AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR THE FIRST ANTARCTIC NUCLEAR REACTOR AT MCMURDO SOUND

(From the office of Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, State of Washington)

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, today commended the Atomic Energy Commission for "expeditious action" in awarding a contract for the first Antarctic nuclear power reactor, to be installed at McMurdo Sound.

JACKSON said the quick action of the AEC in awarding a contract would save a full year on the operational date of the first reactor in Antarctica. He said the reactor now should be operational by March 1962.

JACKSON added that he hopes the AEC will act with similar dispatch on procurement required to meet the urgent need for additional reactors at the South Pole Station and Byrd Station in Antarctica.

Reactors at all three stations were authorized by Congress this year at JACKSON's suggestion before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which he is a member. JACKSON visited Antarctica last fall and was struck by the high cost of conventional fuels and the possibility for using nuclear reactors economically.

Testimony before the Joint Committee showed that nuclear powerplants could cut the cost of power, light, and heat in Antarctica to one-fourth the cost of conventional powerplants.

JACKSON had urged the reactors for Antarctica not only to cut costs, but also to reduce the risk to human life involved in transporting conventional fuel oil by sea and air. He also recommended the reactors on the grounds they would add to this Nation's knowledge in the atomic power field, generally, and would build America's international prestige by being first with nuclear powerplants in this area of peaceful international competition.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does this deal with title III?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; $13 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the Senator has brought up that point, because I understand that the distinguished Senator from Alabama is not present. In addition to what the Senator from New Mexico has said, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the report of the committee appearing at page 40, entitled "Title III—Independent Offices" continuing going to page 42 of the report, dealing with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

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

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—GENERAL STATEMENT

The amount of increase recommended by the committee of $16,900,000 consists of restorations for operating expenses totaling $2,400,000, and increases for plant acquisition and construction totaling $14,500,000. Appropriatiosn for the two items total $2,675,960,000, which is $660,000 over the estimates for the two items of $2,675,300,000.

Recommendations for the activities of the Commission are detailed in the following paragraphs:

OPERATING EXPENSES

1960 appropriation (Atomic Energy Commisison Act, Public Law 86-164)	$2,389,114,000
Estimate, 1961 (including $32,500,000 in H. Doc. 387)	2,459,800,000
House allowance	2,450,560,000
Committee recommendation	2,452,960,000

NOTE—In addition, reappropriation of $37,000,000 and applied revenues of $22,600,000 are available.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $2,452,960,000 for Operating Expenses, which is a reduction of $6,840,000 from the revised estimate of $2,459,800,000, and an increase of $2,400,000 over the House allowance.

Of the restoration recommended, $1,900,000 is for nuclear technology under reactor development, to provide the amount requested of $49,500,000. The committee is advised that there is essential need for maintaining this basic work at the level estimated, in order to provide the information required for the development of new reactor concepts as well as for larger range improvements to existing concepts.

The remaining amount of $500,000 of the restoration recommended is for isotopes development, to provide the full budget estimate of $4,500,000. The committee is advised that the restoration is required in order to assure continuation of the newly developed program of low-dose food irradiations which, if successful, could make a substantial advance in the marketing of otherwise perishable commodities.

The committee further recommends deletion of the proviso limiting funds for the airplane propulsion reactor program to $58 million. The committee is advised that research and development costs in the amount of $73 million are included in the estimate for this program, as follows:

Direct cycle reactor (General Electric Co.)	$41,550,000
Indirect cycle reactor (Pratt, Whitney Co.)	27,500,000
General support (Oak Ridge National Laboratory)	3,950,000
Total	73,000,000

The committee recognizes that large sums have been spent on this program and that it is difficult to determine whether to more actively pursue the direct cycle or the indirect cycle. The committee is advised that the program will be reviewed by the Department of Defense during the year, to determine the military feasibility of one cycle or the other. In the meantime, the committee believes the full amount of the estimate should be available, to allow the Commission to pursue this program without limitation.

Plant acquisition and construction

1960 appropriation (Atomic Energy Commission Act, Public Law 86-164)	$262,500,000
Estimate, 1961	215,500,000
House allowance	208,500,000
Committee recommendation	223,000,000

The committee recommends a total appropriation of $223,000,000 for Plant Acquisition and Construction, an increase of $14,500,000 over the House allowance, and $7,500,000 over the budget estimate. The increase would provide for additional projects, as follows:

Nuclear power reactor plants for the Antarctic (61-d-10)	$13,000,000
Planning and engineering funds funds for materials research laboratory, University of Illinois (61-f-8) and for radiation laboratory, University of Notre Dame (61-f-9)	1,500,000
Total increase	14,500,000

Nuclear power plants for the Antarctic were authorized in Public Law 86-457, and the merits of the project were covered in detail, in hearings on the authorization as well as on the appropriation. The committee is impressed with the savings which would accrue through the use of nuclear energy as compared to the extremely high costs of transporting diesel fuel to the bases at McMurdo Sound, Byrd and Pole stations in the Antarctic. It is estimated that such savings over a few years would pay for this program.

No estimate has been submitted, but the committee is advised that the administration may favor placing the responsibility for this program with the Navy Department, in connection with the logistic support they provide for other programs in the Antarctic. Accordingly, in order to permit such allocation of these funds, the committee recommends inserting the following proviso:

"Provided further, That not to exceed $13,000,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to the appropriation 'Other procurement, Navy', solely for construction of power reactor plants for the Antarctic."

The additional increase of $1,500,000 is recommended to begin work on the projects authorized at the University of Illinois and at the University of Notre Dame by covering the planning and engineering costs of the buildings as authorized.

In agreeing to the general reduction of $10 million made by the House to be offset by slippages and savings, the committee realizes that the Commission, as in previous years, will not be able to obligate under contracts the full amount requested for construction during the fiscal year. No reduction is contemplated on any specific project.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority fund

1960 appropriation	$14,903,850
Estimate, 1960	20,520,000
House allowance	20,520,000
Committee recommendation	20,520,000

The committee agrees with the House in providing the full budget estimate of $20,520,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, covering increased funds over 1960 for the new lock at Wheeler Dam and the Melton Hill dam and reservoir.

U.S. STUDY COMMISSION—SOUTHEAST STATES

Appropriation, 1960	$740,000
Budget estimate, 1961	1,600,000
House allowance	1,500,000
Committee recommendation	1,600,000

The committee recommends $1,600,000, the budget estimate to insure completion of the work of the Commission on schedule.

U.S. STUDY COMMISSION—TEXAS

Appropriation, 1960	$800,000
Budget estimate, 1961	1,300,000
House allowance	1,200,000
Committee recommendation	1,300,000

The committee recommends $1,300,000, the budget estimate to insure completion of the work of the Commission on schedule.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, we appreciate very much the fine way in which the Appropriations Committee has

dealt with this problem and the confidence it has shown. I also appreciate the fact that Mr. McCone, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has moved forward rapidly in this field, to the great benefit of the country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield so that I may address a question to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to point out, with reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority, that the committee has recommended the exact amount adopted by the House, $20,520,000.

I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not sure, but I assume that the RECORD will show that the atomic energy facilities proposed to be placed in the Antarctic are in strict accord with the provision exempting the installation of certain facilities in Antarctica that are embraced in the treaty which was ratified by the Senate earlier today.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. With the permission of the Senator from Louisiana, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "$737,884,600" and insert in lieu thereof "$740,384,600".

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the committee itself for the wonderful work the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and the distinguished Senator from Arizona and all the other members of the committee have done with regard to the pending bill. I know of the diligence with which they have worked. I have known the distinguished Senator from Louisiana from the time I was mayor of Evansville, Ind. When I first came to Washington I received his splendid cooperation, and I was told that the committee would do everything that was possible to be done to alleviate flood conditions and help navigation.

I should like to point out that the committee has a very excellent staff member in Mr. Bousquet, who has accompanied me to the State of Indiana and has viewed at firsthand the result of the devastation, destruction, and damage that result when a river gets out of its banks and starts to move.

The amendment I propose must be taken in the light of the fact that the committee has been extremely kind. They have increased certain appropriations with reference to Indiana Harbor; levee unit No. 5, Wabash River; the Mason J. Niclack levee; and the project at West Terre Haute.

I have just returned from a visit to the State of Indiana, where I made an extensive tour of the Wabash Valley, following 4 years of flooding in the last 5 years.

The amendment which I propose would increase the total amount to be appropriated by the bill to $740,384,600. It is an increase of $2½ million.

I believe I should explain the reason why I am asking for the increase. I am firmly convinced that we ought to have flood control and flood protection now, not in perhaps 150 or 200 years from now. Even a casual examination of projects will show that progress is being made. The fact remains that if people are to live in the Wabash Valley, which is behind the times from the standpoint of flood protection, relief must be given now, because if the present rate of flood control protection is continued, it will be 120 years before a substantial amount of protection will be had. I recall a statement made to me by a 65-year-old man at Vincennes, Ind., who said to me, "Senator, I have been attending flood control meetings since I was 18 years of age. I first came to meetings with my father. We talked about planning to reduce damage caused by floods. All through the years I have kept coming back year after year to these meetings. My days on this earth are numbered. I do not expect to see too much done before I pass on. I hope that in some way we can demonstrate to the people in Washington that simply doing these things in piecemeal fashion is not really getting the job done. The damage which is occurring year after year is piling up far in excess of the benefits which could be derived if we went ahead and appropriated the necessary money."

Frankly, I was appalled. I was absolutely astonished at the destruction. Some Senators may recall Clarence McCormick, who was Under Secretary of Agriculture when Claude Wickard was Secretary. I flew over the territory with former Under Secretary McCormick, and over his land—some 700 acres plus. I saw farm after farm in stubble—dry land. There was nothing at all there. Nothing was growing. This is the story: In 4 out of the 5 years the land had been flooded. So far as the people were concerned, there was not much they could do.

Clarence said to me, "I have planted nine times on that land in 5 years. I have harvested one crop and part of another. I don't mind telling you that, financially speaking, one cannot be successful."

Then he pointed out some other fields. He said, "Those people planted last week in the hope they could grow corn. Last year I tried that. They will be lucky if they get gasoline money back."

Then we went farther south, toward the bottom lands along the river. We saw the bottom lands along the river. People had been farming the bottom lands.

We went back about 11 miles into the country, back into the fields. We were on the field road. There was beautiful corn standing on both sides of us. On one side, it was growing wonderfully high. But for many rows on the left-hand side the flood had set in and destroyed the crops.

We were about an hour and a half late at our destination, but those people insisted that I see what had happened. I got out in the middle of the crossroads. More than 50 farmers and their families, including the children, were there to meet me. I do not mind saying that it was hot. They had ice-cold lemonade for us. This was the real thing. It touched me down deep. There was an old surrey, and in it was a little boy dressed in a costume of about 1890. A little girl was sitting with him on the front seat, wearing the same type costume. Her bonnet was pulled over her head and tucked back under her chin. An old coon dog sat on the front seat between them, hooked up with the horse. There they were in this beautiful bottom land. A sign on the side of the wagon, in typical Okie fashion, read, "We're on our way."

An old man, 85 years old, said to me, "This is the first time I have ever felt I did not have the courage to go back and plant again."

That is the human side of this problem. That is why I think that, so far as we in Indiana are concerned, we feel like stepchildren who are begging for help.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and his colleagues on the committee have done what they could, but what is being done is not enough. We must come back with the story—"This is not enough."

We talk about the watershed program. Thirty-nine watersheds have been so designated in the State of Indiana. One set of engineers works on the program. Everyone admits that one set of engineers can do four projects a year. It is estimated that we need 500 projects to do the minimum job necessary in Indiana. At the present rate, those 39 watersheds which have been started will be completed in 10 years. It will take 125 years to have done the minimum which needs to be done. I do not think we can wait three, four, or five generations to provide the necessary flood-control works. That is why I say we should get the money now. It is not too much to ask for an additional $2,500,000. We need a comprehensive program, one which has been, in some cases, outlined for years. But the progress—and even the authorized progress—is entirely too slow. The farmers need to be protected now. If such protection is not afforded now, all we will do will be to add to the amount of land which is going down the Mississippi and is adding to the delta. We all know that it takes 400 years to create 1 inch of that kind of topsoil.

I think we should get a fair share of funds for these projects now. Frankly, we could use $200 million in Indiana now. I think we could put the people to work. We could put engineers and construction workers to work. I do not want to appear selfish. I am willing to let the Senators from Illinois and Michigan participate in an accelerated program of

flood control. I am willing to let them have their fair share of funds, too. I do not feel that we should have all the benefits. But if they do not want to proceed with such projects, we in Indiana are prepared to do so.

I met with the people in 15 major communities during the 5 days I spent in that region. I started at 7 o'clock in the morning, after breakfast. Many times we would continue our traveling until midnight, answering the questions of those people. It was always the same pattern: "When are you going to get the job done?" They do not care how we get it done; they want it done.

This is not merely spending money; it is investing in the future of our natural resources. It is an investment in flood control, water conservation, soil conservation, and bank stabilization, not to mention the prevention of losses of money to farmers and to the communities. It will be repaid many times in the benefits which come from the soil. As we all know, the soil creates wealth and puts it into the community. The net result, south of U.S. Route 40, is that in most communities in Indiana there has been a decrease in the growth of population. That is where the depressed areas are.

So if it is not desired to pass a depressed areas bill, at least we should do the next best thing and invest in the future of these areas.

I talked this afternoon with Gen. E. C. Itschner. I know all of us have great respect for the excellent work he does. He has a sincere interest in the welfare of this country. In my conversation with him, he said that so far as the Corps of Engineers was concerned, they could increase their capabilities and accelerate their program except for the limitation on funds. He also pointed out something else which is true, namely, that at present the salaries which are being paid those whom we expect to do the engineering work are not sufficient. It will not be possible to get competent personnel to do the work. If it is to be done, let us pay them. If we must hire engineers outside the corps, let us hire them. In any event, I think we should get the work done.

General Itschner said, "Let us award the contracts and place no restrictions on the personnel, and we will get the work done."

He said the Wabash basin is now in a position similar to that in which New England was after the disastrous floods of 1955. The Corps of Engineers went into New England at that time under a crash program and got the work done He pointed out the marvelous accomplishments which can be achieved when the urge comes.

We in Indiana are willing to accept responsibilities. Perhaps we have not yelled loud enough up to now. Perhaps we have not displayed proper interest. But we are here now to tell the Senate that we have an interest. We want the cooperation of Congress to get the work done.

The Corps of Engineers made the point that on the specific projects which are fixed now, they can spend more money, and they are willing to go ahead with them. They can accelerate the planning. Let me demonstrate what is involved in the planning: $30,000 has been appropriated for a study of the Wabash Valley. The Corps of Engineers has a capability, by its own statement, of at least $60,000. Approximately $360,000 will be needed to complete the study. At the present rate, it will take 11 years to complete that study.

This is a basin study, not a specific project study. It will take 10 years to get the basic study out of the way. That is why I have offered my amendment to the bill.

I hope the Senator from Louisiana may find it possible to join with me in support of the amendment. I have heard him speak on the floor, time after time, in defense of economy and saving in regard to foreign aid. We spend money for foreign aid to build dams for flood control. We are willing to do that for the benefit of people whom we do not want to see suffer.

Why can we not do it for our own people, people whom we know, who are our friends and relatives? We know their personal conditions. We do not have to rely on somebody in the administration or in a bureau or an agency to tell us of their condition.

If we can spend money to aid foreign countries, if we can use the talents of our engineers to build dams and levees, flood control projects, and sanitation facilities in Africa, Asia, Europe, and Latin America, then I think we can afford to spend funds here. I urge the Senate to give the measure serious consideration. It will demonstrate to the country that we really mean what we say with respect to America; that we want to go forward to build a better America, and we will start with our land, water, and natural resources first.

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

Mr. HARTKE. I shall be happy to yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I, too, favor foreign aid. But how are we going to keep providing foreign aid if we let the lands in Indiana, Louisiana, and elsewhere deteriorate, when public works are not available in order to create wealth? We cannot make foreign aid available if we do not have the facilities in this country to produce the wealth necessary to provide foreign aid. If wealth, which will produce taxes, is not produced in Indiana, where will the money to be used for foreign aid come from?

Mr. HARTKE. Certainly the Senator from New Mexico is entirely correct.

Recently I was delighted to be in the Senator's State, on my return from a recent important convention on the west coast which propriety may indicate that I not mention by name at this time. Let me say that in Indiana, under normal circumstances, one cow and a calf can be put on an acre of land. But in the Senator's State in many places it takes two sections of land, instead.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In fact, in my country, in the best land, it takes 40 acres to feed a cow.

Mr. HARTKE. That is one section.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Except where the land is irrigated, after the rainfall is placed behind walls, instead of being allowed to run off in flash floods. Confining the water in that way creates wealth, rather than permitting flash floods to destroy the land.

The average production of cotton in the South is 370 pounds to an acre. But if the rainfall is confined and used for irrigation, instead of being permitted to damage the land, as a result of floods, we are able to produce 4 bales of cotton to an acre. That is the difference.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is a cotton expert. I know about corn. In Indiana we are now growing 100 bushels of corn to an acre. One of my friends, a graduate of Purdue and a former county agent, said that within 10 years we shall produce 200 bushels of corn to an acre.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Provided they do not let the Wabash River destroy that activity.

Mr. HARTKE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, has the Senator from Indiana concluded?

Mr. HARTKE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder whether I may address a technical question to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to answer it if I can.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask this question: If the amendment of the Senator from Indiana were to be agreed to, would I then be foreclosed from offering an amendment—as it is my present intention to do—to strike out the appropriation of $25,000 for levee unit No. 5, on the Wabash River?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is really a parliamentary inquiry. As I understand, the distinguished Senator from Indiana is merely endeavoring to add $2,500,000 in order to accelerate the work, not only in Indiana, but, as I understand, all over the country.

Mr. HARTKE. Yes, all over the country. It would apply only incidentally to Indiana. Of course we would be willing to have the entire $2,500,000 used in Indiana; but we would ask for only our fair share.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then do I correctly understand that approval of the amendment would not have the effect I fear?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Illinois should address his question to the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then I address the question to the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is agreed to and if the amount is thus increased, that amount will not then be open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then I take it that the Chair's ruling is that if the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is agreed to, a subsequent motion of mine to eliminate the appropriation of $25,000 for the survey of levee unit No. 5, Wabash River, would not be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not be in order, because the Senate would already have passed on that item.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, Mr. President, I am compelled—although very reluctantly, of course—to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

I do not wish to enter into the debate in regard to levee unit No. 5, at the moment, except to say it is an old, established Hoosier custom to have levees built on their side of the Wabash River, and hence to throw the flood waters onto the Illinois side. That has already been done at Vincennes, Ind. That project protects Vincennes, and we are very glad to have it protected. But the result has been to throw additional quantities of water onto the Illinois side and to flood thousands of additional acres of Illinois land in Lawrence County.

The present proposal in regard to levee unit No. 5 is again to put levees on the Indiana side at, and especially below, Mount Carmel, with the net result of benefiting a few large-scale, rich farmers who own land on the Indiana side, but causing additional flooding on the Illinois side.

So, although I have great affection for the Senator from Indiana, I am not here to sacrifice the farm lands of Illinois in order to help rich landowners in Indiana. That is a well-established Hoosier custom but I do not believe in yielding to it.

Since we now have a technical ruling by the Chair that if the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is agreed to, I shall be foreclosed from attempting, later on, to move to eliminate the appropriation of $25,000 for the preconstruction planning of levee unit No. 5, I shall most reluctantly, be compelled to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. Let me say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois, that in the course of my recent trip it was my pleasure to visit with many of his fine constituents. They had nothing but the finest things to say about him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad of that.

Mr. HARTKE. I met with them almost all the way along, beginning near Covington. It was also my pleasure to trespass on his property. [Laughter.] I visited his fair city of Grayville, where the distinguished mayor and the chamber of commerce and more than 100 of the very fine citizens met with me, and also visited in Mount Carmel, and went down to see their river lands.

Just across from the area the Senator has mentioned, I saw the improvised levee on the banks of the Wabash and I saw the work done by the Army Engineers. When the flood warnings came, they proceeded, in their hip boots, to use great quantities of sand bags to try to keep out the water. They damned a small river, overnight, and saved many thousands of acres of Illinois farmland, by virtue of the fact that the water did not go 6 inches higher.

But my distinguished friend makes a very fine argument for what I am talking about, namely, a comprehensive flood program; and I would include the State of Illinois.

I shall not even discuss, at the moment, the merits of levee unit No. 5. But if the Senator from Illinois fears that my amendment would preclude the offering of the amendment he has in mind, why does not he offer his amendment to my amendment? That would avoid the technicality, and thereby the Senator from Illinois would give the Senate an opportunity really to demonstrate its interest in protecting those fine Illinois farms.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course there is an old maxim, "Beware the Greeks bearing gifts." So I beware of Hoosiers when they propose to put levees on their side of the Wabash and to throw additional quantities of water onto the Illinois side, because we know very well what they did at Vincennes and what they are trying to do in this instance.

What my friend wants is to require the Illinois farmers to buy higher hip boots when more water is thrown onto our side of the river, from Indiana. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTKE. All I say is that I am interested in having $25,000 made available for use by the Corps of Army Engineers, to make additional studies, so the floods will not occur and so flood damage will not be done, not only at Mount Carmel, but elsewhere.

I wish the Senator from Illinois had been with me when I was there. The farmers in the communities there had absolutely nothing to which to look forward. If the Senator from Illinois had gone into the area, as I did, and had seen the farmers gather around the elevator in the middle of a hot afternoon and ask for any kind of help, I am sure he would have been as impressed as I was. I certainly shall be delighted to go there and try to settle any problems the Senator from Illinois may have in regard to levee No. 5.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have also traveled down the Wabash. And I have done so at floodtime. I would be perfectly ready to give protection on the Indiana side equal to any protection we have on the Illinois side. I would like to see a levee protecting the city of Mount Carmel on the Illinois side, and I would be glad to have a levee on the Indiana side directly opposite so there would be equal protection.

But my friend from Indiana knows perfectly well what is at stake is not alone the protection of Mount Carmel, but also the question whether the protection of the farmlands below Mount Carmel is to be confined to the Indiana side.

The current plans of the Army Engineers are for a levee on the Indiana side, but for no corresponding levee on the Illinois side, with the net result that the lands on the Indiana side will be protected, but at the expense of land on the Illinois side. Unless the Senator is interested in the hip boot industry and the wearing of hip boots by the people in Illinois, I hope he does not try to play again the game that his predecessors did at Vincennes.

Mr. HARTKE. Does the Senator believe the Army Engineers to be biased in their opinion or that they would give an opinion that was not truthful in regard to this particular area?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Their statements show that Illinois will be damaged.

Mr. HARTKE. I will not ask the Senator to answer it, but I point out that the Army Engineers have made a study and have determined that there is a cost-benefit ratio which means that the benefit to be derived by the people in this area, including Illinois and Indiana, is 1.7 to 1.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the net result would be a detriment to the State of Illinois. There would of course be some benefit to the State of Indiana. What I am saying is that there should be equal sharing of the benefits by the residents on the Illinois side.

Mr. HARTKE. I am talking about people. The cost-benefit ratio—benefit to the people in the overall program—will be 1.7 to 1, according to the Army Engineers. I think the committee, in its determination of the evidence, was right when it said it should not be delayed, because the committee considers this an important project that should be built at an early date.

The committee said in the report:

> The committee does not feel that the needed flood protection for levee unit No. 5, which was authorized in 1936, should be postponed indefinitely.

Also, it took into consideration Mount Carmel, and it approved $10,000 in the budget for a study of Mount Carmel; but it also approved an additional $15,000 for a survey. Nobody is building anything there this year. All the Engineers are going to do is study the project.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the Senator from Indiana has quoted the Army Engineers, let me quote from page 2710 of the hearings, the second paragraph of their statement:

> The Corps of Engineers recognizes that the construction of levee unit No. 5 will increase the flood level at Mount Carmel, the frequency of damaging floods, and the annual average flood damage in Wabash County, Ill.—

This is on the Illinois side—

> the extent of which would be determined during the course of a study.

In other words, it is clear from the Corps of Engineers' official comments that it is proposed to injure Mount Carmel and Wabash County in Illinois and then to have a study made to find out how much injury will be inflicted. That is both cold and wet comfort.

Mr. HARTKE. If the Senator will read further in the report, he will find that not only was this matter taken into consideration, but was presented to the people of Mount Carmel. Additional funds are allocated to Mount Carmel.

I suggest that the Senator offer his suggestion as an amendment to my amendment, so this question may be disposed of now, in order not to jeopardize the opportunity which the Senate has of demonstrating to the country the truth of the fact that we are interested in conserving the wealth of the United States for ourselves and our children.

If the Senator will do that, I am sure he will not be prejudiced in any way by having the question determined at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the Senator from Indiana implies that the people of Mount Carmel desire to have levee unit

No. 5 erected on the Indiana side, let me say that I have been in touch with the Honorable Harry C. Miller, mayor of Mount Carmel, and the people representing farmowners on the Illinois side, including the Wabash County Flood Protection Committee, under the chairmanship of Leonard W. Koger, Jr. I have been in touch with them. They are opposed to this proposal. I have had a heavy volume of mail from Illinois constituents in opposition to it. And I am informed that 104 Indiana residents, as well, have filed a suit contesting the levee district's legality.

If we could get a ruling that the approval of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana would not foreclose my later amendment, I would be willing to reconsider my position on his pending proposal.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I regret to say that I shall oppose the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Indiana. As I stated in my opening remarks, the committee tried to balance this bill. Because of conditions that exist in Indiana, the committee has provided funds for 10 projects in Indiana, 3 of which are for the planning of reservoirs on the Wabash River.

I regret to say that it required a calamity in the northeastern part of our country to awaken the people of New England. I well remember that projects in that area had been authorized back in 1936——

Mr. CHAVEZ. In 1934. Eighteen of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the people were not interested in them. No effort was made to provide funds to build dams to prevent floods. It required a great hurricane and a great disaster to awaken the people. Almost the same situation exists in the State of Indiana. We did not hear too much about that area until the great flood of 3 or 4 years ago. Since then we have provided funds to plan 3 reservoirs in the upper Wabash River Basin. In addition, we have provided for the construction of levees in order to avert future floods.

I believe that the committee has treated Indiana very fairly; I do not think it would help the Indiana situation much to provide an additional amount of $2½ million that could be applied anywhere in the country as the Engineers see fit.

If the Senator desires to ask for more funds for any of these projects, I suggest that, instead of offering an amendment which would provide funds to be used all over the country, he be specific and come before the committee next week.

The committee will then have under consideration a supplemental appropriation bill. As I understand, a new title will be added to the mutual security bill to provide for supplemental appropriations.

If the distinguished Senator from Indiana can make a case, I am sure the Committee on Appropriations, will give him a hearing and perhaps may comply with his request. But I beg of the Senate not to accept this amendment to the bill, because, as I have said, we have provided a balanced bill. If we open this bill to amendment, I can readily understand that many Senators would like to have some projects which have been authorized provided for in this bill.

It would open up the flood gates. We might lose many of the projects we now have, which I believe, we can defend before the conference when it occurs.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HARTKE. Will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. HARTKE. In the first place, I wish to say that at no time have I intended any reflection upon the work of the committee, and certainly I have never intended a reflection upon my distinguished friend from Louisiana, for whom I have the highest regard. I know of the diligence and the close study with which the Senator from Louisiana approaches these matters.

The Senator makes a comment about opening up the floodgates. This is what I would like to stop. I do not wish to open up the floodgates. I wish to close the floodgates.

The Senator says that other Senators will want projects added. If there are other projects which should be done this year, the Senator and I know that putting the projects off until next year will not make them any cheaper. Putting the projects off until next year will not keep the land from being flooded.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to my friend that I have been making this argument for the past 7 or 8 years. It was a very hard task to get the few projects we got in the bill.

As I pointed out in my opening statement, we have added 34 new projects the cost of which will be in excess of $520 million. If we add more to the list, we may be met again with a veto, for all I know.

I believe the bill as it now stands is a well-balanced bill and under the circumstances it is my considered judgment that Indiana has been well taken care of.

I certainly would like to be able to increase the recommendations to comply with what the Senator has requested. If I should do so, I fear I might endanger passage of the bill. I know we would have a great deal of trouble getting the House conferees to agree to any additional sums of money above those that we have now included in the bill.

Mr. HARTKE. I compliment my distinguished friend for arguing for this program for 7 or 8 years. I think that is a fine attitude. I do not wish to have my friend stop his argument now. I should like to have him continue. I should like to give the Senator an opportunity to demonstrate his devotion to the cause.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not stopped. We added 34 new projects.

Mr. HARTKE. I understand. We can spend this amount of money easily.

I ask my distinguished friend if we really should be fearful of a veto. I am not afraid of a veto. I think the people should know the facts. If the people know the facts they will meet the veto.

I think if the President, instead of making the visits he made or in addition to making the visits he made to foreign countries, would visit around in our country and see the conditions of our own people, he would be hard pressed to veto a bill. At least, in my judgment he would have a hard time putting his head on his pillow at night after a veto.

This is the point I am talking about. I am talking about people and their lives. I hope my distinguished friend will at least give me a chance, and give himself a chance, to have the Senate support his position of the past 7 or 8 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to my good friend that there are many areas in the United States today in which we could use much more money than we have provided. The increase in the bill of $82 million for flood control and rivers and harbors, I think, goes pretty far. I am willing to work as hard as I can in order to get the House of Representatives to agree to the increases which we have recommended.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe that there is a limit beyond which we cannot go. If my good friend will be patient and will appear before the committee next week, the committee certainly will listen to him. I would much prefer that the Senator be specific as to the projects with respect to which he desires additions, rather than simply asking to have placed in the bill an additional amount of $2½ million. In my opinion, that is not a good way to proceed. There are some projects I know of which are as worthy as the one about which the Senator is now talking.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. So far as the costs are concerned, we know the costs will go up in the future. We know that every project which is authorized must show a greater benefit than the cost. This is not a waste of money; this is a saving of money.

Certainly we can spend $2½ million. The Senator says this proposal is not specific enough. I point out to my distinguished friend that we are being much more specific—since this at least will go to our people in the United States—than the foreign aid specifications are. I remember that when my friend from Alaska tried to require some specifics with regard to the foreign aid expenditures it was said, "Oh, no, we do not want to be specific for the foreign aid program. Give us the money, and let us determine where it will be spent."

I have the utmost confidence in General Itschner and in the Corps of Engineers. I do not think they will waste a penny. I think the Senator will agree that if we provide $2½ million to the Corps of Engineers not 1 penny will be wasted. We will receive many, many times more benefits than the cost of what we put into the projects.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with that statement. I would hesitate to overload the bill and endanger its passage.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Do I correctly understand that the amendment calls for a $2½ million addition to the bill, for expenditure by the Corps of Engineers wherever the Corps of Engineers wishes? The Corps of Engineers might spend some money in Indiana, or might not.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That is my understanding.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Corps of Engineers might spend all of the money in Indiana, or might spend all of the money in Mississippi, but that would be a matter within the discretion of the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding.

Mr. CAPEHART. Do I correctly understand that the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is objecting to that, and may offer an amendment to delete from the present bill the $25,000 for levee unit No. 5, whereas if the $2½ million amendment were to be withdrawn the Senator would agree to the $25,000?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, that is not true. My objection is to the $25,000 for levee unit No. 5. I object to the $2½ million only because it would foreclose my proposal to eliminate the $25,000.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would not the able Senator from Illinois go along with the request for $25,000 for levee unit No. 5?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, because it is a typical Hoosier practice of building levees on the Indiana side of the Wabash River, and then when there is a flood, the flood is on the Illinois side.

Mr. CAPEHART. Every river has two sides.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Apparently the Senators from Indiana believe that the Wabash has only one side, judging from the experience we have had.

Mr. CAPEHART. If every Senator took the position of the able Senator, we would never have any flood control or any levees in the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I simply ask our Indiana friends to provide levees on both sides of the river, and not merely on one side. The Indiana people have protected themselves at our expense at Vincennes. Now they propose to do the some thing to the south.

Mr. CAPEHART. The best answer in the world to the Senator's question is, Why not introduce proposed legislation for a levee on the Illinois side?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. We cannot put authorizing legislation into this appropriation bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why is the Senator opposed to us, when we had the aggressiveness and good sense to have the appropriation bill provide funds to study a levee, when nothing has been done on the Illinois side? Do the people of Illinois understand that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senators from Indiana——

Mr. CAPEHART. I am willing to put it to a vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Just a moment, please.

If the Senators from Indiana would agree that this study is to be for levees protecting the city of Mount Carmel, Ill.——

Mr. CAPEHART. It is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Just a minute, please. If the Senators would agree that it is to protect the city of Mount Carmel, Ill., and corresponding lands on the other side of the river, that would be perfectly satisfactory, but the present proposal is to draw up the construction plans to build levees on the farm lands south of Mount Carmel on the Indiana side, not on the Illinois side.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. The result of construction there will be flooding on our side of the river.

Mr. CAPEHART. We are not talking about building levees at all. We are talking about studying the advisability of building levees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am perfectly willing to vote to study the advisability of building levees on the Illinois side at Mount Carmel, as well as on the Indiana side. I have always been willing to do so.

I do not understand why the able Senator is opposed to this item, because it calls only for a study of the advisability of work on the Illinois side.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say to my good friend from Indiana that he either does not recognize the difference between preconstruction planning money and study money, or he is very successful in concealing the difference.

As the Senator well knows, the levee on the Indiana side was approved and authorized many years ago. The money which would be spent there would be for the detailed engineering plans. The levee on the Illinois side has not been approved, and therefore any money appropriated in relation to it would merely be for a survey to determine whether there should be a levee.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no question with regard to whether——

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senate is willing to authorize detailed engineering plans for levees on the Illinois side, to match the levees on the Indiana side, that will be satisfactory. But it cannot do that until studies are completed and authorizing legislation is passed. To attempt merely to have another study at this time to determine whether there should be levees on our Illinois side of the river, and to go ahead with construction plans for levees on the other side of the river, is the famous 50–50 game of one horse and one rabbit, with the horse going to the Indiana group and the rabbit going to the Illinois group.

The Senators from Indiana may believe we are like rabbits, but we are not jackasses.

Mr. CAPEHART. Judging from the way the able Senator from Illinois talks, Indiana always gets the better of the deal, and perhaps we are jackasses. Those are the words of the Senator from Illinois, not mine. The RECORD will show the intimation that we always get the better of a transaction, that we are wiser than the people of Illinois, and that we know how to do things and they do not.

I will vote either to study, to plan or to build a levee around Mount Carmel, Ill., because I think it is needed. I will vote for that, and I will vote for levee No. 5 in Indiana. I will vote to support both of them. But, unfortunately, the able Senator from Illinois did not come here with an amendment or a bill to make the necessary study and plan to build a levee at Mount Carmel, and until he does so, I cannot support his request. When he does, I shall support him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with respect to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana, may I ask what has been the plan now and in the past with respect to earmarking money for planning purposes, as distinguished from putting it into a general pool?

Mr. ELLENDER. Planning money is usually specific as to each project, whereas for surveys, as I indicated a while ago, the money is provided in a lump sum and we leave it to the engineers to allocate the survey money to various projects.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is directed to planning money.

Mr. ELLENDER. Planning and construction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amendment seeks to earmark $2½ million, which is contrary to the practices under which the committee has operated in the past?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is to a large extent, and that is why I am suggesting to my good friend from Indiana that he appear before the committee next week with a proposal to earmark a specific amount for certain projects, and let the engineers come in and state their capability on those projects.

It strikes me that we would gain time by following that procedure. I have been advocating that kind of action ever since I first came to the Senate, in order to conserve and protect our water resources. But sympathetic as I am to providing more money, with the little amount we have added from year to year, I would foresee objection, as we have had objection in the past, from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. I hope that the Senate will stand by the committee and reject this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "$13,062,800" and insert in lieu thereof "$14,062,800".

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement upon the amendment. The amendment is along the same line as the previous amendment. It goes to the question of funds for surveys, concerning which there is no specified designation at the present time as to projects. The amendment calls for

an increase of $1 million in the funds allotted for the use of the Corps of Engineers. I believe this amount is necessary. I think it can be utilized, and in the long run it will not only save the United States money in costs, with respect to what we must appropriate, but also, as I indicated previously, it will represent a saving to the property owners and to the people of America in the conservation of our water resources.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend that we increased the amount over the budget request by almost $4 million, and we shall have a hard time to retain half of the increase recommended. What the committee did was to take into consideration all of the projects for surveys that were submitted to the committee, and if the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] will refer to page 4, he will see that we have provided the method by which the allocation of the total amount may be distributed:

> The committee reaffirms its position that an active, well-balanced survey program is the keystone of an orderly and sound water resource program.
>
> As in the past, the committee prefers not to make specific allocations to individual investigations. It desires, however, to call to the attention of the Corps of Engineers the testimony presented to the committee with respect to the need for increased amounts for surveys contained in its tentative allocation of budget recommendations, and expects that increased amounts will be applied to those surveys where feasible.

I wish to say at this point that the total sum of $13 million-plus which the committee has recommended, which, as I said, is almost $4 million more than the budget estimate, will in a measure provide for most of the worthy projects that have already been submitted to the committee for consideration.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I compliment my distinguished friend again upon what he has done, but the people will state, as we talk with them, that we are not going fast enough. The Army Engineers will tell us, if we ask them, that they can use this money. They have said so in the testimony. As I previously said, General Itschner and the other Army personnel are distinguished generals. We have a general in the White House. I think they should confer a little and that those men should be given an opportunity to utilize their abilities.

Mr. ELLENDER. They did confer with General Itschner. General Itschner made a proposal to the White House, and the entire recommendation was only $9,700,000. We increased that amount to $13,062,800, which is almost $4 million above the budget estimate, as I said. It is almost $2¼ million above what the House approved. So it is evident that we shall have difficulty in obtaining even the amount that we recommended. I should like to insert $15 million for the survey program, but I wish to be realistic. It is my belief that the amount recommended for surveys in the aggregate of $13,062,800, if we can obtain it, will be adequate, to cover the most urgent studies which have been submitted to us by various witnesses who have appeared before the committee.

I hope that the amendment offered by my good friend from Indiana will be rejected.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield first to my good friend from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the distinguished Senator from Louisiana yielding to me, because before we reach a vote on the civil functions appropriations bill, I expect to speak on the items for the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. I wish to commend the subcommittee and its distinguished chairman for the part they had in planning for an orderly program of construction for flood control and for the Bureau of Reclamation. I was pleased that the chairman of the subcommittee read this section of the report:

> The committee reaffirms its position that an active, well-balanced survey program is the keystone of an orderly and sound water resource program.

I was a Member of the House of Representatives in 1936 when we wrote the first comprehensive Flood Control Act in this Nation.

I have observed with great interest the orderly program that is being carried out through the direction of our distinguished chairman and the Committee on Appropriations, and the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Corps of Engineers. I wish to commend them for the increases they have recommended for studies, in order that we may have future projects and keep them on schedule.

I hope the House will agree to the item the committee has recommended for additional study. For instance, it has increased the item for flood control studies from $3,561,600 to $4,946,100.

That is a commendable item. I wish to congratulate the committee. I know from past experience that it will be difficult to hold to that item.

We have many projects in Kansas. I could mention several. I hope some of them will be included. There is, for example, the Walnut River project, and the Cow Creek project. They are programs for the future. We need them, as has been stated by my distinguished senior colleague earlier in the debate.

We in Kansas wish to express our appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee for the projects which have been included. I can assure him that I will continue to support him as he comes in with orderly programs on an orderly basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement about the committee report, because it is appropriate to the problem that has been raised by the able Senator from Indiana. I commend him for his vigilance and diligence in respect to the interests of his State.

We have before us a committee report which I believe represents not only hours of very hard work on the part of the committee, but is also, I believe, an impartial and fair report, which balances the equities of the various projects which the committee had to consider.

I make this comment because I see before me four Members of the Senate who I believe have been very fair in handling such projects as these. I do not exclude any other members of the Committee on Appropriations, but these four Senators, with whom I have worked on projects in Oregon are present in the Chamber. I speak, of course, of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]; the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]; and my neighbor to the north of my State, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I have always received very fair and impartial consideration from the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and from the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

What has been our procedure before the Committee on Appropriations? We have all had an opportunity to appear before the committee and to ask for additions to the President's budget estimates on the basis of information that we have received from the Army Engineers as to how much they could efficiently and effectively spend. On more than one occasion the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and their committee have given a very understanding hearing to me on the basis of this argument.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR KEFAUVER

This is the first time that I have had the pleasure of seeing the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in the Chamber, to express my congratulations to him. I do so now.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Returning to the point I was making, we have all had an opportunity to appear before the various subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. The Senators I have mentioned, as well as other members of the committee, have given us fair and full hearings. At those hearings we have presented what the Army Engineers have advised us they could spend efficiently and effectively.

The committee itself has to work within the realm of realities. I believe the committee has done that in regard to the report. The Senator from Louisiana is quite right. Sympathetic as I am with the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], as a matter of principle, if we ever start modifying the report of the committee by asking to have added to each one of these items an increase in the amount of money that the Army Engineers tells us they can spend for some of these projects, what will we do? We will write the bill on the floor of the Senate. We will not have the benefit of the testimony and the balancing of interests that the committee has had the benefit of.

I have just returned from a rather extensive trip through my State. I be-

lieve the Senator from Louisiana will be interested to hear me say this. I made many speeches and held many conferences with my constituents. I was surprised to find that the No. 1 issue raised with me, of the many issues of concern to the people of my State, was the matter of appropriations for needed projects in my State. My State at the present time is in a very serious economic slump because the bottom has fallen out of the lumber industry. Mill after mill is closing down. Thousands of lumber workers do not have any jobs today, although they hope that perhaps next week, or the week after, or the month after there will be jobs for them. To a large extent, my State is a one-industry State. We need to have much greater diversity, and that is why we need so many of the projects which are involved in the committee report. We need to diversify our economy.

The Senator from Louisiana will be pleased to know that although on many occasions I mentioned before these audiences the names of the Senators I have mentioned on the floor this afternoon, various groups in my State are aware of the great service that the Senator from Louisiana has performed through his impartial handling of these appropriation items in the appropriation bill.

For example, I refer to the Green Peter project, which is one of the projects for which the State of Oregon is receiving funds in the appropriation bill. The administration recommended $1,400,000. The Senator from Louisiana knows that I appeared before the committee and pleaded for the amount the Army Engineers stated they could efficiently and effectively spend. When we slow down projects for lack of funds, we waste taxpayers' money. There is no economy when we get a project under way and then stop it or delay it. There is no saving of taxpayers' money if we do not proceed with it as rapidly as we can to completion, so that it can start making profits which will return its costs to the Treasury of the United States.

In this instance the committee, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, saw fit to increase the President's request from $1,400,000 to $2 million. As the Senator knows, this has been one of my pet projects. This is one of the projects that I have had to battle for over a period of years, first to stop it from being given away under a partnership concept some years ago. In those years all we could get was planning money. Once the construction was started, the Senator from Louisiana and the other members of the committee have speeded up construction by speeding up appropriations.

I believe the RECORD should show that the people of Coos Bay have specifically ask me to express to the Senator from Louisiana and his colleagues their appreciation for the fact that $23,000 for planning on the Coos and Millicoma River project, which the President recommended but which the House dropped, has been restored in the Senate verison of the bill. So we can go ahead at least with the planning for this much needed project.

I could take each one of these projects and report to the Senator from Louisiana the deep appreciation of the people of my State living within the economic environment of each project.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana and the members of his subcommittee for what I believe has been fair dealing. It does not mean that the senior Senator from Oregon would not have liked to have more. I asked for more in regard to a good many of these projects. That was my duty as legislative counsel for my State. But I may say, as counsel in the case, so to speak, that in my judgment the court was just and fair, and I thank it for the fair dealing it gave to the people of Oregon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I, too, wish to express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee and to the Committee on Appropriations for this bill, which appropriates funds for vitally needed flood control and navigation projects all over the Nation, but in this instance, in particular, for the State of Minnesota. The two Senators from Minnesota and members of the other body have testified in favor of important projects which will add to the economic well-being of our State and to its economic productivity.

I am particularly appreciative of project funds to plan the construction of a navigation project in the outer harbor of the Duluth, Minn.-Superior, Wis., harbor. The bill appropriates $60,000. I assure Senators that this is a project which means much to the entire Great Lakes area.

Also, the bill appropriates $50,000 to plan the construction of a navigation project in the inner harbor of the Duluth-Superior harbor.

To construct a 9-foot channel in the Minnesota River, the bill appropriates $500,000. That channel, by the way, leads down into the grain-processing areas of Minnesota and into some of our newly developed industrial areas. It will mean a great saving to the people of our State and will be a great help to the industrial future of the State.

To rectify damages on the Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., the bill authorizes $2,660,000.

To construct improvements in the Red River of the North drainage basin, the bill appropriates $368,000. Anyone who has been in that area knows the problems which have developed in floods. I can assure the Senator from Louisiana, who is an economy-minded Senator, and whose record in that field is most exemplary, that no sum of money will be better used than that which has been appropriated for the Red River of the North, in the drainage area where there have been severe problems resulting from floods over the years.

The bill appropriates the sum of $60,000 for the construction of a flood control project on the Redwood River at Marshall, Minn. There have been two or three serious floods in that area in the past 7 years, causing not $60,000, but literally hundreds of thousands, even millions of dollars in damages.

To plan the construction of a flood control project at Rushford, Minn., the bill appropriates $75,000.

To construct a navigation project at St. Anthony Falls, the bill appropriates $4,900,000.

To plan the construction of a flood control project at St. Paul and South St. Paul, the bill appropriates $500,000.

I am certain the Senator from Louisiana and his colleagues know that about 4 years ago a flood occurred in that area which cost the people of that area millions of dollars. I hesitate to give the exact amount, but it was more than $10 million. This flood control project is desperately needed.

To plan the construction of a navigation project at Two Harbors, the bill appropriates $6,000.

To plan for the construction of a flood control project at Winona, Minn., the bill appropriates $80,000.

I desire to express the gratitude of all Minnesotans for the excellent and painstaking work of the Committee on Appropriations, and especially the subcommittee and its chairman on this important measure.

I am pleased that the committee added funds for two navigation projects in the Duluth, Minn.-Superior, Wis., harbor, and an appropriation for a navigation project at Winona, Minn. Each of these three projects was authorized in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill as enacted into law on July 14, 1960.

These projects are extremely important to the economy of northern Minnesota. According to a recent study, the Duluth-Superior harbor had more traffic in 1958, than any other of the 19 Great Lakes harbors, and has a benefit-cost ratio of 19.3 to 1, higher than most of the other Great Lakes harbors. Two Harbors is also a major Great Lakes port, and has the highest benefit-cost ratio of any Great Lakes harbor—68 to 1.

The citizens of northern Minnesota are concerned that unless Congress approves these projects to deepen the harbors of Duluth-Superior and Two Harbors, these ports will not be able to take advantage of the opportunities of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Citizens of other States will suffer also because Duluth-Superior and Two Harbors are the most westerly ports of the St. Lawrence Seaway system and service much of the northern region of the Midwest. These citizens, however, are confident that the Senate will approve these projects which are so necessary to the well-being of their region's economy.

The citizens of Minnesota were also pleased that the Senate Appropriations Committee concurred in the House approval of funds to initiate construction of the St. Paul-South St. Paul flood control project. They had been disappointed when the 1961 budget of the administration did not recommend funds for this project. Three times in the last 10 years, the Mississippi River has flooded these communities and caused more than $12 million of direct damage

and many more millions of indirect damages. The financial wisdom of this project is obvious when the fact is known that its cost is $7,070,000, less than two-thirds the direct damages incurred in the past 10 years. This project is even more urgent for humanitarian reasons. Three times in the past decade more than 6,000 residents had to flee their homes; many returned to find their possessions either damaged or lost. For at least a month after each of the three floods, 14,000 workers remained unemployed. Such hardships place a great burden on local financial resources, a burden which the Federal Government should help to bear.

The water problems of Minnesota are not unique, and these Senators who represent States with similar water problems will, I am sure, join with me to voice our appreciation for the tireless efforts and deep good will which has characterized the work of the Senate Appropriations Committee as they considered this bill. Their recommendations deserve the support of all of us.

I heartily support the bill which is before the Senate. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I join in congratulating the members of the Committee on Appropriations for the work they have done on the bill. I think it is an exceptionally good bill. I especially wish to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for his constructive work and his fair conduct of the time-consuming hearings on the proposed legislation. I know that a number of citizens of my State have come each year to testify on various aspects of the program, which is so important in my State, and they are always received with courtesy and are given a fair hearing.

I also wish to express my appreciation to my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], for the fine work he has done on the bill. Arkansas is fortunate in having its senior Senator in such a strategic position on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, the bill, although drawn up before the Democratic convention began, represents a major step in carrying out the natural resources plank in our party's platform. This plank states the truism that "natural resources are the birthright of all the people." It goes on to say that the Democratic party will promote a comprehensive national resource policy and bring renewed vigor to preserving and developing the Nation's resources. This bill is a positive step in getting under way a more concentrated effort to protect our natural resources birthright. I feel certain that a new Democratic administration will mean the beginning of a forward-looking program of sound resource conservation work.

The committee's recommendations for the Arkansas River program are a substantial boost to expediting work on this promising project. The development of the Arkansas River for navigational purposes should bring unprecedented economic development to the Arkansas Valley area. Our Nation's past experience with other navigation projects, such as in the Ohio Valley, illustrates the possibilities for regional industrial expansion from low-cost water transportation. The addition of $4 million for bank stabilization over the House-approved amendment was good news to the supporters of the program. Bank stabilization is an essential element of the overall project, and I hope it will be considered as such by the Budget officials from now on. I am also pleased that $200,000 has been added for initiating planning on additional locks and dams in the system. Although the Engineers could have effectively used more money, this is at least a substantial start on the planning for these units.

The committee has recommended $500,000 for construction on Millwood Reservoir.

This has been one of the most difficult projects to get under way in my State. The senior Senator from Louisiana is thoroughly familiar with the project, and I am particularly pleased that this appropriation is included in the bill.

This project will provide flood control and water supplies for a large area of southwest Arkansas. Substantial funds have already been appropriated for the project, and there is no valid reason why the Budget Bureau should recommend against further appropriations to continue the work. The $500,000 will be sufficient to get the project well under way. The Southwest Arkansas Water District has been organized and is in operation to handle the distribution of water from the project. I am hopeful that the project will now proceed as rapidly as possible.

Beaver Reservoir, which is very near my home town of Fayetteville, is scheduled to be allocated $2,800,000 in construction funds. This is the last unit in the White River Basin program and will be an important asset in helping bring about further economic development in northwest Arkansas.

I was especially pleased that the committee added $150,000 to initiate planning on the Ouachita River navigation project. The existing navigation channel has been outmoded for years, and modernization and deepening of the channel was authorized in this year's public works authorization bill. The Ouachita Valley is rich in natural and human resources, and the availability of cheap water transportation should make the region even more attractive to outside industry. There have been many frustrations and disappointments in connection with this project, and the appropriation of planning funds will be welcome news to the citizens of this area.

There are other Arkansas projects in this bill which I could mention, but I will not take up any further time of the Senate in doing so. I did want to express my appreciation to the members of the committee for their favorable consideration of the items which are so important to the citizens of my State. I know the people of Arkansas are grateful for the committee's foresight in understanding our water problems.

I hope that all of the Arkansas projects will be retained in the conference committee.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, included in this appropriation bill are funds for the AEC amounting to $2,452,960,000 for operating expenses and $223 million for plant acquisition and construction. The Commission estimates that within this fiscal year the AEC in Idaho at the NRTS, a total of $40,103,000 will be spent as operating expenses and $30,269,000 for construction work.

Of particular interest to NRTS is the Senate deletion of a proviso placed in the bill by the House of Representatives which would have limited the aircraft nuclear propulsion program to $58 million during the coming year. The Senate bill in removing this limitation approved the expected expenditure for this program up to $73 million for research and development. Of this, approximately $41,550,000 is expected to be spent on a direct cycle reactor—General Electric Co.—and $27,500,000 on the indirect cycle reactor—Pratt Whitney Co. Work on both these cycles is being done at the NRTS and it is expected, at some time in the future, on the basis of research and development work now being done by the Commission, that a determination will be made as to which of the two approaches will be selected for the flying prototype.

Other projects in which money appropriated for fiscal year 1961 will be spent in Idaho at the NRTS are the following:

The Navy reactor program, including the natural circulation reactor under contract with General Electric on which construction has not as yet begun.

Construction of additional technical space for the SPERT reactor—$500,000.

Beginning of construction of an additional test reactor at the ETR-MTR site—$24 million.

Additions and modifications to the MTR-ETR in the amount of $800,000.

There is widespread interest in the development of a nuclear-powered aircraft, to prevent our being embarrassed by a similar development behind the Iron Curtain.

The coming year will see Idaho advance in the amount of work it is doing in the atomic energy field and through which it is a major contributor to the U.S. leadership in atomic energy.

Therefore, it is most encouraging to read the brief comment in the committee report on this subject, as follows:

> The committee recognizes that large sums have been spent on this program and that it is difficult to determine whether to more actively pursue the direct cycle or the indirect cycle. The committee is advised that the program will be reviewed by the Department of Defense during the year, to determine the military feasibility of one cycle or the other. In the meantime, the committee believes the full amount of the estimate should be available, to allow the Commission to pursue this program without limitation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Sena-

tor from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments today to say again what a very fine job the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator HAYDEN, the subcommittee chairman, Senator ELLENDER, and the other members of the committee have done in promoting the economic development of the Nation's natural resources. The many programs carried on by the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are largely responsible for this progress. The senior Senator from Arizona has again shown great foresight in attacking the problems of the West—irrigation, flood control, recreation, and power generation.

Montana does well in this money bill, and I am especially pleased that the Senate committee has concurred in the House action in providing $2,500,000 to begin construction on Yellowtail Dam, in southeastern Montana. This is a very important project, a large development with multipurpose benefits. The committee's recommendation will be joyously received in Montana and neighboring Wyoming. I do hope that the Bureau of Reclamation will be able to proceed with preliminary construction work and site preparation at an early date.

Last year the Congress provided funds to begin preliminary work and necessary rail and highway relocation in the vicinity of the East Bench unit in southwestern Montana. This year the budget request of $2,800,000 will enable the Bureau to proceed with the first year of major construction on this irrigation project.

The Senate committee recommendation of $565,000 for the Helena Valley unit will permit work to proceed toward the completion of this project.

The $336,000 allowed by the House for the Bureau of Reclamation will permit detailed investigation of the Jefferson unit, Missouri River Basin project. The unit involves storage regulation of the Big Hole River at the Reichle Reservoir site, and will irrigate approximately 47,500 acres of new land and 15,100 acres of supplemental lands. The lands proposed for irrigation occur in a number of tracts extending along both sides of the Jefferson River and the Missouri River between Twin Bridges and Canyon Ferry Reservoir, in Montana. Both Senator MURRAY and I are pleased that the Senate committee has also approved this nonbudgeted item.

The Senate committee has included several items of great interest to Montana, which were not included in the bill as sent here from the House. The Bureau of Reclamation's basin report on the Three Forks division indicated some favorable findings concerning the West Bench unit; and I am most pleased that the committee has recommended an additional $80,000 for the Bureau's investigation program, so that a more detailed study of this project can be undertaken.

In the State of Montana there is considerable interest, especially at the State college in Bozeman, concerning the need for controlling evaporation. I am in complete agreement with the $100,000 increase provided for the Bureau's program of engineering research on evaporation reduction, which will supplement programs in Montana and Arizona.

Mr. President, the major program under the Corps of Army Engineers, insofar as Montana is concerned, is the continued construction of the second powerplant at the Fort Peck Dam. This project is nearing completion, and I understand that two power units will go into service by the end of 1961.

When both Senator MURRAY and I appeared before the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, we discussed the possibility of developing the Missouri River above Fort Peck Dam, in Montana. This project is a product of the vision and pioneering spirit of Montana's senior Senator in the field of water-resource development. He has spearheaded this project, one which I and the other members of the Montana delegation shall continue to pursue in line with his recommendations. Preliminary estimates indicate that a potential of 600,000 kilowatts is awaiting development between Fort Peck and Great Falls.

This work is under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Army Engineers, and the inclusion of $40,000 in this money bill will enable them to proceed with the very important studies.

Mr. President, again I wish to say how much the people of Montana and I appreciate the fine work being done by our colleagues, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. They are truly great friends of the West.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I know I express the feeling of the people of my State, as well as my own feeling, when I say that we are very grateful for the consideration the committee has given us in connection with our problems in regard to floods and the development of our resources. The chairman of the subcommittee and its other members—particularly the ranking Republican member, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]—have given us great consideration. The committee maintained all the requests made by the budget and supported the action of the House in adding to the budget $100,000 for planning for No. 2 Green Reservoir; and I am very grateful that the committee included the sum of $300,000 to initiate construction of Fishtrap Reservoir, on the Big Sandy. The subcommittee heard the evidence in regard to the floods which have swept the valley of the Big Sandy for 100 years. The chairman and the other subcommittee members gave to those who came from that area a great deal of consideration, and I wish to express my thanks for the inclusion of this amount. I know the Senator will do his best to maintain it in the conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], because, I repeat, we have provided $3,225,000 more than the budget. If we can keep that amount, we shall have ample funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, in line 15, it is proposed to strike out "$737,884,600" and insert in lieu thereof "$738,208,600".

On page 5, line 1, after the colon, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided further, That of the funds herein provided for "Construction, General" not less than $300,000 shall be available for construction of the Mason J. Niblack levee, not less than $495,000 shall be available for planning and construction of the Salamonie Reservoir, and not less than $100,000 shall be available for planning and construction of the Sugar Creek levee, all in the State of Indiana:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana desire to have his amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. HARTKE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, these amendments will do what was suggested earlier; namely, come down to specific projects for Indiana. The amendments would increase the amount appropriated up to the stated capabilities of the Corps of Engineers. The amendments would remove the shackles, so to speak, and would get the flood-control program under way.

I realize that my distinguished friend has done a magnificent job in the committee. But very shortly the foreign-aid bill will be before us. At that time I wonder whether I then shall hear the same Senators exercise the same degree of concern in regard to how we are going to spend our money. Of course I am not opposed to that program; I should like to see it carried out. But I wonder whether the same Senators will then express the same concern about the situation, in reverse—in other words, whether they will express the same concern for the welfare of the people overseas that they have expressed for the welfare of the people in this country, and whether they then will say that an orderly job is being done, and that the work does not need to be accelerated, and that what is now being done is all that we can do.

If this is all that we can do, we had better examine our capacity to survive as a Nation, because if we cannot do this job in order to preserve our natural resources, even in accordance with the stated capabilities of the Army Engineers, then soon we shall not even be able to dream or think up to the level of what heretofore we have been able to do.

Mr. President, at this time I withdraw the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has that right; and the amendments are withdrawn.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator

from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] desires to offer an amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out, "$737,884,600", and to insert "$737,859,600".

On page 4, in line 20, after the colon, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for levee unit No. 5, Wabash River, Indiana:.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am pleased to know that the chairman of the subcommittee is in such an amiable mood this evening and that he has his characteristic zeal for economy.

I do not wish to labor this point again at great length, for I think perhaps in the course of the previous debate the Members of the Senate have learned of the issues at stake.

It is true that the bill in its present form provides both for an appropriation on the Indiana side of the Wabash River, for the planning of specific levees, and that it also provides an appropriation for a survey as to whether levees should be built on the Illinois side.

This means, in effect—if we view the matter from the standpoint of a race between two sister States, although I do not like to consider the matter in that way—that the State of Indiana, which already has crept a mile ahead of Illinois, is given another quarter of a mile. But we in Illinois are at the post, and we are given a start of about 100 yards. So the differential advantage of Indiana over Illinois is increased.

I stand for equal protection of the land on both sides of the Wabash River. It was a shame that the Indiana people got levees at Vincennes, with no corresponding levees on the Illinois side, with the result that many thousands of acres of Illinois land are flooded each year, because of the Indiana levees. We do not want that to happen on the lower Wabash or at any other place on the Wabash.

I think what probably should be done is to have a levee built to protect the city of Mount Carmel, and to have a corresponding levee built on the other side, to protect the lands on the Indiana side.

But my good friends from Indiana are really "putting something over" on us when they are promoting the construction of a levee farther south on their side, when there are no real prospects for the construction of a corresponding levee on our side.

So I hope very much that the very amiable and economical chairman will accept this amendment, which will save $25,000 and will preserve equality of treatment to the land on both sides of the river.

If that is not done, I think I should serve notice that we will fight to the death any appropriation for construction money for a levee on one side, if it is not accompanied by a corresponding levee on our side. This is not a declaration of war; but it is a declaration of intent and purpose.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on this subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS IN OPPOSITION TO APPROPRIATION OF $25,000 FOR LEVEE UNIT NO. 5, WABASH RIVER PLANNING IN H.R. 12326

I hope very much that the able subcommittee chairman, Senator ELLENDER, and the Senate will be willing to remove from this bill the appropriation of $25,000 for preconstruction planning work on levee unit No. 5, Wabash River, Ind.

PROJECT WILL FLOOD ILLINOIS LANDS

The reason for my opposition is the grave danger that this levee project to protect some Indiana land from floods would greatly increase the flooding and damage in Mount Carmel, Ill., and in the farmlands in Wabash County, Ill., downstream from Mount Carmel. I have had many urgent appeals from Illinois people against this project. They are alarmed about these dangers. They have established a Wabash County Flood Protection Committee under the able leadership of Mayor Harry C. Miller, of Mount Carmel, and Leonard W. Koger, Jr., its chairman.

INDIANA OBJECTORS ARE PRESSING LAWSUIT AGAINST DISTRICT

A large number of Indiana residents are also objecting, and the legality of the levee unit No. 5 is itself being contested in the Indiana courts. The pendency of this litigation is another reason to withhold further spending now.

ILLINOIS SURVEY FUNDS DO NOT BALANCE OFF INDIANA PLANNING APPROPRIATION

I understand and appreciate the committee's desire to be completely fair and helpful to the interests of the Illinois as well as the Indiana residents, for it has also included in the appropriation for surveys an item of $15,000 for a study of the Wabash River at Mount Carmel. This would go into the feasibility of protective works on the Illinois side across from levee unit No. 5.

But the survey holds little promise for the Illinois interests, because of the negative findings in such a preliminary study by the Engineers back in 1948. And the planning money for the Indiana levee unit poses an imminent threat because that project was authorized way back in 1936. If pushed closer to the point of readiness for construction, as the appropriation in this bill would push it, there is a prospect that work would go ahead on the Indiana side much sooner and serious doubt about whether Illinois can ever, or will ever, get protection from the resulting higher and more frequent flood levels.

I would gladly support funds for a survey of desirable levees on the Illinois side to protect Mount Carmel, and appropriate levees across the way on the Indiana side to be sure the Illinois protective works did not worsen conditions on the Indiana side—and to give Indiana parallel and equal protection. But I believe the proposal in this bill which gives Indiana priority protection at the expense of Illinois should be deleted.

This would give time and opportunity for a fuller hearing of the grounds of opposition to the levee unit by the committee next year and a better balancing by the committee of the various Illinois and Indiana interests that would be injured and benefited before the levee unit is pushed to the point of starting construction.

It would also allow a related consideration of the flood control effects of various upstream reservoir proposals, some already authorized and others being studied as a part of the overall Wabash River Valley survey.

It would also enable the litigation concerning levee unit No. 5 to be determined by the Indiana courts before more Federal funds are appropriated.

Let me outline somewhat more fully the objections to this project which I have mentioned.

OBJECTIONS OUTLINED

1. Pending Indiana litigation makes appropriation now premature

The proponents of levee unit No. 5 and the brief report of the Engineers (Senate hearings, p. 2710) leave the impression that the legality of the levee unit is finally determined. But this is not the case.

It is true that a court order setting up the district was entered on September 23, 1959. But 104 petitioners, residents of Indiana, filed a complaint to review that judgment on December 22, 1959, and that complaint is pending in the Gibson County circuit court. It is docket No. 11,535. The title of the case is *Margaret B. Brown and Mark W. Lowell, Trustees, Birdie R. Gray, Trustee and Others* v. *Stephen A. Blood and Others.*

I understand a special judge, Hon. Joe A. Lowdermilk, has been appointed by the Supreme Court of Indiana to hear and try the issues.

The last reported action in the case was a motion by some of the principal defendants on June 23, 1960, for a continuance to give them time to file their answer before August. At last account that answer was not filed. If this answer is filed before September, presumably the case could be heard in September.

But the length of that hearing is difficult to guess, and the expressed determination of the petitioning objectors to carry this case to the Indiana Supreme Court if necessary makes it clear that no early, final decision is probable or possible. The seriousness with which these legal objections are being urged in Indiana is evidenced by the 880-page length of the petition, the large number of petitioners, 104, who have joined in the action; and their decision to exercise their full legal rights of appeal if necessary to block a project they strongly oppose.

I am confident the committee might have reached a different conclusion about this appropriation at this time, had these facts been outlined to it more fully. Surely it would be improvident to spend Federal funds even for planning in connection with a levee district which may be ruled out by action of the Indiana State courts.

2. Building this levee would flood other lands

The more substantial basis of opposition to levee unit No. 5, even if the legal objections are later removed, however, is the severe damage this new levee will inflict on other lands.

Illinois property owners have already had such an experience as a result of the building of levees on the Wabash below Vincennes. Illinois landowners there have had to give up their farms, and the threats to Wabash County farmers below Mount Carmel and to Mount Carmel are even more serious.

In their comments supplied to the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Corps of Engineers frankly conceded in brief and general terms the damaging results that the building of levee unit No. 5 will have. These comments state (Senate hearings, p. 2710):

"The Corps of Engineers recognizes that the construction of levee unit No. 5 will increase the flood level at Mount Carmel, the frequency of damaging floods and the an-

nual average flood damage in Wabash County, Ill., the extent of which would be determined during the course of a study."

But these elements of damage to Mount Carmel and Illinois farmlands downriver have been much more carefully detailed by Mr. Leonard M. Koger, Jr., chairman of the Wabash County Flood Protection Committee, in his statement to the Senate Appropriations Committee. He estimates the damages to Illinois business and farm property values to aggregate $6 million.

Let me list his well-documented conclusions. He indicates that the construction of levee unit No. 5 will:

1. Create an immediate and serious flood threat to one-third of the area in the incorporated city limits of Mount Carmel and to over 12,000 acres of farm and rural property in Wabash County, Ill.

2. Increase flood level by five feet at the highest stage at which confinement will be operative.

3. Increase the frequency of major floods of a 27-foot stage (10 feet above flood stage) to an average of one every four years instead of the prevailing frequency of one every 11 years.

4. Increase the frequency of disastrous floods of the nature of the 31 foot flood in 1913 from one in 47 years to an average of seven in 100 years.

5. Cause the annual average flood damage in Wabash County to increase approximately 100 percent.

6. Create a serious threat to the general health and welfare in the city of Mount Carmel if the increased flow of flood waters causes the water treating plant and sewerage plant to become inoperative and force the shutdown of the electric generating and gas distribution facilities of the local company.

7. Create an unfavorable climate of the industrial development of the area and will tend to discourage expansion of industry already located in the area.

8. Cause an immediate decrease in the value of residential, industrial and agricultural property to the extent of $6 million as shown by intervening petitions filed by Illinois property owners.

9. Cause floodwaters to remain longer on and move more rapidly across agricultural land reducing soil fertility by water logging and erosion.

For the fuller information of the Members of the Senate—and of conferences, should this go to conference—I include at this point the full text of Mr. Koger's statement:

Opposition to Appropriation of Funds for Indiana Levee Unit No. 5

(Statement of Leonard M. Koger, Jr., chairman, Wabash County Flood Protection Committee, Wabash County, Ill., before Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Apr. 27, 1960)

The Wabash County Flood Protection Committee came into existence in August 1956, when certain Indiana property owners were petitioning Indiana Gibson County circuit court to create levee district No. 5 preparatory to seeking Federal funds for construction of Indiana levee unit No. 5 on the Indiana side of the Wabash River. Indiana levee unit No. 5 received congressional authorization under a Flood Control Act adopted June 22, 1936.

This committee was created for the express purpose of opposing all efforts to consummate the construction of levee unit No. 5 in Indiana, opposite Mount Carmel and Wabash County, Ill. The committee represents several hundred property owners in Mount Carmel and Wabash County. Among the groups supporting the work of this committee are industrial plants, including a large paperboard factory, a lumber company, a sand and gravel company, a grain elevator, a farm implement company, and an electric and gas company. There are small business establishments supporting the committee. It has the backing of the city council of Mount Carmel, the Mount Carmel Chamber of Commerce and the county board of commissioners. Civic organizations of the area support the committee's work, as well as the county farm bureau organization, and other groups.

The Wabash County Flood Protection Committee has been active during the past 4 years alerting residents of Wabash County to the potential and inherent dangers which come with construction of a levee such as the one proposed opposite their community. The committee has also helped those property owners, both individuals and business establishments, file over 325 intervening petitions in Gibson County circuit court remonstrating to the formation of the levee district.

Wabash County, located in the southeasterly part of Illinois on the right bank of the Wabash River, is one of the smallest counties in the State. The county covers an area of nearly 220 square miles and has a population of approximately 15,000. The area is predominently agricultural with 85 percent of the land devoted to crops, pasture, and woodland. The soil in the county is rich and productive, yielding wheat, hay, oats, vegetables, and providing abundant food for livestock. Since 1939, numerous oil wells have appeared in many parts of the county and millions of barrels of oil have been pumped from the still productive area.

The normal average temperature in Wabash County is 56° F. with an average maximum and minimum of 78° for July and 32° for January. Recorded temperature extremes are 112° above and 22° below zero. The normal annual precipitation in Wabash County is 42 inches.

Mount Carmel, the county seat of Wabash County, has a population of approximately 10,000. Other smaller communities in the county are Allendale, Keensburg, Bellmont, Lancaster, Cowling, Friendsville, and Patton. Wabash County has for its eastern boundary approximately 40 miles of Wabash River bank.

Mount Carmel lies opposite the mouths of the White and Patoka Rivers which empty into the parent stream from the east bank at Wabash River miles 95.6 and 94.6, respectively. Mount Carmel is laid out on a square street pattern and covers an area of approximately 1,285 acres along a bluff which fringes the lowlands adjacent to the right bank of the river. About one-third of the city area, 410 acres, is located in the flood plain. Development in this area is primarily industrial and residential. Industrial establishments include sand and gravel works, lumberyard, grain elevator, paper company, logging operation, and farm implement company as well as local electric and gas plant, city water intake, city pumping station, and city sewerage plant.

The Wabash River gage is located on the property of the local electric and gas company and daily records are kept by that organization. The gage location is approximately 94.5 river miles above the mouth of the Wabash River. The gage zero elevation at this point is 371.46 feet above sea level and the flood stage is 17 feet. The maximum stage within the period of record for this gage is 31 feet which was measured on March 30, 1913. The maximum discharge measurement at this point is 279,000 cubic feet per second and the minimum is 2,060 cubic feet per second. The estimated average annual runoff volume is 17,548,000 acre-feet, or 11.51 inches depth over the drainage basin above Mount Carmel. This volume corresponds to an average discharge of 24,800 cubic feet per second.

There are no records to indicate the March 1913 flood has ever been exceeded at Mount Carmel. The following chart gives the dates and stages for the major floods experienced in Wabash County:

Flood crest date:	*Crest stage (feet)*
Aug. 9, 1875	28.3
Apr. 2, 1904	27.1
May 13, 1908	24.9
Mar. 30, 1913	31.0
Feb. 7, 1916	26.7
Apr. 23, 1922	26.0
June 2, 1927	24.8
Jan. 17, 1930	27.1
Mar. 29, 1933	23.7
May 20, 1933	26.1
Jan. 23, 1937	27.0
Apr. 16, 1938	23.9
Mar. 20, 1939	24.7
Apr. 24, 1939	25.2
May 25, 1943	27.5
Apr. 16, 1944	-----
Apr. 26, 1948	22.9
Jan. 23, 1949	25.9
Jan. 16, 1950	27.0
Feb. 18, 1950	25.5
Apr. 9, 1950	22.96
Feb. 20, 1951	23.87
July 7, 1957	23.0
June 15, 1958	24.6
Jan. 30, 1959	22.98
Feb. 20, 1959	23.6

In Wabash County agricultural losses resulting from flood damage for the year 1957 amounted to $300,000. Over 10,000 acres of land were involved. In 1958, the estimated amount of flood damages for the county was $375,000, involving approximately 12,000 acres.

Flood damage in the urban area of Mount Carmel begins when the river stage reaches 23 feet. Serious damage begins at the stage of 27 feet. At the 27½-foot stage floodwater covers the railroad siding on the property of the electric company making impossible the delivery of coal which is necessary for electric generation. The same stage is critical to a large paper manufacturing plant located in the same area, as well as the sand and gravel company, lumberyard and sewerage plant. At a 31-foot flood stage the city water plant becomes inoperative.

These industries have located on the flood plains of the Wabash River for essentially two good reasons. (1) The need for water transportation as in the case of the sand and gravel operations, which also obtains its raw material from the bed of the river. (2) The need for large volumes of water for cooling and processing purposes. Both the large paperboard manufacturing concern and the electric generating company mentioned previously use vast amounts of water for these purposes.

It is true anyone building in such an area should expect to contend with the natural or regulated flood flow of water. These industries have taken precautions to mitigate against natural floods, but they are not prepared to suffer losses through increased flows and flood heights caused by acts of others. Nor should they be required to do so.

The flood risk in the past has had very little effect on industrial property values. It is admitted that possibility of flooding may have served to depress residential property values and probably has prevented, to some extent, normal repairs and maintenance.

Flood warning in ample time to permit the safe evacuation of persons from the flood plain is normally possible due to the slowly rising flood hydrograph. Consequently, loss of life from floods is improbable and there is no record or recollection of any loss of life in the county due to floods. Neither

does the record indicate there has ever been an epidemic attributable to the floods.

Records of the average annual direct and indirect flood damages are not available for the city of Mount Carmel. In a report made by the Department of Army, Corps of Engineers, Louisville district, April 15, 1948, the average annual direct and indirect damages for the flooding conditions at that time were estimated to be $17,300 and $4,900, respectively, in terms of 1948 dollars.

Mount Carmel and the adjacent rural areas in the county have no flood protection. Congress has authorized no flood protection projects for the area. However, Congress has authorized the construction of an agricultural levee on the Indiana side of the Wabash River.

The project known as levee unit No. 5 is located in Gibson and Posey Counties, Indiana, on the left bank of the Wabash River opposite Mount Carmel and Wabash County. The plan involves the construction of an earth levee system which would provide protection for approximately 45,000 acres of Indiana land against a flood equal to that having an average frequency of 7 times in 100 years. This project received congressional authorization by the Flood Control Act adopted on June 22, 1936. The estimated cost of the work is approximately $10 million for construction and over $600,000 for land and damages.

Indiana landowners began the necessary steps to form the required levee district several years ago. This first attempt resulted in an adverse Indiana Supreme Court decision. Again in 1956 the Indiana interests initiated the formal court proceedings necessary to establish the levee district which would be the authority responsible for operation and maintenance of the levee. The petition requesting the Gibson County Circuit Court to establish the levee district was signed by five large landowners of Gibson and Posey Counties. In their petition they set out the physical facts of the levee. These physical dimensions are identical to levee plans previously submitted by the Corps of Army Engineers, Louisville district.

Levee unit No. 5 is described as an earth levee with an average height of 11 feet, an average base width of 78 feet, and a crown width of 12 feet. The proposed levee is 45.2 miles long and designed to protect some 45,000 acres of land. The levee begins at a point approximately 3 miles southwest of Patoka, Ind. From that point the levee will carry west along the south bank of the Patoka River for approximately 8 miles. There, where the Patoka flows into the Wabash directly opposite Mount Carmel, the levee turns toward the south and runs along the left or east bank of the Wabash River following it to the point where the Black River empties into the Wabash. From there the levee traverses up the northerly bank of the Black River in a northeasterly direction to a point known as Johnson. It is interesting to note that of the 45,000 acres of land the levee will protect, over one-third is owned or controlled by only a few landowners.

The top of the levee opposite Mount Carmel will be at an elevation of 404½ feet above sea level. In order to top the levee the flood crest will reach 33 feet on the Mount Carmel river gage. This is somewhat higher than the record 1913 flood. The Corps of Army Engineers terms the levee a 15-year levee, indicating it will be overrun on an average of once every 15 years. According to testimony of Mr. S. M. Bailey, Chief, Engineering Division, U.S. Army Engineer district, Louisville, during a hearing held relative to the formation of Levee District No. 5, when the levee is overrun a portion of it will be washed away and would afford no protection. Such condition would prevail on the average of once every 15 years. Mount Carmel has not experienced such a flood for over 47 years.

The engineers also state that under the conditions of confinement created by the levee the 23-foot stage (the stage at which damage begins in Wabash County) would be equaled or exceeded on the average of once every 1½ years or about the same as under present conditions of stream confinement. Also, according to Mr. Bailey, under conditions of confinement produced by construction of the levee it is estimated the increase for the highest stage at which confinement will be operative, or the maximum increase, will be 5 feet. Major floods having a stage of 27 feet would be equaled or exceeded on the average of about once every 4 years as compared to once every 11 years under the present conditions of confinement. It is estimated that the average annual flood damage would be slightly over twice the estimated damage without confinement.

Although the flood plains in the eastern portion of Wabash County are somewhat defined because of the abrupt increase of elevation at the edge of the flood plain, confinement created by the proposed Indiana levee would tend to have disastrous effects on agricultural and urban property in the Illinois flood plain. Not only would the frequency of major floods increase but the floodwaters would remain standing on agricultural land for a greater length of time. At the same time the current of the stream would increase considerably thereby causing scouring and erosion of the agricultural land. Crop losses caused by the overflow onto Illinois farmland would make the soil incapable of being farmed in an efficient and husbandmanlike manner. Such conditions would force eventual abandonment of acreage as tillable land.

In the vicinity of Rochester, Ill., there is now a structure known as Rochester-McCleary Bluffs levee designed to protect a portion of the agricultural land in the south part of Wabash County. This levee, constructed at the expense of the landowners protected by it, would be greatly endangered if proposed levee unit No. 5 on the opposite side of the river were built.

Property owners in Mt. Carmel and Wabash County fear the construction of the proposed levee unit No. 5 will cause great economic loss. Soon after proceedings began in Gibson County circuit court, requesting establishment of the levee district, hundreds of Mount Carmel and Wabash County residents filed intervening petitions opposing such action. In these intervening petitions the opponents of the levee swore the value of their property would be decreased to the extent of some $6 million if the proposed levee were constructed. In 1958 Special Judge Lester Nixon, of the Gibson County circuit court, held that the court had no jurisdiction to hear the objections of the Illinois residents. Therefore, Wabash County property owners are without recourse in the Indiana proceedings. Many Indiana residents outside the levee, and on the north side of the Patoka River, as well as pipeline and oil companies continue to oppose the formation of the levee district.

As of this date, the formation of the levee district for Indiana levee unit No. 5 is still in litigation in the Gibson County circuit court. So long as this question is still before the court it would seem questionable as to whether Congress would want to appropriate further funds for surveys, studies, detailed planning or actual construction, if it were aware of this fact.

Throughout the long and vigorously contested court proceedings it has been apparent that Illinois landowners will not be awarded compensation for the $6 million damages they will suffer if the authorized levee is constructed. The court has held it has no jurisdiction to hear the intervening petitions and the claims for damages of Illinois property owners. It follows that at the same time it would have no jurisdiction to award damages to those same property owners.

An organization known as the Wabash Valley Association has actively promoted development of the Wabash Valley in Illinois and Indiana. That group has comprehensive plans for making the Wabash navigable and for flood control along the valley. Included in their proposals are plans for construction of several reservoirs in the upper reaches of the Wabash River. Appropriations have been provided by the Federal Government for construction of some of these. It could be that reservoirs such as these will alleviate some part of the flood problem in the lower reaches of the Wabash. To build a levee such as unit No. 5 in Posey and Gibson Counties in Indiana before the upper reservoirs are built and before their effectiveness is determined, seems to be premature. However, the Indiana interests with the backing of the Wabash Valley Association continue to seek appropriations for levee unit No. 5 in Indiana.

In the first session of this Congress, the House of Representatives did not deem it necessary to make further appropriations for this levee. The situation and conditions have not changed since last year. It would appear that the same wise decisions to omit funds for this levee again in this session would be justifiable.

In a report dated April 15, 1948, of a survey made by the Corps of Engineers, Louisville district, the question of flood protection for Mount Carmel and the adjacent rural area was discussed. It was the conclusion of that group that protection for only a small portion of Mount Carmel could be economically justified but it would not prove feasible to protect with agricultural levees the great rural portion of Wabash County which lies opposite the proposed Indiana levee unit No. 5.

If the Indiana levee is not constructed, there is no need to build a levee in Illinois. There is no need then to place the burden of construction costs on all the taxpayers, and the financial responsibility of maintaining and operating an unnecessary levee on the local people.

This committee, speaking for a vast number of individuals, businessmen, civic organizations, local governing bodies and others, respectfully requests that the Appropriations Committee give due consideration to its plea for deletion from the appropriation bill any and all funds designated for further study, planning or construction of Indiana levee No. 5.

Summary

The Wabash County Flood Protection Committee urges opposition to appropriation of funds for Indiana levee unit No. 5 for the following reasons.

The construction of Indiana levee unit No. 5 will:

1. Create an immediate and serious flood threat to one-third of the area in the incorporated city limits of Mount Carmel and to over 12,000 acres of farm and rural property in Wabash County, Ill.

2. Increase flood level by 5 feet at the highest stage at which confinement will be operative.

3. Increase the frequency of major floods of a 27-foot stage (10 feet above flood stage) to an average of one every 4 years instead of the prevailing frequency of one every 11 years.

4. Increase the frequency of disastrous floods of the nature of the 31-foot flood in 1913 from one in 47 years to an average of seven in 100 years.

5. Cause the annual average flood damage in Wabash County to increase approximately 100 percent.

6. Create a serious threat to the general health and welfare to the city of Mount Carmel if the increased flow of floodwaters causes the water treating plant and sewerage plant to become inoperative and force the shutdown of the electric generating and gas distribution facilities of the local company.

7. Create an unfavorable climate for the industrial development of the area and will tend to discourage expansion of industry already located in the area.

8. Cause an immediate decrease in the value of residential, industrial, and agricultural property to the extent of $6 million as shown by intervening petitions filed by Illinois property owners.

9. Cause floodwaters to remain longer on and move more rapidly across agricultural land reducing soil fertility by waterlogging and erosion.

Since Indiana courts will assume no jurisdiction over Illinois property, Illinois landowners will not be compensated for damages resulting from the construction of the Indiana levee.

The question of the formation of levee district No. 5 is still in the process of contested litigation and the outcome of the suit remains to be determined.

There are other flood abatement projects upstream in the Wabash River Valley, which when completed may make the construction of levee No. 5 unnecessary.

When considering the ratio of benefits to costs for the project, the costs used for such computation did not include costs represented by damages suffered by Illinois property owners.

According to the report of the 1948 survey conducted by the U.S. Corps of Engineers it is not economically feasible to protect the rural areas adjacent to Mount Carmel with levees. There has been no substantial change in the physical problem since that time. There is no reason to believe the rural areas could be protected more economically now than previously.

This committee questions the wisdom of spending large amounts of money for projects which increase the agricultural potential of certain favored land, at the expense of extensive damage to neighboring land, while other agencies of the Government are spending taxpayers' money to reduce the amount of land in crop production

This committee objects to and rebels at the idea that in order to pay for the construction of levee unit No. 5 Illinois taxpayers will contribute more funds toward the construction of the levee than will the Indiana taxpayers.

No appropriation was made during the last session of Congress for further study or planning on levee unit No. 5. Conditions have not changed since last year and certainly no appropriations are warranted again this year.

I have also received a statement presented by an Indiana landowner, Mr. John F. Hull, Sr., on May 24, 1960, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in opposition to the construction of Indiana levee unit No. 5. Although I believe Mr. Hull has been misinformed in reference to the costs of the essential relocation of railroad bridges and tracks resulting from this project and has somewhat overstated them, his general description of the project itself and of the effects of building up a levee wall which protects a roughly rectangular area of farmland, but thereby throws the water in larger quantities at more rapid flows and in greater depths on the lands opposite these levee walls both in Indiana and Illinois, is so clear and persuasive that I believe his facts will be helpful in the final determination of this issue.

I therefore include Mr. Hull's statement at this point in the RECORD.

Opposition to the Construction of Indiana Levee Unit No. 5

(Statement of John F. Hull, Sr., Gibson County Flood Protection, Gibson County, Ind., before National Rivers and Harbors Congress, May 24, 1960)

The speaker is a retired farmer from Patoka, Ind., here to represent an organized group of other farmers who own and/or operate 17,000 acres of land that would be adversely affected by the proposed Wabash Valley unit No. 5.

We protest the acceptance of the unit No. 5 project as a part of the Wabash Valley improvement program, and for the following reasons:

Wabash Valley levee unit No. 5 is not like unto other levees, to wit:

The prevailing concept of a levee is that it is a structure usually paralleling the bank of a stream; that it is a structure having comparatively little effect upon the stream flow it parallels; that it is designed to prevent the damaging spread of floodwaters that otherwise would jeopardize homesites, industrial sites, or agricultural lands; that the levee does little or no damage to others along the stream, but is of great benefit to those interests or people it is designed to protect; that its benefits greatly outweigh its costs, resulting in increased assets for the neighborhood, the State, and the whole national economy.

This Wabash Valley unit No. 5 is not at all like until this concept, in this, to wit:

To explain why this unit is so very different, may we review with you the topography of the area in which the upper segments of this proposed levee are located, and very particularly we invite your attention to the 5- or 10-mile segment of the Wabash River that extends just above and below Mount Carmel, Ill.

The Wabash River draining most of the northern part of Indiana flows southward along the Indiana west line. Along the stretches of this river there is a flood plain. While this flood plain varies in width from mile to mile of its length, it tends to become wider and wider as its various tributaries add their volume to the flow, and their little flood plains to the greater one of the main stream. This flood plain sometimes is the same on either side of the stream. Sometimes, when the hills crowd the stream, the flood plain is almost entirely on the opposite side of the river from the hills. This is particularly the case in the Wabash Valley at this point at Mount Carmel, Ill., where the high land comes very close to the river's western edge, forcing the flood plain almost entirely over to the Indiana side.

You will notice on your map that at a point almost opposite to Mount Carmel, the Wabash is joined with its largest tributary, the White River. This White River, with its east and west forks, drains almost all of central Indiana, and almost exactly the same pattern of flood plains appears down the tributaries of the White River, carrying on with a wider and wider flood plain to its mouth near Mount Carmel. Please note that this great addition to the flood plain of the Wabash River at this river junction occurs on the Indiana side. Please note further that at a point one-half mile down stream from the confluence of the Wabash and White Rivers, the Patoka River joins the Wabash. This river joins the Wabash just north, and upstream from the first, or the east-west leg of the proposed levee.

This Patoka River, which drains the southern part of the State, has a similar flood plain pattern as the other rivers, except that its flood plain is much smaller.

It can be seen that at this point of juncture of these three rivers just north of the proposed location of levee No. 5 we have really a mighty river that drains almost all of Indiana, and a good portion of Illinois; that it has a great flood plain and that the flood plain at this point is almost entirely on the Indiana side.

I take it that it is understood that a flood plain is that area of relatively low land lying along the course of a stream over which the streamflow will pass at floodtime when the natural channel of the river cannot carry the volume of water caused by upstream floods.

If the picture of these converging flood plains has been clearly drawn, it will be seen that the flood plains of the Patoka and White Rivers at their mouth become the flood plains of the Wabash River.

Whereas in dry season the Patoka and White Rivers flow westerly to the channel of the Wabash, in flood stage these rivers both empty on the flood plain of the Wabash, and much of their water turns south, pouring across this 10-mile-wide flood plain, becoming the stream of the Wabash River.

It is across this flood plain, or stream of the Wabash River, that the advocates of levee No. 5 propose to build a dam across seven-eighths of this channel. This amazing proposition makes levee unit No. 5 not like unto any other levee proposal.

When one is as far away from this proposed levee site as Washington, D.C., the preceding statements may seem like theorizing. Let us then turn to concrete, specific engineering data as are furnished by studies of the U.S. Engineers.

During a flood period of the Wabash River in 1943, from May 15 to June 2, at a point exactly in the area of flood plain we are discussing, the U.S. Engineers took daily measurements of waterflow in depth and velocity and reported their measurements in cubic feet per second, flow and discharge. They reported the volume within the channel as "channel discharge," and the volume passing over the flood plain as "over bank flow." This complete data may be secured from the office of the U.S. Engineers at Louisville, Ky., or from the expert testimony given in case 9927, tried in the Gibson circuit court, at Princeton, Ind.; or it can be had in like testimony presented in case 11,535 now pending in the Gibson circuit court.

May we point out before setting out excerpts of this data that it discloses the fact that the percentage of riverflow that goes down the flood plain rises from zero in normal flow to much more than 50 percent in very high flood stage.

Quoting briefly: May 19, when the gage at Mount Carmel read 24.12 feet:

	Cubic feet per second
Channel discharge	108,500
Overbank discharge	46,800
Total discharge of the river	155,300

Then a few days later, when the Mount Carmel gage was 26.39 feet:

	Cubic feet per second
Channel discharge	126,000
Overbank discharge	132,000
Total discharge of the river	258,000

Note that when the flood deepened from 24.12 feet on the Mount Carmel gage to 26.39 feet, or a 2.27-foot increase in depth on the gage, the percentage changed from less than half of water flowing over the flood plain, to much more than half the discharge flowing outside the channel and over the flood plain.

It must be clear from these data that to build a dam at this point across seven-eighths of this channel flow creates a critical situation by raising the floodwaters phenomenally above the levee and by increasing the amount of current in what is left of the channel.

We regret that we cannot give at this point complete, competent, expert testimonial data of the exact magnitude of the resulting damming effect of this proposed levee on the great flood plain in Indiana or on the industrial area in Illinois.

The footwork of the attorneys for the petitioners in resisting any testimony as to this damming effect was brilliant. But, for that matter, both the engineers called in for the petitioners and the remonstrators were very reluctant to give specific figures. The reason for this reluctance is perfectly obvious on the face of it, the reason being that no two flood situations would ever be quite the same.

For instance, if flooding rains occurred in the Wabash area of northern Indiana and Illinois, the resulting height of the water of the flood plains would give one picture. If the flooding rains occurred in central Indiana over the east and west forks of the White River, the resulting flooding on the above-described flood plains would present another picture. If the flooding rains occurred in the southern portion of Indiana over the area drained by the Patoka River, the flood crests would present still another picture.

Then, still again, there would be, and has been, innumerable combinations of variants, not only of amounts of rainfall over these three areas, but combinations of variants in the amounts of water in these three rivers at the times when these rains occurred. This myriad of confusing data just about precluded any engineer from making pinpoint accurate statements about the damming effects in the flood plain or on its periphery.

But out of all this—claim and counterclaim—question—objection—or the if, and, or but statements, there did come a few bits of positive expert testimony. They are:

1. A statement by Mr. Samuel Bailey of the U.S. Engineers that levee unit No. 5 was designed to protect when the Wabash had a maximum discharge of 296,000 cubic feet per second.

2. That at a discharge of 296,000 cubic feet per second, the proposed levee would have a free board of only 1 foot.

3. That hydraulic studies of the Wabash flow were made in 1943 from May 15 to and including June 2 by the U.S. Engineers, constant reference was made to this report.

4. That in this report it was shown, when the Wabash flood crest stood at 27.11, the total Wabash discharge was 295,400 cubic feet per second, which is very close to the 296,000 cubic feet per second for which the levee No. 5 is designed to protect.

5. That the design for levee No. 5 is only for partial protection. For instance, this hydraulic report previously referred to shows that on May 25 the Wabash discharge was 307,000 cubic feet per second, which far and away overtops the 296,000 cubic feet per second for which the proposed levee is designed.

6. That after the construction of this levee, if there came a flood that reached the height of 33 feet on the Mount Carmel gage, the levee would be overtopped; and that a flood with a discharge similar to one of 28 feet on the Mount Carmel gage before construction, after construction would register 33 feet on the Mount Carmel gage.

7. That the proposed levee would have the effect of damming the Wabash stream. That when the flood of the Wabash reached a height for which this proposed levee was designed, 296,000 cubic feet per second discharge, the damming by the proposed levee would raise the flood level at Mount Carmel 5 feet.

8. That in direct testimony, question No. 115, to Mr. Charles Okey, hydraulic engineer of TVA, retired, when he was asked how much the design of the proposed levee No. 5 would need to be raised to contain a similar flood to the one of 1913, answered:

"If the levee were high enough to hold that flood located where the levee is in this plain about which we are talking, the added height would be in the neighborhood of 6 or 7 feet to carry the 1913 flood."

9. That the railroads whose lines cross this flood plain in the above-described area have been assured that their costs for raising fills, trestles, and bridges will be borne from the U.S. Treasury. The estimate of these costs submitted by the railroads is $8 million.

That the estimated cost of construction, without consideration for damages, would be $10 million.

That the total cost for this proposed partially protecting levee would be $18 million.

10. That the total acreage protected would be about 45,000 acres.

This project, levee No. 5, is really a spender's dream. It is apparent that if this $18 million can be secured for this levee, then a levee must be built to protect Mt. Carmel, Ill., and its environs—more millions. If these levees can then be secured, numbers who now are opposed will want levee protection on the Indiana side along the White and Patoka Rivers—still more millions.

A glance at the first enumerated items of testimony discloses that the levee is not even designed to give more than 3 or 4 years of protection. When the levee breaks and washes out, it must be repaired—more spending. When it is repaired, even those who now oppose it will clamor for a levee higher and stronger—more millions.

If it is made higher and stronger, then the railroads must be raised again—still more millions.

If proposed levee No. 5 is made higher, then the protective levee in Illinois, those in Indiana in Gibson County, and even the old Brevort Levee in Knox County, Ind., must be made higher and stronger—more and more millions of taxpayers' money to be poured into this bottomless pit, while good, practical construction projects up the valleys of these three rivers wait for funds.

Attention is invited to testimony items 6 and 7, where even the testimony of the petitioners admits that at a flood crest that gives a discharge of 296,000 cubic feet per second the flood level at Mount Carmel will be raised by an additional 5 feet. This figure of 5 feet is on the face of it a debatable estimate when this stream is dammed for seven-eighths of its width by building the proposed levee across the flood plain just south of the Patoka River.

This estimate becomes more than questionable if the levee must ultimately contain a discharge of 307,000 cubic feet per second (which is considerably below that of the flood of 1913) when the crest at Mount Carmel was 3.5 feet higher than it was May 25, 1943, when the discharge was 307,000 cubic feet per second.

But to pursue our studies of this proposed situation, let us take this new low figure of 5 feet and apply it over the flood plain above the proposed levee.

In a flood situation where the Wabash discharge at Mount Carmel was 296,000 cubic feet per second, and the rains had fallen up the Patoka River valley, then the pileup of floodwater would run up Main Street in the town of Patoka, Ind.

In a similar flood situation, but where the heavy rains have occurred in the central part of the State of Indiana, drained by the White River, then the flood pileup would flood the main street of Hazleton, Ind., and stand more than 2 feet deep in the Hazleton Consolidated School.

While these previously mentioned instances would be spectacular, they would be insignificant compared to the property damage all around the periphery of the before-described flood plain.

Since this country was settled, smart farm people have selected their homesites, their barnsites, cribs, and livestock shelters just as close as possible to these fertile flood plains, but high enough that they would be above overflow. Even a 5-foot upward lift of this flood crest would cost them and our society millions.

Attention is invited to testimony item 9, where it was given on highest authority that the Government would pick up the $8 million check for the railroads' costs on this project.

Once before petitioners tried to put over this project. Then we who were to be damaged had the cooperative help of the railroads. The project was defeated in the Supreme Court of Indiana. But this time the railroads apparently forsook us. During the second trial, when it was discovered that it was planned that the Government would pick up the check, we understood why we were forsaken.

Attention is called to item 10 of the testimony where it is stated that this levee No. 5 is designed to protect 45,000 acres. In this enclosure of 45,000 acres, there are about 6,000 acres that are high enough that they have never been covered by any flood in history; and there are in the enclosed area another 6,000 acres that are in roads, ditches, sloughs, and generally unplowable land.

There are probably 3,000 acres that lie close to the proposed levee around drains from this area that would probably be actually damaged by the levee which would hold this drainage water in while it is holding the floodwater out. (There are no pumps in this levee design.)

This would leave 30,000 acres that admittedly would be greatly benefited.

Few of us are naive enough to believe that this project would ultimately cost as little as $18 million. But if it did cost only $18 million, this would be a Federal cost of $600 per acre to improve the productivity of land at a time when the same Government is spending billions contending with surplus agricultural products.

Now, when so many worthwhile and constructive projects are being conceived in the Wabash Valley and its tributaries, projects that are not expensive; that would add so much to transportation, conservation of water resources and flood prevention—when there is such a wealth of these worthwhile projects, why should we ask to squander Indiana's limited share of these funds in such projects as Wabash levee No. 5?

On the basis of the clear statement by the Corps of Engineers to which I have referred and the clear proof offered by Illinois residents of Mount Carmel and in the Wabash Valley, I believe the threatened damages that would result from construction of levee unit No. 5 are so great as to warrant the withholding of the appropriation of the $25,000 included for the planning of that project in this bill.

3. Economic feasibility doubtful

Mr. Hull raises questions about the net feasibility of this project on the basis of his estimate that not much more than 30,000 acres as contrasted with the claimed 45,000 acres will be greatly benefited by levee unit No. 5. It is difficult to draw any firm conclusions from the testimony in the hearings on this point. But it seems to me clear that it deserves much more careful analysis and study. Even one of the principal proponents of this project, Mr. Thomas F. Mumford of Griffin, Ind., in his statement to the Senate Appropriations Committee (see hearings, p. 1739–41), concedes that there are only about

34,500 acres of cropland there in the total of some 43,200 acres that would be protected by the proposed levees.

The benefit-cost ratio claimed by the Corps of Engineers is only 1.6 to 1 (hearings, p. 2709), and if the damages to the Indiana land opposite the levees on the tributaries to the Wabash River are taken into account, along with the damage estimated at $6 million plus additional annual flooding damage to Mount Carmel and Illinois farm lands, I believe there may be very serious doubt whether the net benefits (the values created by the levee for Indiana lands less the damage caused to other Indiana lands and Illinois lands) is as great as the Engineers have estimated.

At least in the light of these substantial criticisms, I believe there should be more persuasive proof of economic feasibility before Congress appropriates further Federal funds, even for planning.

4. Will large landowners be main beneficiaries?

I have not found in the hearings any clear analysis of the farm interests that would benefit from this project. Mr. Mumford's statement claims "there are 679 individual persons who own land within the protected area." But reliable persons familiar with the situation there who have examined the documents in the pending court proceedings advise me that four or five family groups own over one-third of the total area to be protected by this $10 million project.

I certainly believe more definite information should be obtained about this before Congress commits the general taxpayers' money for this purpose.

5. Other flood control measures deserve prior study

According to my information, three reservoir projects, the Mississinewa, the Salamonie and the Huntington, have all been authorized. Two are on tributaries to the Wabash, the third is on the Wabash, all above the proposed levee unit No. 5. All would if built have some effect in retaining waters farther up the river and reducing floods at the point of this proposed project.

In addition, a more extensive survey is being made by the Corps of Engineers of all possible reservoir sites on the Wabash River generally, including some sites in Illinois.

Surely it would be folly to spend more Federal money now on planning for a flood control project the need for which may be greatly reduced, if not eliminated, by other flood control measures further upstream.

In conclusion, I wish merely to say that I have no animus against reasonable flood protection for my friends and neighbors in Indiana. But it is asking a little too much to ask Illinois residents to accept this meekly when such protective walls on one side of the Wabash will admittedly throw more water on and increase the flood damages inflicted on Illinois farmlands and the city of Mount Carmel, with its various industries and public facilities in the direct line of fire.

For all these reasons, I hope the Senate will at this time delete this appropriation of $25,000 for levee unit No. 5 and take a more careful look at the whole situation and the legitimate interests of Illinois residents before giving Federal funds for this planning or construction work to go ahead.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. I should like to repeat the statement made by the committee with reference to this project:

The committee considers this an important project that should be built at an early date.

The committee does not feel that the needed flood protection for levee unit No. 5, which was authorized in 1936, should be postponed indefinitely.

As I stated previously, this represents some 43,000 acres of some of the best cornland in Indiana. They have been wiped out 4 out of 5 years. If we do not get to this project pretty soon, we will not need to worry about it, because there will not be any farmers left in the area.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would like to be present, so 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. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I see no reason for eliminating this provision of the bill. It was given careful consideration by the committee. It is a part and parcel of the bill. The only argument in favor of eliminating it is that a levee is needed on the Illinois side of the river as well as the Indiana side, with which I agree 100 percent. But why delay construction of a levee on the Indiana side until the Illinois Senator gets around to introducing legislation providing for a levee on the Illinois side?

I hope the amendment is defeated. I have told the Senator from Illinois, publicly as well as privately, that I would support him at any time he would care to introduce a bill to build a levee on the Illinois side. I agree with him that one is needed. But the provisions of the bill do not call for constructing a levee on the Indiana side; they call for planning the levee, which means we shall have to come back next year and get an appropriation through this Congress to construct it.

This levee has been under consideration since 1936. I sincerely hope the able Senator from Illinois will withdraw his amendment, for the reason that I cannot conceive of one who is interested in developing levees and reservoirs in the Wabash River Basin, which covers both the Illinois and Indiana side, making such a proposal. As a Senator of the United States, I am just as much interested in the Illinois side as I am in the Indiana side.

This is a project as to which research has been approved by the Army Engineers. They have studied it; they have approved it. The provision we are talking about calls for spending money in connection with the possibility of a levee in and around Mount Carmel, Ill., which the able Senator from Illinois is discussing.

If the Senate starts eliminating appropriations for the planning of a levee which the committee has carefully studied, on the grounds that we must wait until somebody else is ready to make a similar proposal, then we never will build a levee and we never will build a reservoir and we will never get anywhere in the great development of our rivers, conserving our soil, and protecting our cities and farms.

I have no quarrel with the Senator from Illinois, except that I think he is mistaken in trying to stop something that he knows is right. I think he is 100 percent right in seeking to have levees on the Illinois side of the Wabash River. I am with him on that score. If there is any way we can make a provision for it in the bill we are considering tonight, I shall be very happy to support him, because he is 100 percent right.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator on the conversion which he has undergone. He has apparently been baptized in the waters of the Wabash and has emerged a nobler and better man as a result.

But I point out that we have been flimflammed in the past by the State of Indiana, and I believe he was the moving spirit in getting the Wabash levee on the Indiana side, at Vincennes, with no corresponding levee on the Illinois side. The result was that thousands of acres of Illinois land have been damaged, while at the same time Indiana lands have been protected.

If the Senator has had a deep-seated change of heart and agrees that there should be no levee on the Indiana side unless there is a levee on the Illinois side, I will take it as a great improvement in character, and this will encourage me.

But, as I have said, since the State of Illinois has been flimflammed once, I do not propose to preside over the liquidation of thousands of additional acres of Illinois land; and I hereby serve notice that when we come to the appropriation bill next time, if there is an appropriation for constructing levees on the Indiana side without corresponding appropriations for levees on the Illinois side, we will fight in the fields, on the roads, and in the cities—paraphrasing Winston Churchill—for equality of treatment.

Mr. CAPEHART. No one is opposed to levees on the Illinois side. I will be very happy to vote for them. I think the Senate will be very happy to vote for them. I think what the able Senator from Illinois has to do is take a lesson from the Senators and Representatives from Indiana. We shall be glad to teach the Senator how to get an appropriation and how to get a levee. I shall be happy to vote with him. I shall be happy to assist the Senator in getting levees on the Illinois side of the Wabash River. I do not think Senators appreciate, however—I know I do not—coming in here at the last minute, after the committee has given careful consideration to this subject, and asking that an item be stricken out, on the theory that there should be a levee somewhere else along

with this one. Why did not the able Senator appear before the committee? Why did not the Senator have plans drawn? Why did not the Senator propose that a similar levee be built on the Illinois side of the river? I am for the Senator on the project. I shall be happy to support him next year, and we will be able to get it through.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I should like to join my distinguished senior colleague from Indiana and say that we shall be more than delighted to accommodate the Senator from Illinois. We shall work with him. We shall vote with him. We shall talk with his constituents.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course.

Mr. HARTKE. We shall help him to survey the levee scene or to do anything he wishes to have done.

Mr. CAPEHART. We shall be as happy to work as hard for a levee on the Illinois side of Mount Carmel as we are to work for one on the Indiana side. What more can we do?

Mr. DOUGLAS. This touching solicitude really wrings my heart. I am deeply touched by the nobility displayed by my colleagues from Indiana.

But if I may clear up a factual matter, my friend from Indiana taunted me about not having made an appearance before the Committee on Appropriations on this subject. I refer my friend to pages 2555 and 2556 of the record, at which I made a statement on this question and made my protest. I am very sorry my friend does not read the record and does not know what went on in the committee, but I made a full representation in this case.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have the floor. I agree that the Senator made a protest against the Indiana levee, but the Senator did not take an affirmative stand as to getting a levee of his own.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say that the person whom I introduced—namely, Leonard M. Koger, Jr., chairman, Wabash County Flood Protection Committee, Wabash County, Ill.—on pages 2538, 2539, 2540, and 2541 of the record presented a fully documented case in opposition. But authorizing legislation could not be presented to the Appropriations Committee.

My good friend from Indiana evidently has twinges of a guilty conscience, and he protests that he will reform in the future, but why should he not do so now? Why should he postpone his needed reformation until some time when it may be too late?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that this question has been contested by Illinois citizens for some time. A suit was entered by people from Illinois in order to stop the formation of levee unit No. 5. On September 23, 1959, the Gibson County circuit court entered a judgment approving and confirming the assessments and declaring levee unit No. 5 established. It appears that this is a final judgment unappealed from and from which under every possible consideration the time for appeal, if any, has long expired.

As stated by my good friends from Indiana, this project was authorized in 1936. The committee gave it due consideration.

I wish to read at this time an excerpt from the committee report:

> Opposition has been expressed by local interests in Mount Carmel on the basis of the adverse effect the project would have on flood heights in the Mount Carmel area. The committee is informed that during the course of a previous investigation of the feasibility of levee protection along the Wabash, local interests were informed of the effect that the construction of levee unit No. 5 would have on the height of major floods. Local interests considered flood protection for Mount Carmel unnecessary at that time, but stated that they would reconsider the matter if the levees were constructed on the Indiana side.
>
> The budget estimate includes $10,000 for the continuation of the survey of the Wabash River, Mount Carmel. An additional $15,000 will be required after fiscal year 1961 for the completion of that study. The Corps of Engineers have stated that they have the capability of completing that study in fiscal year 1960 if an additional $15,000 were provided for fiscal year 1960.
>
> The committee does not feel that the needed flood protection for levee unit No. 5, which was authorized in 1936, should be postponed indefinitely. The committee has, therefore, recommended $25,000 planning funds for levee unit No. 5 for fiscal year 1961, and in addition recommends that $15,000 of the increase provided for surveys be applied to the study of the Wabash River at Mount Carmel.

Mr. President, I think a good case has been made for this project, and I think the committee acted wisely in providing the funds to initiate planning.

Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from Illinois has made a fine case for getting all of us to assist him next year to get through the necessary appropriation to build a levee at Mount Carmel. I think the Senator has served his people well in that respect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Louisiana unintentionally gave the impression that the legality of the levee unit No. 5 had been finally determined. This is the impression which the Corps of Engineers and the proponents of levee unit No. 5 try to give, but it is not the fact.

It is true that a court order setting up the district was entered on September 23, 1959. But 104 petitioners, residents of Indiana, filed a complaint to review that judgment on December 22, 1959, and that complaint is pending in the Gibson County circuit court. It is docket No. 11,535. The title of the case is Margaret B. Brown and Mark W. Lowell, Trustees, Birdie R. Gray, Trustee and Others against Stephen A. Blood and Others.

I understand a special judge, Hon. Joe A. Lowermilk, has been appointed by the Supreme Court of Indiana to hear and try the issues.

The last reported action in the case was a motion by some of the principal defendants on June 23, 1960, for a continuance to give them time to file their answer before August. At last account that answer was not filed. If this answer is filed before September, presumably the case could be heard in September.

But the length of that hearing is difficult to guess, and the expressed determination of the petitioning objectors to carry this case to the Indiana Supreme Court if necessary makes it clear that no early, final decision is probable or possible. The seriousness with which these legal objections are being urged in Indiana is evidenced by the 880 page length of the petition, the large number of petitioners, 104, who have joined in the action; and their decision to exercise their full legal rights of appeal if necessary to block a project they strongly oppose.

I am confident the committee might have reached a different conclusion about this appropriation at this time had these facts been outlined to it more fully. Surely it would be improvident to spend Federal funds even for planning in connection with a levee district which may be ruled out by action of the Indiana State courts.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to my good friend that I took the matter up with the Department of the Army, and under date of July 20, 1960, I received a letter from Col. Loren W. Olmstead, Corps of Engineers, Acting Director of Civil Works. In the letter he stated:

> The Gibson County circuit court, on September 23, 1959, ordered the levee district established. I am informed that the levee district was established after meeting all required legal conditions including observance of all requirements relative to the hearing of remonstrances from property owners involved. Subsequent to establishment of the levee district, a complaint was filed in Gibson County circuit court as docket No. 11535 on behalf of property owners who allegedly had an opportunity to remonstrate prior to establishment of the district. The court has not scheduled a hearing date on the complaint. Pending the hearing, there are no legal restrictions against the levee district proceeding with fulfillment of its purpose. Attorneys for the levee district advised our Louisville district, that they are of the opinion that there are no elements in the new complaint which are likely to upset the judgment establishing the levee district.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that the Corps of Engineers is now presuming to make a legal decision for the Supreme Court of Indiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am merely citing for the RECORD the information which I have, upon which I based the statement I made a moment ago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would not the chairman agree that additional funds should not be spent until the question of legality is decided?

Mr. ELLENDER. I think it has been decided, according to that letter. This question has been in litigation for some time, and I consider it a delaying tactic.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The issue is before the courts now. Only a tentative decision was reached last year. It is now being tested in a review proceeding. Obviously the Indiana Supreme Court regards this as a debatable question, because it has named a special judge to consider the subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I have said, the committee has given the question much study and has made its recommendation. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is absent because of a death in his family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 283]

YEAS—86

Aiken	Bartlett	Bible
Allott	Beall	Bridges
Anderson	Bennett	Burdick
Bush	Gore	Monroney
Butler	Hart	Morse
Byrd, W. Va.	Hartke	Morton
Cannon	Hayden	Moss
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Carlson	Holland	Muskie
Carroll	Hruska	Pastore
Case, N.J.	Humphrey	Prouty
Chavez	Jackson	Proxmire
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Clark	Jordan	Robertson
Cooper	Keating	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Curtis	Kennedy	Scott
Dirksen	Kerr	Smathers
Dodd	Kuchel	Smith
Douglas	Lausche	Stennis
Dworshak	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Eastland	Long, La.	Talmadge
Ellender	Lusk	Thurmond
Engle	McCarthy	Wiley
Ervin	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Fong	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Frear	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Magnuson	Young, Ohio
Goldwater	Mansfield	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—14

Byrd, Va.	Hill	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Russell
Green	Johnston, S.C.	Sparkman
Gruening	Martin	Yarborough
Hennings	Murray	

So the bill (H.R. 12326) was passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KERR, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Before I make a motion, I should like to pay my humble tribute to the very able Senator from Louisiana for his diligence and devotion and fairness in connection with one of the most difficult bills that ever comes before the Senate.

When a good many of us are enjoying recreation or are engaged in other activities, the Senator from Louisiana, morning, afternoon, and even in the evening, is holding hearings in connection with the civil functions appropriation bill. I know of no greater tribute that could be paid to him and his associates on the subcommittee, both majority and minority members, than the unanimous vote which this comprehensive appropriation bill received this evening.

I wish to say to him in my own way that every Member of the Senate owes him a debt of gratitude and appreciation for the many hours he has spent in behalf of them and in behalf of our country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I fully concur in the compliment paid to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I know the job of going through a detailed bill like this, with the many projects and many problems involved. It is probably the most difficult appropriation bill that comes before the Senate. I have appeared before the committee. I have endeavored on occasions to get money from him. I have not always been successful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have not always been successful either, but I still like the way he treats me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; even though I have not been successful he has always been thoroughgoing in his effort.

I would be remiss if I did not pay tribute to the very distinguished clerk of the committee, Kenneth Bousquet. He has been with the committee a long time. He knows the bill from one end to the other. He is really a great credit to himself and to the Appropriations Committee for the fine work that he has done year after year.

While I have an opportunity to do so, I should like to say that I have voted for the bill, even though I did so with reluctance, for the very good reason that while the President's budget provided for 42 new starts, I believe the House has added 5, and the Senate added 34 new starts. That commits us in the future to approximately $534 million.

I remember the difficulties we had when the bill went to the White House. I might have made a statement before its passage. I did not do so. But that is neither here nor there.

I can only say that the President and the Bureau of the Budget, in an endeavor to protect the budget, will probably look at this bill with a bit of a dismal eye. But that does not demean the fact that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has done a topflight job.

I note the presence of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. He is the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee. This is painstaking labor, believe me. It keeps one in the committee room day after day.

So I salute my colleagues for their fidelity. I salute them for their diligence and for their service in the public interest.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am proud to associate myself with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, particularly as it pertains to the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

I trust that the result of the vote—86 to 0—notwithstanding the policy of this administration to have no new starts, and with the cooperation of the Senators named, will make it possible to place this measure on the statute books and get the new starts under way. I think the country is deserving of some new starts. I think the Senate, by its vote of 86 to 0 has indicated that it desires new starts.

I think the Senate should be complimented for handling in a nonpartisan way, and with complete fairness today a very important treaty and agreement involving the honor and responsibility of the United States. It was negotiated by the leader of our Nation.

Also, the Senate is to be complimented for passing one of the most important appropriation bills to come before it at this session.

If we can deal with "new starts" in the days to follow as we have dealt with them today, disposing of each as it comes up, with fairness, with diligence, and with responsibility, I have no doubt that the Senate will be able to complete action on the measures which the House has already passed, and that we can return to our respective States by Labor Day, and permit our constituents to pass judgment on our action.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the majority leader addresses himself to a new subject matter, will he yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the majority leader speaks of the vote of 86 to 0, I thought I had qualified my vote, in part. On one other occasion I think there was a vote of 85 to 1 in the Senate. I happened to the "1." One stands out a little like a lighthouse in the fog. It is like the old World War I song: "They were all out of step but my Jim."

Perhaps I was out of step, but I still believe I should qualify my vote and advert to the fact that there are new starts which have not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and by the President, and they commit the Government to future expenditures of something in excess of $500 million. At a time like this, with so many fevers in the world, I believe we ought to be very solicitous about the solvency of this country, as we have never been before.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe I heard the majority leader say that we would apply ourselves to bills passed by the House. Am I to believe that we will take up no bills other than those already on the calendar?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; I would not want to foreclose action on any bill; but I should think we would take them in the order of priority; that it would be the better part of wisdom if we acted first on those which have already been passed by the House.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then the Senator intends to include for further consideration bills which are not on the calendar at present, should they be placed on the calendar?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct. I would not foreclose action on any bill which has not yet been introduced or is to be introduced. That is a matter for the majority of the Senate to act on. I am only the agent of the Senate. Sometimes I am not a very good agent. I am trying now to dispose of matters—appropriation bills and other items—on which the House has acted. Then other measures can follow, if that is the disposition of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while a substantial number of Senators are present, will the distinguished majority leader advise us about the time for convening tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senate is willing, I would suggest 9:30. I assure the Senator from Illinois that his presence would not be required before 11 o'clock.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My presence is always required, because I never know in advance, quite, what mischievousness might develop which might require my attention.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I was trying to assure the Senator that nothing mischievous would develop before 11 o'clock. There will be the prayer; and Senators will have an opportunity to make insertions in the RECORD during the morning hour. I would not permit, promote, or anticipate any rollcalls of any nature. If so, I would certainly see to it that the Senator from Illinois had advance notification.

I hope the Senate will convene at 9:30. Perhaps if we do, it will be possible to adjourn or recess early in the evening. Several Senators have expressed concern about missing dinner. If we convene at 9:30 and make really good progress on the bill tomorrow, I will suggest to the Senate that the session be concluded by 6:30 or 7 o'clock.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The only difficulty with that is that some of the most delightful mischief occurs in the morning hour, and I would like to be around if that happens.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I invite the presence of the Senator from Illinois at 9:30 in the morning.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1817, S. 3758.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3758) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employees engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, out of deference to the Senator from Illinois, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today, it adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am grateful for that.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators and their wives who may have other engagements tomorrow evening, I will suggest that the Senate have no votes after 7 o'clock tomorrow evening.

I announce that the Senate will convene early and remain late for the remainder of the week. Since we shall convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, and in light of the fact that we have had a long day today, Senators may understand that there will not be any yea-and-nay votes after 7 o'clock tomorrow evening.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, does the distinguished majority leader have any announcement to make with reference to how long the Senate will remain in session tonight?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] desires to make a statement in explanation of the bill this evening. I do not know how long he will take. I do not think he will take very long. I should assume that the Senate could recess or adjourn by 8:30.

PUBLICATION OF NEW DAILY NEWSPAPER IN PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it will come as encouraging news to many who are concerned about the trend to monopoly in the newspaper industry that a new, independent daily paper will begin to publish in Portland, Oreg., around November 1 of this year.

Born of the management-inspired strike against the two Portland dailies, the Portland Reporter has been staffed by strikers displaced from their jobs by imported strikebreakers. The Reporter has been publishing twice a week in a plant owned by the Portland Journal of Commerce. Now it has bought its own printing plant, thanks to the efforts of some 50 Oregon unions and labor councils who raised $100,000 for the purpose of establishing the Reporter as a daily.

It is good to know that the lopsided news coverage in the city of Portland, both of whose existing papers are heavily biased politically and economically, is about to have some competition from the men and women who are devoted to journalism for itself, not for the monetary profits which can be made from a newspaper. Portland has long needed some competitive newspaper reporting; I believe the Daily Reporter will offer it, and thereby reverse in one city at least the alarming trend toward newspaper monopoly.

Secondly, it is also good to know that out of the evil of professional strikebreaking as practiced by the Portland Oregonian and the Oregon Journal has emerged an enterprise which will be a monument to free unions. These newspaper men and women who will staff the Daily Reporter are longtime residents of Portland; they have long been part of its community life. In their ruthless labor policy, the two existing newspapers stooped to an infamous importation of strikebreakers from many parts of the country. They imported

into the city of Portland people who are only temporary residents, many of them with unsavory reputations in other cities where they have worked as strikebreakers.

Many will wish the Reporter well simply because they want to see these displaced employees stay in Portland and continue practicing their high standards of journalism.

My own good wishes go to the Daily Reporter because I do not think strikebreaking of the kind engaged in by the Portland dailies should succeed in driving from the city these valuable citizens; it also has my good wishes because I know how important it is that the major city of our State of Oregon have fair and impartial presentation of the news.

I have mailed my subscription to the Daily Reporter. I look forward to receiving it when it begins publication around the first of November.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of these remarks an article entitled "The Reporter Will Go Daily," published in the Oregon Labor Press of July 29, 1960.

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

THE REPORTER WILL GO DAILY—PRESS AND BUILDING NOW BEING READIED

It's definite and final: the Portland Reporter will become a daily newspaper before the end of the year.

November 1 is the target date for daily publication of Portland's new, independent, liberal newspaper.

Long-brewing plans to launch the Reporter as a daily became definite this week when the newspaper leased a building of its own and a complete printing plant.

The Reporter, born last February and published twice a week by the members of Portland newspaper unions, already is well established and highly regarded by readers and advertisers.

The Daily Reporter will be an afternoon newspaper.

Publisher Robert D. Webb said The Reporter will carry national wire service news and syndicated features. It will continue to be published in its present tabloid page size.

"Our news emphasis will remain where it is today—on accurate, impartial and lively coverage of local news and features," he added.

Webb predicted at a press conference Tuesday that the Reporter will start daily publication with a paid circulation of at least 50,000.

Growth of the Reporter from last February's 8-page strike weekly to a full-fledged daily newspaper is a Cinderella story of American journalism and trade unionism.

One of the magic wands helping the Reporter's dream to come true is the Rose City Development Co.

The company was formed by more than 50 Oregons unions and labor councils to buy and remodel the building which will be leased to The Reporter.

Union investments ranging from $50 to $17,000 had reached a total of $100,700 on Wednesday of this week.

"When all commitments are fulfilled, it now appears that the total will reach $140,000," said A. T. Williams, Sr., president of Carpenters Local 226 and president of the development company.

With great personal dedication and sacrifice, Williams has worked night and day for 5 weeks to finance the purchase and remodeling of the Reporter's building.

OLD BUILDING REMODELED

The building is a 43-year-old red brick structure covering half a block on Northwest 17th Avenue between Northrup and Overton Streets.

It was purchased last Friday from the Railway Express Agency for $70,000 cash.

Although it was once used as a stable for horses and wagons of the historic Wells Fargo Express Co., the architect for the Reporter said the building is "exceptionally well suited to remodeling for modern newspaper production."

Remodeling will begin as soon as the city planning commission approves the plans and blueprints prepared by Architect John W. Reese.

Ample offstreet parking will be provided on lots adjoining the newspaper plant.

Meanwhile the Reporter's second magic wand already is waving. A complete printing plant is on its way to Portland from Miami, Fla.

The plant was used to print a daily newspaper in Florida until a few months ago. Webb said it is "a complete, modern newspaper plant, including everything from presses and linotypes to desks, chairs and paper clips."

Owned by the International Typographical Union, the plant is being leased to the Reporter. It includes a press capable of printing a newspaper of 96 tabloid-size pages.

The first shipment of 28,000 pounds of equipment will arrive here from Miami this week. Additional shipments are expected weekly throughout the summer, while the building is being remodeled to receive them.

Officers of the Rose City Development Co., the Typographical Union and the Reporter emphasized this week that the unions will not influence the policies of the Reporter in any way.

"The Reporter already has proved that it speaks with a completely independent voice, and we want it to remain that way," Williams declared.

The Reporter will apply to the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission for a permit to issue stock in the newspaper, Webb announced this week. The stock issue, when approved, will be offered to the public on a nationwide basis.

UNIONS INVEST IN BUILDING

Officers of Rose City Development Co., in addition to Williams, are James T. Marr of the Oregon AFL-CIO; Edward J. Whelan, Multnomah County Labor Council; Francis Murnane, Longshoremen, and George Salmon, Machinists 63.

Oregon labor organizations which have invested in the Rose City Development Co. are:

Electrical Workers 48, Portland District Council of Carpenters, Carpenters 226, Food and Drug Clerks 1092, Carpenters 1020, Elevator Constructors 23, Multnomah County Labor Council, Pulp & Sulphite Workers 68 (Oregon City), Oregon AFL-CIO.

Carpenters 1388, Boilermakers 72, Waitresses 305, Building Service Employees 49, Oregon Labor Press, Office Employees 11, Steamfitters 235, Laundry Workers 107, School Custodians 140;

Shingle Weavers 2969, Communication Workers 9201, Label Trades Section, Sheet Metal Workers 16, Carpenters 783, Clackamas County Employees 350, Laborers 320, Machinists 1432, Painters 10, Molders & Foundry Workers 139;

Electrical Workers 799, Portland Building Trades Council, Plumbers & Steamfitters 418 (Medford), Carpenters 583, Barbers 75, Chemical Workers 109, and Plumbers 51.

In addition, the following unions have shown an active interest in making an investment, pending final approval by their membership.

Bartenders 496, Chemical Workers 133, Garment Workers 228, Ladies' Garment Workers 70, Marine Firemen, Sailors Union of the Pacific, Marine Cooks & Stewards, Iron Workers 516, Longshoremen 8, Carpenters 573 (Baker), Machinists 63, Glass Workers 740, Butcher Workmen 656, Woodworkers 3-3;

Portland Police Local 456, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Sheet Metal Workers 544, Steelworkers, Amalgamated Lithographers, Engineers 87, Electrical Workers 49, Musicians 99, Furniture Workers 3182, and the Regional Council of Woodworkers.

EIGHTY-SEVENTH SESSION OF OREGON STATE GRANGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the 87th session of the Oregon State Grange which was held in Roseburg, Oreg., one of the highlights of the session was the annual address of the master of the Oregon State Grange, my very good friend Mr. Elmer McClure. I particularly enjoyed my most recent visit with him late in June, when I had the pleasure of his company at breakfast here in the Capitol.

It is with great pleasure, therefore, that I ask unanimous consent that the master's address before the State convention of the Oregon Grange be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ANNUAL ADDRESS, 87TH SESSION OREGON STATE GRANGE

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the 87th annual session of the Oregon State Grange. This is only the third time in our history that we have had the privilege of convening in this beautiful city in the heart of the Umpqua Valley. When we first met in Roseburg, the year was 1912 and Roseburg was a quiet, happy little city, the hub of the vast agricultural area surrounding the town. Prunes were perhaps the major crop, and getting the first ripe watermelon of the summer was a real contest.

C. E. Spence was master of the State grange that year and in his address to the delegates, he announced that the U.S. Supreme Court had upheld the initiative and referendum law, and that the constitutional convention, proposed by the enemies of direct legislation had been defeated by a vote of more than 2 to 1, 59,000 to 23,000. Spence predicted, and how prophetically, that attempts to nullify the initiative and referendum would continue.

The second time we met in Roseburg, 1934, Roseburg was not such a happy and contented place. It, like the rest of the State and Nation, was still rocking from the stock market crash of 1929 and 1930. Ray Gill was master, and one section of his address was devoted to the AAA and the NRA, which, he said, was not a perfect piece of legislation, a view with which the Supreme Court later agreed, as you will recall. He also warned that our economy was suffering because of high interest rates.

Brother Gill further reported that the State grange had led the fight which defeated the second sales tax attempt. He, too, reported attempts to restrict and hamper the use of the initiative and referendum.

I hope no one will think that because we will again, in 1960, in session in Roseburg, give consideration to these problems, that no progress has been made or that we are in a rut.

In 1960, as we assemble in Roseburg, we find that once again Roseburg has changed. Her agricultural industry, while still the very fiber of which she is woven, has been augmented by the development of the lumber

industry in this area. She has a new hustle that presages an expanding economy for many years to come. All of Oregon, as well as the rest of the Nation, has every admiration and respect for the way Roseburg sustained the shock of the explosion last year that left so much destruction in its wake, and for its quick and determined recovery.

In such an atmosphere the delegates to this session will surely find the inspiration and determination to solve the complex problems attendant upon an organization like the Grange which stands as an essential vehicle to our form of government and our way of life. And, like Roseburg, we can and will, reach our decisions with dignity and confidence.

2. AGRICULTURE

American agriculture continues to be the major weak spot in the Nation's economy. Solutions to the problems of agriculture are offered in wholesale lots these days. As one of America's favorite comedians is so fond of saying, "Everybody wants to get into the act." It seems to be the concensus that the biggest single need agriculture has at this point in our history is better public relations. I concur with the majority opinion, yet I am aware that public relations, per se, will not solve one single problem the farmer has. It will not influence any of the elements with which he must contend at the production level. It won't change the weather or drain a swamp. It won't kill a weed nor milk a cow. Public relations alone, will not pay off the mortgage nor control the market. But it will get the farmer, now a small minority, whose voice is often drowned out by the much stronger voice of the off-farm interests, better understanding from the general public.

Good public relations will alert the off-farm public to the farmer's problems and will bring understanding of the programs he is seeking to establish to meet his needs.

To explore this idea further, one of the farm programs least understood by the general public is the cooperative organizations which are so vital to the small farmer. To start at the real heart of the problem, we find a vast majority of our population today almost totally ignorant of agriculture. Only a few years ago, most people in America had either grown up on farms or their parents had been raised on farms. They still had grandparents and other close relatives engaged in agriculture. They knew and appreciated the value of the family farm as the backbone of American community life and of the agricultural industry. They were interested and sincerely desired a prosperous agriculture for this country.

Now we have millions of people who have no more farm experience than a drive in the country will give them. They have never had occasion to evaluate the role of the family farm in the American scene. When these people read newspaper and magazine reports that cooperatives are devices to avoid taxation or that they are inimical to the free enterprise system, they believe it. These are the people who lend their support and their strength at the ballot box to legislation to tax cooperatives out of existence or to put so much hampering regulation on them that they will be ineffective. They also lend strength to the opposition when legislation is introduced into the Congress or into a State legislature to aid and strengthen the farm and rural cooperatives.

Now you and I know that only through strong cooperatives can the small farmer hope to compete with the giant industrialized agricultural enterprises that are threatening to completely dominate the agricultural industry. The majority of Americans, I am afraid, simply do not understand what it would mean to the political and economic life of America if we permit American agriculture to be completely industrialized.

It is the job of public relations to create and to expand in ever-widening circles this understanding.

This same lack of understanding on the part of the general public exists in almost every phase of the production of the food and fiber that supplies this Nation in such abundance. Somehow, the general public must be made to realize that the family farm is the heart of a strong and healthy agriculture in this country, without which America cannot continue to grow and prosper. The benefits to agriculture and indirectly to every person in this country from such programs as those designed to aid in soil conservation, tree farming, land bank, transportation, education, financing, and above all, research—research into the growing processing, packaging, promoting, distribution, selling, yes, and even into the consumption of farm products, must be understood by the general public. They must know why the farmer must have all of these programs if he is to remain in business. And have them he can if he does a good enough job of public relations. If he has proper public relations, the public will insist that such programs be put into practice because the public will then understand that to do so is a wise investment that will result in a higher standard of living for every person in this country.

It is my recommendation that the Oregon State Grange and every one of its Pomona and subordinate granges adopt an all-out program to improve agriculture's public relations. This is not a job that can be done once and forgotten. Public relations is a continuing struggle. People who listen to us today, and are convinced, listen to others tomorrow and are once more in doubt; so that we must have a continuous program of keeping people informed about agriculture.

3. SOIL CONSERVATION

Soil conservation programs in Oregon have met with general acceptance by the public as well as most farm people. While, of course, the general public knows little or nothing about the mechanics and techniques of soil conservation, there is widespread appreciation of the basic truth that nations survive and are great and prosperous only so long as they maintain and increase the productivity of their soil. There is little opposition to State and Federal programs of soil conservation among the off-farm public.

As for the farmer himself, he has the evidence of the success and value of soil conservation programs ever before him. He is convinced of their worth. Oregon has 57 individual soil conservation districts, all established by petition and vote of the landowners within these areas. There are now 40,743,146 Oregon acres in soil conservation districts. These districts are in 32 of Oregon's 36 counties. Twenty-one counties are completely covered by districts.

This program is steadily expanding. During the past biennium, three new districts were formed and seven existing districts were enlarged. Methods and practices are constantly studied and improved. This is a program that should have the unqualified endorsement and cooperation of the Grange.

4. FARM FORESTS

Income from farm forests is a major share of net farm income in Oregon. In 1958, the last year for which statistics were available, out of a total crop income in Oregon of $210,272,000, farm forests contributed $6,166,000. This was the 10th most valuable farm crop in that year. These figures, of course, do not include animals and animal products.

This income could and should be expanded manyfold. Oregon's climate is ideal for the growing of trees and much of her area is more suitable for the growing of trees than for any other use. Its optimum value can be realized only if it is devoted to its natural use. Perhaps the chief reason more farmers do not use more of their forest lands for the growing of trees is our present method of taxing forest lands and growing trees.

It is a grave error for Oregon to continue with a tax structure that discourages farm forestry. The day is not too distant when farm forests must supply a major portion of the saw timber for the lumber industry. Lumbering is Oregon's No. 1 industry. It is to the benefit of all of us to adopt a program that will allow the lumber industry to continue to expand.

During the last year, the State grange has had an interim committee working on the subject of timber taxation. Their report will be before you for consideration later on this week. It is my recommendation that the State grange adopt a policy supporting an ad valorem tax program that will encourage the growing of farm forests without penalizing other classes of property.

5. GRAZING LANDS

There continues to be considerable dissatisfaction among cattle and sheep ranchers whose operations depend upon grazing permits in the national forests over the administration of the grazing permits. Many ranchers complain that the rules and regulations set up by the Forest Service to govern their policies and individual decisions are not readily available nor are they clear and understandable. The result is that many ranchers have great difficulty planning their operations. The size of a herd of cattle or band of sheep cannot be changed much from day to day if a rancher is to continue in business. When he has planned his operation and the size of his herd around a permit to graze a certain number of cattle or sheep, having his permit suddenly reduced by half can cause him tremendous losses.

It is, of course, true that range and water conditions vary from year to year depending upon weather and other factors. But with good range management practices, the productivity of the grasslands and the amount of available water can be somewhat stabilized.

The livestock industry is one of the more important elements in the economy of this State and the State grange should use its strength and influence to the end that the national forest grazing lands in Oregon shall be developed to their maximum productivity and that their use shall be distributed equitably and reliably.

6. WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT

In the relatively short time since any part of the Willamette Basin project has been in operation, the total direct dollar benefit to the area amounts to $58,350,000 in prevented flood damage and in hydroelectric power revenues. In addition to this, benefits upon which it is impossible to place a direct dollar value include irrigation, navigation, domestic water, pollution abatement, recreation, and soil conservation.

Work is continuing on the project with local, State and Federal cooperation. Its eventual effect on the economic and social development of this State is impossible to determine. Already foreshadowed, however, are many changes. Each county in the area covered by the project reports changes directly due to the project. Multnomah County, at the mouth of the Willamette Basin, reports significant decrease in stream pollution due to the more constant flow of the river as a result of flood control storage in the upper basin. Several counties report a shift in agricultural crops from small grains, etc., to row crops and nursery stocks. Still other counties are most concerned with the increase in water freight with barge lines operating between Portland, Salem, and Albany. Several counties report greatly expanded recreation activity with fishing,

boating, water sports, camping and picnicking becoming much more important in the lives of the residents of the area.

All of these uses are important and it would take more than a Solomon to determine which is most important. I do not think such a determination, if it could be made, has any value in adjudicating priority use. Because water used for irrigating farm crops has a direct dollar benefit does not mean that we should not use water to water lawns and shrubs for our homes and parks. We can figure out how many dollars we have saved by controlling floods, but how can we reduce to dollars the social benefits of healthy, outdoor recreation?

It is, therefore, with regret that I watch the increasing tension between groups of people eager to appropriate some project or other to the use of that group at the direct expense of all other users. The rights of farmers, even though farmers are decidedly a minority group, numerically, to equal use of the impounded water in the Willamette Basin projects must be maintained. It would be utter folly to permit the recreational use of water impounded in dams to supersede the agricultural and stream flow maintenance use of the water.

7. ROGUE BASIN

When we consider the undeniable value of the Willamette Basin project to the State of Oregon as well as to the Willamette Basin proper, we must conclude that this type of project, i.e., the comprehensive development of an entire river basin as one coherent project, is the logical and best way to go about such developments.

There is evidence that residents of the Rogue River Basin are fast coming to this point of view and I recommend that we support this type of river basin development in Oregon whenever there is local demand.

8. EDUCATION

What's wrong with Oregon's schools continues to be a fascinating subject to many people. A great deal of bitterness has been engendered in the subject and I am afraid that we have now reached the point where we are permitting this bitterness to becloud the issues.

The situation reminds me of the old legend about the queen who sent two of her officers out to survey the vegetation in her kingdom. One of the men was told to bring back a specimen of every weed in the kingdom and he returned crying that her majesty the queen was in a mighty bad way because she had a kingdom full of nothing but weeds. The other man was sent forth to bring back a specimen of every flower he found in the kingdom. He came back most jubilant and informed his queen that hers was the most beautiful kingdom in all the world—full of nothing but flowers.

I really believe that many people in Oregon are so busy hunting "What's wrong with education in Oregon" that they have completely lost sight of the fact that much is right with education in Oregon. The danger here is that unjustified attacks on educators or school administrators puts these people on the defensive and while they're in the mood, they defend everything in sight—right or wrong.

This is a dangerous attitude on both sides. It's dangerous because it tends to divert energy and attention from the real business at hand—getting the best possible education for every single child in our State—at a price we are willing to pay. We are a long, long way from that goal. Sometimes I think we have our signals crossed and that we aren't even headed in the right direction. But we certainly aren't getting any closer to it while we, figuratively, stand still watching the supporters of today's methods and the detractors of them flail each other over the head.

It is up to us to see to it that our criticism of Oregon's schools and educational system are truly constructive. When educators and school boards refuse, as some of them do, to give consideration to such criticism and refuse to make any effort to remedy bad situations, they should be held accountable. Probably the weakest spot in the educational system in Oregon is school boards. It cannot be denied that many school boards pay too little attention to criticism of the schools they administer. This is certainly not true of all school boards by any means. In the last few years school boards have formed their own association and are making every effort to improve the administration of the schools. They are making progress—and from all indications, they are on the right track. In those school districts where the school boards really run the schools with the desires of their communities in mind, we have outstanding educational programs at a cost the district can afford to pay. This is as it should be.

Because we live in a democracy, it is by law the responsibility of the school board to set the educational policy of the district and to see that it is carried out. It is up to you and me as voters to see to it that we elect school boards with the strength to carry out their duties. No school board has the right to transfer this responsibility to a hired administrator.

It is really too bad that most of the anger directed at the shortcomings of our schools is aimed at the teachers. I've even heard them blamed for the extravagant school buildings. Such criticism should be aimed at the school boards. There's where the authority and the responsibility really lie.

The State grange education committee has devoted a great deal of time and study to the school problems in Oregon. Theirs is a very well thought out and comprehensive report and I hope you will give it and their recommendations, which will be before you a little later in the session, very close and careful consideration.

9. POWER

The recent increase in electric power rates for the entire State of Oregon excepting only those areas in which there are competing public power facilities spread the gap between the cost of public and private power even further. In its wake, we notice a revival of interest in some areas in putting into operation dormant PUD's, as well as in expanding the boundaries of existing and operating PUD's.

This is a very healthy movement and I recommend that every subordinate and Pomona Grange in an area affected by one of these projects give it every consideration and where such projects are feasible that the grange lend them every support.

The grange has long had a firm policy of supporting development and expansion of publicly-owned distribution systems because there can be no doubt that public power means an abundance of low-cost power to all classes of consumers.

10. REGIONAL CORPORATION

The State grange is also on record in support of a regional corporation for the development of the Columbia Basin resources. I think we must reaffirm this position. Continuing the present practice of taking each dam, each generator, each transmission line before the Congress for authorization and appropriation is simply not doing the job that should be done if this Nation is to receive the benefit of full comprehensive development of the Columbia River Basin resource.

If we must continue battling for each dam, how many more key damsites are we going to lose as we lost Hells Canyon? How many times can the general unorganized public be brought together into such a movement to save a valuable damsite?

Presently the Washington Public Power Supply System is engaged in an all-out effort to secure a license to build Nez Perce Dam with non-Federal funds. Nez Perce is considered by most engineers to be a key damsite to further comprehensive development of the river basin. If a 700-foot-high dam is built on this site as recommended by the U.S. Corps of Engineers in its 1958 report, it would provide 6 million acre-feet of storage with an ultimate power-producing capacity of 2,400,000 kilowatts. Even so, it does not seem possible to get authorization for a Federal dam at the Nez Perce site at the present time. So in order to get the necessary development, the WPPSS has filed an application with the Federal Power Commission for a license to build the Nez Perce Dam. It may or may not receive the license. This continuing struggle over each new project keeps the entire situation in turmoil. A regional corporation, however, could build, either out of revenues or by issuing revenue bonds, the right dam in the right place at the right time. We could have maximum orderly development of the region's river resource. Anything less will certainly penalize the economic development of the Pacific Northwest for decades to come.

11. INTERTIE

At the last two sessions of the State grange, we have considered the question of an intertie between the Bonneville Power Administration lines and California power systems. We decided to support the intertie in principle, but we did not commit the State grange to any specific proposal.

Recent developments lead me to believe that the soundest policy for us to adopt at this time is that before we sign any contracts to furnish power to California users, we must have established a marketing area for Bonneville power. Any power sold outside of this area should be sold on an interruptible basis. At the present time, BPA has a surplus of power which could be sold in California to the great benefit of both regions. However, as the demand for power in the Northwest grows, the time is probably fairly close at hand when we will be needing all of the BPA output in our own area. It could be most detrimental to our own interests if we are firmly committed to provide power to California markets.

State grange policy should be that we support an intertie to furnish power to California only if it is firmly established that the Pacific Northwest has the prior right to BPA power.

12. TAXES

Resistance to tax increases continues to mount throughout the State. In the recent primary election in most counties, every measure to set a new tax base or to authorize the issuance of bonds was defeated. School districts throughout Oregon have not approved their budgets. Even the increase in legislators' salaries was defeated, though I am sure that most people are fully aware of the injustice of asking our legislators to serve their State at a financial loss.

On the whole, I think taxpayer resistance is a healthy thing if it is not carried too far. We could seriously hamper the operation of our State and foolishly curtail needed services. We could refuse to make investments in facilities needed to expand our economy that would result in tremendous economic losses. I am particularly reminded of the Dock Commission installations in the Portland Harbor.

The Dock Commission proposes to issue revenue bonds to expand and improve the cargo handling facilities in the Portland Harbor so that Portland will be second to no seaport on the Pacific coast in its cargo-handling ability. These facilities, if installed, would undoubtedly result in a tremendous increase in the economy of the whole State. Now if blind tax resistance leads the voters to reject this bond issue, as they have so

many others, they will most certainly have done serious injury to their city and to themselves. Somehow voters must be taught to distinguish between wise investment of public funds in terms of the dollar and cents value of the services supplied and the extravagant expenditure of public funds and to vote accordingly on revenue measures.

13. SCHOOL TAXES

Schools continue to be the most expensive item in our State and local budgets. Ad valorem taxpayers are looking to the State for a measure of relief. Many taxpayers are asking for an increase in State basic school support. Some people are advocating that the State pay one-half the cost of schools. I am a little concerned over this proposal. If the State is committed to automatically furnishing one-half the operating cost of all schools, we could find our school programs being expanded on the thesis that any added expense would cost only 50 cents on the dollar.

While I think it might be good to increase basic school support payments, I would warn against the legislature adopting any policy statement committing the State to pay one-half of the operating costs of schools.

14. HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION

Pressure for a homestead exemption from payment of taxes continues to grow. Oddly enough, most people think this is a new idea. Far from it. In reading the proceedings for the session the State grange held in Roseburg in 1934, we find that that year, too, the State master was warning against such an exemption. The reason he gave then is the same reason I give today. Such an exemption would become too great a burden on other property taxpayers.

It is true, however, that mounting taxes are becoming unbearable to many retired people living on fixed incomes. I think we must adopt some program that will afford them a measure of relief. If taxes on their homes could be deferred for the balance of their lifetimes, the accrued taxes, without penalties or accrued interest, could then be collected from their estates. This would lift the burden from these older taxpayers without penalizing other classes of property taxpayers.

15. THE FORAND BILL

The percentage of people over 65 is higher in Oregon than in the Nation as a whole, so health problems and medical care for our older people is of greater concern in Oregon than in some other States.

Under present medical programs many, many of these older people who have managed to save what should be enough money to keep them in comfort and security during the closing years of their lives, have their entire savings wiped out by a single illness, leaving them in abject poverty dependent on State welfare for the balance of their lives.

Private hospital coverage plans do not protect these people from such financial disasters because private coverage plans reserve the right to cancel coverage and these older people, after years of paying premiums to such companies, all to often find themselves canceled when they most need insurance protection.

The last two sessions of the State grange have considered this problem and adopted a policy supporting legislation to broaden the social security program to provide medical coverage for those retired on social security. The Forand bill, now before the Congress, would provide this legislation. I, therefore, recommend that the State grange give every support to the passage of this bill.

16. INTEREST RATES

The skyrocketing cost of credit has reached the danger point. It has now come to the place where interest charges are threatening the entire economy of this country.

Interest is a cost that every one of us pays, whether we have any personal indebtedness or not. If you are one of the very few fortunate people in this country who is completely free of debt, don't think you aren't paying any interest. You are.

For instance, interest on the national debt, now the second largest item in the national budget, exceeded only by national security, amounts to more than $9 billion a year. The average income taxpayer in the $5,000 per year income bracket, pays $51 of this $9 billion.

Public utilities, which finance their operations almost wholly with bonded indebtedness, are now paying about 100 percent more for interest than they paid in 1947. In this same space of time, 1947 to 1959, the general Consumer Price Index rose about 25 percent. In other words, the cost of interest increased four times as fast as the average commodities included in the Consumer Price Index.

Commerce of all kinds in this country runs on credit. Any increase in the cost of credit increases the cost of doing business and the cost of the product for which each one of us, as a consumer, must pay.

The tight money, high interest policy has been especially damaging to the homebuilding industry upon which Oregon's lumber industry is so dependent. Mortgage money for home buyers is costing up to 7 percent in the West and 6 percent in the East.

If you are paying for consumer credit, you are probably paying anywhere from 9 to 30 percent interest on a 12-month contract.

Interest costs are, to a great extent, influenced by the rate of interest allowed by the Federal Government on Government bonds. The present attempt to push a bill through the Congress to remove the ceiling on interest rates on long-term Government bonds should be defeated and I propose that the State grange do everything in its power to bring about the defeat of any legislation that would tend to increase interest rates, either on public or private indebtedness.

17. LEGISLATION

The Grange has been a legislative force for good in Oregon as long as it has been in existence. Unlike most organizations, the grange does not confine its interests to those matters that would affect the economic status of one particular group. Such groups often promote their own interests even at the expense of the general public. Nor are we like many organizations formed solely to push some specific piece of legislation through the legislature. These loosely knit groups, with which we often work, have no permanence. They go out of existence when the legislation they are seeking is either passed or defeated.

The Grange is permanent. It has very broad interests and it dedicates its efforts to the good of the general public. Our members come from nearly all walks of life and every point of view is expressed and considered before State grange policy is finally set. Once we set a policy, it then becomes the duty of the State officers to seek every honorable means to put that policy into effect. Often, many years go by before conditions are such that a particular policy can be put into action. For instance, the Grange set its policy calling for direct election of U.S. Senators as long ago as 1885, but it was well into the 20th century before that policy went into effect. Our history is replete with such examples.

Often political alinements shift several times during the course of a long struggle to have some particular legislation adopted. Even support for it within the State grange and within the subordinate and Pomona granges varies from year to year. The State grange dictates no policy to any member or to any subordinate grange. Only the State grange officers are duty bound to carry out the policy set forth by the delegates in annual session. However, we cannot overlook the fact that it is essential to the success of any political effort that we have cooperation between the subordinate, Pomona and State grange. For this reason it is doubly important that delegates to State grange give very careful consideration to the policies they adopt for the State grange. It is also important that they consider the resolutions at State grange in terms of what their own subordinate or Pomona Grange might be willing to do by way of cooperating in any effort to carry out such policy.

Our legislative committee is in an embarrassing position when it goes before legislative committees or seeks support from individual legislators and is confronted with stacks of letters from Grange members, subordinate or Pomona granges, presenting an exactly opposite opinion than State grange policy.

Speaking of the legislature, there have been many changes in the operation of the Oregon State Legislature in the past few years. A few years ago, the general public was allowed to be on the floor of the house and senate chambers during sessions. They were more or less restricted to remaining outside the bar, but a great deal of leeway was allowed in enforcing this rule. Now the general public is not allowed on the floor and the doors of the house and senate chambers remain locked for the half hour before and after sessions. This takes the emphasis off personal contact with legislators and places it on appearances before legislative committees, letter writing, etc. Years ago, night sessions were held almost every night. During the last two sessions almost no night sessions were held. This means that the legislators disperse right after adjournment. Some of them commute long distances and are away from Salem when not actually in session or committee meetings. We can no longer depend on personal contacts to present our views.

Legislative sessions are much longer now, running upward of 100 days which keeps the legislative committee in Salem for a much longer period of time.

18. TRANSPORTATION

The importance of transportation to all Oregonians needs emphasis and reemphasis. All forms of transportation are important to our entire economy. Most of what we use is shipped into our State. Most of what we produce is shipped out. Freight and cargo rates have a direct bearing on how much business Oregon does and how lucrative that business is.

We must continue to encourage the development of all forms of transportation as competing entities. If one form of transportation is permitted to dominate and control all forms of transportation, competition will no longer be effective and freight rates will spiral upward. I, therefore, recommend that we continue our opposition to the present efforts of the railroad companies to broaden their franchises to permit them to enter into all forms of transportation. With their huge invested wealth, given to them out of the public domain during the era of railroad expansion into the West, they could soon dominate the entire transportation industry in this country. Killing off competition within a single type of transportation is harmful enough, but to kill off competition in the entire transportation industry would be folly indeed.

Water transportation on the Columbia and Willamette Rivers continues to expand, with oceangoing vessels expected to reach as far inland as Pasco, Wash., with the completion of the locks at John Day Dam. I recommend that the State grange continue every effort to hasten the development of water transportation in Oregon.

19. YOUTH CONSERVATION

The Youth Conservation Corps bill, which the State grange is on record as supporting, is now before the House, having passed the Senate. This bill is of extreme importance to Oregon as much of the development of picnic and camping sites that would take place if this bill becomes law would be in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. This means that Oregon, in addition to the interest we share with the rest of the Nation in this program as a wise effort that is already proven to be effective in preventing juvenile delinquency and developing strong and healthy young men, also has this additional motive.

In recent years, many large companies, such as utilities and lumber companies that own or control large areas of land have adopted the practice of developing picnic and recreational sites for the use of the public. This is a most valuable public relations program for these companies and is of inestimable value to the general public in terms of recreation.

This kind of program is not too great a burden to power companies, with their assured income, but many lumber companies, even though desirous of developing such picnic and recreational sites in the public interest, find the burden too great. If this Youth Conservation Corps were established, many of these sites could be developed under this program.

20. CONCLUSION

In making those recommendations, I am aware that, because of the limits of time, I have had to omit many subjects that I would like to have mentioned. Many of these will come before you in resolutions from subordinate and Pomona granges and I know they will receive very careful consideration.

I am glad to report that we have many more resolutions than usual for the consideration of the delegates during this session. This bespeaks increasing interest in grange affairs throughout our State. It is most gratifying, even though it makes a heavier burden on the delegates. I have every confidence that this group of delegates is equal to the task and will, as have so many bodies of State grange delegates in the past, bring out of all these proposals a wise program that will be in the bests interests of the people of the State of Oregon.

I am sure that all of us will enjoy this session in Roseburg and that when we have finished our work here, we will be proud of it.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Farmers Union Herald of June 20 contained an editorial entitled "Federal Voice for Cities Is Urged." This thoughtful editorial comments upon the proposal advanced by the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, Senator CLARK, when he introduced legislation to create a Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs with full cabinet status.

Mr. President, the problems of the metropolitan areas are ones which will be brought increasingly to our attention in the years ahead. During both this session of the Congress and the preceding one my attention has been focused upon just one such instance. I refer to the testimony brought before the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Area Problems. The deliberations of our committee have resulted in legislation which has passed this body and its counterpart. The general problem, of which the Washington Metropolitan area is but one specific instance, however, remains for the most part unmet although, in my judgment, legislation which could result from the work of the very able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] constitutes a very important step forward in bringing us to grips with the difficulties we must face in the near future.

I wish to commend both of my colleagues and those others who worked with them for the effort they have expended in this increasingly vital aspect of our domestic concern.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

FEDERAL VOICE FOR CITIES IS URGED

Among the vast and portentous developments that have changed the face of the American continent in the last century none is more important than the phenomenal growth of the cities.

A hundred years ago this was primarily a country of farms and small towns, of rural acres and villages. Today 6 out of 10 Americans—over 100 million persons—live in metropolitan areas.

Every study being made, every survey and projection, shows a continuation and even acceleration of this trend. Suburbs sprawl far into the countryside. In many places the suburbs of one city melt into the suburbs of another urban area. Along the east coast almost the entire area between Boston and Washington is urbanized.

This great shift in population with its change in our manner of living has not come about without marked deterioration in the operation of Government and public services. Planning has lagged far behind growth.

As cities have spread across county and State lines, the structure of governmental units has often become obsolete. A welter of special authorities and commissions have been created to fill the gap, but these are usually inadequate stopgap devices.

Not only is the organizational structure of Government outdated in many places, but what is equally important, the taxing mechanism of most communities is completely inadequate to the task. The property tax—a relatively fair tax a hundred years ago but now one riddled with inequities—is still the basic source of revenue of most communities.

Many communities have about reached the limits of their tax resources. State and local debt has risen 309 percent since 1946. During this same period Federal debt increased by only 5 percent.

The obsolete boundaries, the antiquated governmental structures and dated tax systems of cities and communities have resulted in a terrible lag in every manner of public facility and service.

Urban blight, spreading slums, and inadequate housing are a part of every city scene. As far back as 1956 the Census Bureau reported that 13 million urban housing units were substandard, and the situation has continued to deteriorate since that time. Half of the 13 million units were not considered fit for rehabilitation. The Rockefeller Bros. Fund puts the need for urban renewal at $3 billion annually, seven times what is currently being spent.

The transportation crisis faced by almost every major city is also growing in severity. Mass transportation and commuter train services have been allowed to wither away. Meanwhile, expensive highway systems are being built which often do no more than contribute to traffic congestion.

Water shortages as well as sewage and pollution problems plague hundreds of cities. Urban schools are badly overcrowded—schools are run in two and even three shifts in many places. Hospitals and health facilities are so jampacked they cannot begin to meet the need.

One proposal that has been made to give the problems of cities greater hope of solution comes from Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat of Pennsylvania, himself a former mayor of Philadelphia. CLARK has introduced legislation to create a Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs with full Cabinet status.

In a searching speech made recently at George Washington University, CLARK asked that the cities of America be given a voice in the councils of the Federal Government equal to their importance. CLARK said:

"We have a Department of Agriculture, with a budget of $6 billion. We have a Department of the Interior concerned with millions of acres of empty land. But we have no department of the Government concerned with the problems of the metropolitan areas where most of our people live and where the need for expansion of public services is so heavily concentrated."

CLARK also called for "new concepts of federalism in line with the realities of modern life" and the deliberate expansion of Federal aid.

CLARK wants the Federal Government to be given a larger role in the payment of Government services because its taxes are fairer than State and city taxes.

CLARK points out that: "The tax issue is at heart a class issue." Federal taxes fall more heavily on corporations and high income individuals while State and local taxes tend to put a far larger burden on low income families. Those who oppose Federal action usually do so knowing that Federal aid redistributes the wealth downward.

The Federal tax system is also fairer because it is equally applied everywhere and no one can run away from it. Corporations cannot dodge it by going to States or communities which offer a favorable "tax climate."

The vast growth of metropolitan areas has brought with it a need for some fundamental rethinking of the relationships between our cities, States, and the Federal Government. Proposals to modernize these relationships will have to be given more attention if the vitality of the Federal system is to be preserved.

HERMISTON, OREG., SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE OFFICE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I bring to the attention of the Senate the honor accorded the staff of the Hermiston, Oreg., Soil Conservation Service office. The office has been given a superior service award for its outstanding work record of assistance to the farm families of the area cooperating with the Soil Conservation Service program.

The June 5 issue of the Oregon Grange Bulletin carried a complete description of the fine work being done by these career service employees.

It is important, in my judgment, that achievements such as this be given widespread recognition in view of the criticisms leveled at those of us who believe that the classified service employees deserved a modest pay increase which the Congress has recently enacted over administration opposition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

HERMISTON SCS UNIT TO RECEIVE TOP AGRICULTURE AWARD

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has notified Thomas P. Helseth, Soil Conservation Service Oregon State conservationist, that the agency's Hermiston work unit office is to receive a superior service award in recognition of outstanding assistance given cooperators of the West Umatilla and Boardman soil conservation districts in Umatilla County.

In its announcement, the Department said the Hermiston staff is one of two offices in the United States to be honored this year among field units working with some 2,800 districts.

Hermiston SCS technicians to be honored include the present staff technicians Louis A. Parton, soil conservationist; Robert F. Gobel, engineering aid, and Edward E. Weber, soil conservation aid, all of Hermiston.

Former Hermiston staff members now assigned to other districts will also be cited for their part in the development of the West Umatilla and Boardman districts. They include Robert E. Swanson, soil conservationist, Eagle Valley, Idaho; Charles R. Buzzard, soil scientist, Grants Pass, Oreg.; Robert Morland, civil engineer, Portland; and Donald S. Leach, soil conservationist, Clatskanie, Oreg.

Assistance given by the SCS technicians helped the districts' cooperators solve such major problems as wind erosion, drainage and restoration of alkali lands, improvement of irrigation systems and seeking and management of irrigated pastures.

Some 490 farmers and ranchers now are cooperating in the program of the districts, 375 of which are following complete farm plans. One hundred more farmers have plans underway.

Soil conservation work carried out on 450 of these farms in the West Umatilla and Boardman districts since 1946 has resulted in a $1,400,000 basic increase in income for the landowners.

At the time the districts were formed there were few irrigated pastures. Today, under conservation planning, there are around 4,000 acres of improved pastures, which have brought an increase in milk and beef production valued at $300,000.

Irrigation water problems, the need for improved distribution systems and methods of water application were other problems faced by the new districts.

Irrigation demonstrations, and "show-me" tour to well-run irrigated farmlands were some of the techniques used to improve operating methods.

A total of 11,350 acres have been leveled for better surface irrigation, 3,500 acres put under sprinkler systems and improved water application work has been carried out on 16,000 acres.

Improved irrigation methods stepped up the amount of land under irrigation by 15 percent and boosted the annual farm income of district cooperators $750,000.

Drainage of wet lands and treatment of alkali-ridden areas paid off in the reclamation of more than 3,500 acres and an increase in crop production of $100,000 on 95 farms.

Wind erosion, long a major land problem on unprotected grainlands, was solved by laying out crosswind stripcropping, grass seedlings, and establishing a protective cover on soils.

In carrying out wind erosion and soil saving practices, cooperators completed 12,000 acres of wind stripcropping, used crop residues on 22,000 acres and retired 3,100 acres under the Federal soil bank program.

These good land use practices have brought increased production to 175 operators of dryland wheat and irrigation crop enterprises valued at $250,000.

In addition to the assistance given the districts by Hermiston SCS technicians in farm and ranch planning activities, farmers received help from the Oregon Extension Service and State experiment stations, irrigation districts, chambers of commerce, service clubs, schools, 4-H Clubs.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to extend my personal congratulations again to all those receiving this deserved honor.

PLYWOOD PRODUCTION AND MILL PRICES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Plywood Men Face New Price Famine," published in the New York Times of Sunday, August 7, 1960.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 7, 1960]

PLYWOOD MEN FACE NEW PRICE FAMINE

(By John J. Abele)

The Douglas-fir plywood industry again is confronted with a price famine in the midst of production plenty.

Prices for quarter-inch sanded panels declined last week to $60 a thousand square feet, the lowest level since just after World War II. A downward trend has prevailed for most of the last year. The price last summer was $76. Earlier in 1959 it was $85, a 3-year high.

The latest decline occurred despite a fairly good level of business although homebuilding, a major market, has not been as strong as expected earlier.

The basic reason behind the price slide was that new productive capacity has been increasing at a faster rate than sales, which have been climbing substantially. Prices declined as supply outpaced demand. Production was 7 percent ahead of new orders in the first half of 1960.

Price problems such as this have been a recurring growing pain of the plywood industry, one of the major growth industries of the postwar economy. Production last year amounted to a record of 7,700 million square feet, four times the level of 10 years earlier. Output this year is expected to reach a new peak of 8,500 million square feet, according to a recent statement by C. Henry Bacon, president of the Douglas Fir Plywood Association.

Demand generally has been rising along with production, spurred on in large measure by the aggressive merchandising program of the association, which this year will spend $5,500,000 for promotion purposes. Plywood is used widely in the construction of industrial plants, public buildings, roads, bridges, and stores as well as in home construction. Growth in nonhousing fields is demonstrated by the fact that production has soared in recent years despite a fairly stable level of new housing starts.

POINT OF NO RETURN

The prevailing price before the recent decline was $64 a thousand square feet, a level that many manufacturers consider to be the point of no profitable return. The Evans Products Co., for example, announced that it would close down four plants in Oregon rather than meet the new price.

Other producers were considering production cutbacks as a means of getting supply back in balance with demand. MacMillan, Bloedel and Powell River, Ltd., said it would curtail production at two plants in British Columbia. It said the reduction was "unavoidable" because of reduced demand. Other leading manufacturers, however, said they planned to continue present operations.

Representatives of some large producers interviewed last week were inclined to believe that the present price weakness would probably continue for the rest of the year. Others felt that production cutbacks would "dry up" some of the oversupply and bring some improvement in prices before then. They also expressed hope that a pickup in homebuilding and the general economy would improve market conditions.

BIG PRODUCERS FAVORED

With many producers complaining that they can't make money at present price levels, the question arises as to why production continues. There are several reasons, most which favor the larger producers whose operations are integrated from timberlands to marketing outlets.

Manufacturers who have their own timber supplies usually can make profits on the conversion of the timber into finished supplies. This is not so for producers who have to buy logs on the open market at fairly high and stable price levels. They get caught in a squeeze between high raw material costs and low prices for finished products.

Improvements in operating efficiency—most noticeable in the newer large mills—also are helping some manufacturers to reduce their production costs and thus be in a position to accept lower prices for their products. Greater utilization of the wood from each log and the use of lower grade species also are contributing to lower operating costs.

Still another advantage accrues to plywood companies that buy a large part of their requirements from other manufacturers. They pay present market prices for this production and so are not hurt when prices go down. A prime example of this kind of operation is the United States Plywood Corp., the largest in the business, which manufacturers only one-third of its requirements and buys the other two-thirds from outside suppliers.

Diversification into the production of related products also has softened the blow of lower prices for some large producers. Fir plywood accounts for 35 to 40 percent of the business of United States Plywood and the Georgia-Pacific Corp., another leading producer. The rest is in hardwood plywood, plywood specialties, particle board, lumber, paper, or other products.

The International Paper Co., and the Weyerhaeuser Co., are other large plywood producers but plywood is almost a sideline in view of their much larger interest in such fields as lumber, paper, and packaging.

The effect of diversifiation was demonstrated in the recent semiannual report of Georgia-Pacific. Despite lower prices of plywood, the company posted record sales and earnings for the period.

EMPLOYMENT OF CERTAIN RETIRED PERSONNEL BY FEDERAL AND DISTRICT GOVERNMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, out of order, I send to the desk a bill for introduction, with the request that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

I introduce this bill which I hope will effect a fuller use of mature and experienced professional manpower, here in the District of Columbia, without costing the city any money. The plan would, also, I hope, be of help to the

Federal Government. The bill is a simple one. It provides that any person who is retired from the Federal Government service, may, if he has all the qualifications required by the Board of Education, of Washington, D.C., be appointed to teach in Washington's public schools, and draw his Federal retirement pay, as well. The bill further provides as a complementary provision, that any professional employee of the Board of Education may on his retirement, accept a position in the Federal Government, and continue to draw his earned retirement pay. Such a plan is both practical and just.

At present, any teacher who is retired under the laws of any State in the Union may accept a position in the Federal Government, for which he may be qualified, and any person, retired under the Federal employees' retirement law, may accept a position in any school system in the United States, for which he may be qualified, except in the District of Columbia.

Some years ago we passed a bill making retired teachers eligible for service as substitutes in the schools of Washington, without having such appointment, in any way impair their pension. The proposal in this bill simply extends the principle of the earlier bill, now a law.

A number of qualified Federal workers are interested in doing a few years teaching, after having had a period of service in the Federal Government and similarly a number of teachers are interested in rounding out their careers with a few years in Government service.

The bill involves no additional costs to either the Federal Government or the Washington public schools, and is so far as I have heard not controversial. As it would be of some help in recruiting much-needed professional manpower, and as no additional cost is involved, I hope we may give early favorable consideration to it.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3832) to authorize the employment of retired personnel of the Federal Government by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and to authorize the employment of retired personnel of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, by the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, 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 any former employee of the Federal Government who has been retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall, if otherwise qualified under the rules of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, be eligible for appointment to the position for which he may be qualified under the rules of the Board, and shall draw the pay or compensation authorized for the position to which he may be appointed, in addition to the pension he is authorized to receive under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

SEC. 2. Any former employee of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia who shall have been retired under the Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia, approved April 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 875), as amended, shall, if otherwise qualified under the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission, be eligible for appointment to the position for which he may be qualified under the rules of the said Civil Service Commission, and shall draw the pay or compensation authorized for the position to which he may be appointed, in addition to the pension he is authorized to receive under the Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia, as amended.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to ask the majority leader about the schedule next week, particularly with respect to hearings. The Committee on Foreign Relations had considered scheduling some hearings. Will the leadership be disposed to allow us to meet while the Senate is in session?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First, I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that I am proud to be a member of the party which has produced the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think the work he did today was outstanding. His work is always of a very high character.

When the Senate reconvened for this session, I understood the Senator's committee had some important business which would require hearings to be held during the sessions of the Senate, and I obtained consent for the Committee on Foreign Relations to hold hearings during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this session.

I pay tribute to the Senator for his efforts and for the manner in which he has conducted the public business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the majority leader to say that there would be no further yea-and-nay votes tonight?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

MARY ELIZABETH HOBACK, MISS WEST VIRGINIA, IS A WORTHY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE STATE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this past Saturday the finals for the Miss West Virginia contest were held in Clarksburg, in our Mountain State. It was my privilege to be present during a part of the program of that 3-day event.

Miss Mary Elizabeth Hoback, of Bluefield, was chosen from a group of 15 West Virginia girls possessed of poise, personality, delightful demeanor, demonstrated talent, and, of course, unquestioned beauty.

The Clarksburg Junior Chamber of Commerce was the sponsor of this statewide pageant, with the cooperation of the jaycees in the West Virginia organization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the Associated Press article which tells of Miss Hoback, her background, and her hopes for the future. This attractive young woman says that she is proud to be a Mountaineer and that she is deeply interested, with other West Virginians, in our efforts to build a better State.

It is for that particular reason that I have given this statement, and submit the news story for printing in the RECORD. I also express genuine tribute to Miss Hoback and to the other young women of West Virginia who are a very important segment of the population of our State.

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

[From the Parkersburg News, Aug. 9, 1960]

"I'M A MOUNTAINEER," SAYS MARY HOBACK—MISS WEST VIRGINIA PROUD OF HOME STATE

BLUEFIELD.—Scenic Miss West Virginia is a gal who wants to stay in West Virginia, and a performer who writes her own copy.

Dark-haired Mary Elizabeth "Beth" Hoback will go to Atlantic City in September with the avowed purpose of representing "her" State.

Said she, "I'm a Mountaineer."

Referring to the State's not overly optimistic publicity of late, she said, "I'm not ashamed of West Virginia. If we don't stick with it (the State), we can't build it up."

Reducing her logic to bicycling, one of her favorite pastimes, she quipped, "Down in North Carolina (where she is in college) you ride a bike for miles on the flatlands. But in West Virginia you pump and push up the hills, and coast down the other side. I like to coast down those mountains."

The 18-year-old sophomore at Flora MacDonald College in Red Springs, N.C., relied on a dramatic reading to win the talent division of the State contest at Clarksburg last week.

To win the bathing suit competition she relied on a sincere smile and her first appearance in a new white bathing suit (36-24-36).

In the Atlantic City competition, she said, the dramatic reading will be changed from "The Crucifixion," which she read at Clarksburg, to "The Mysterious Forest," a composition she wrote as a senior in high school.

A fan of Henry David Thoreau, Beth classes him as an "early day beatnik."

"I think people should be different. To be different all you have to do is be yourself. There's no one else like you."

A college degree is first on her list of objectives. She plans to study physical therapy, but as yet isn't sure where she will study.

"I would like to go to school in West Virginia. There's a good school of physical therapy at the new medical center at West Virginia University."

She studied her first year in North Carolina under a full scholarship from her Presbyterian Church; a grant from the college, and a working scholarship, under which she earned while attending classes.

"I don't think my parents could afford to send me otherwise."

Along with physical therapy, Beth plans to study dramatics for a possible stint in television or the theater, but "I'm not certain."

Currently, she does commercials for a live Saturday morning television show (WHIS-TV, Bluefield), and some modeling.

College, however, may have to temporarily take a back seat. Miss Hoback says she

probably will not be in school this fall, because of a whirlwind tour of personal appearances after the pageant.

Marriage fits a vague category somewhere after college, but there's nothing in the foreseeable future, she claims. "I'm dating several boys that I like."

Miss Hoback, who will be 19 December 18, is "against going steady, until I'm ready to get married—there is one boy, though." That one boy though is West Point Cadet Banks Hudson, 20, whom she met in June of this year.

West Virginia's Miss America package stands 5 feet 4 inches, and weighs at present 117 pounds.

The Miss America Pageant will be Beth's fifth contest. So far she has never lost. Last year's titles included Miss East River Swimming Pool; Miss Claytor Lake; and Miss Bluefield. The fourth was the West Virginia crown.

"Atlantic City will be different. There are so many things I don't know about. There will be awfully strong competition but I will try hard."

Beth is a daughter of Mrs. Helen Neal, of Bluefield, and Robert Hoback, of Philadelphia. She has a 13-year-old sister, Sharon; and a 2-year-old brother, Marty. She named him after a current boy friend.

Her schedule calls for her first airplane flight, to Clarksburg Tuesday afternoon for pictures and choosing part of her wardrobe; back to Bluefield Friday, and on to New York City later, to choose an evening gown.

Locally, the big celebration is tentatively set for August 19, during the West Virginia-Virginia all-star football game at Bluefield.

The junior chamber of commerce which sponsored her entry, is planning an official welcome, in the presence of some 8,000 persons expected for the football game. Other personal appearances are in the planning stage.

MIGRANT SCHOOL PROGRAM GROWS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor visited California last month, bringing to eight the number of States in which the subcommittee has conducted field trips or hearings. In California, as in the other States, we were impressed with the difficulties faced by all those concerned with the education of the children of migrant farm laborers.

We found new evidence of the need for well planned Federal help to those educators who so often have only a few busy weeks to work with the migrant youngsters. We received much testimony indicating that local officials favor the kind of approach offered in bills I have introduced to improve the educational opportunities not only for the children but for the migrant adults too.

The visit also indicated, I believe, the need for comparison of educational opportunities among States. One provision of the bills I introduced would do just that—it would encourage pooling of data about educational programs and methods in the many States that now have programs.

There is much to learn, I believe, from the programs now under way. In the Newark (N.J.) Evening News of July 18, 1960, for instance, Reporter Dawes Thompson, gives a vivid description of summer school effort under way in New Jersey this year. As he points out, New Jersey officials admit that there is much more to be done, but they are probably doing more than in many other States. Mr. President, the article gives information that may be of much help in other States visited by the migrant workers. I ask unanimous consent that the Evening News article be included in the RECORD.

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

MIGRANT SCHOOL PROGRAM GROWS—NEW JERSEY LEADS STATES IN HELPING CHILDREN OF FARM LABORERS

(By Dawes Thompson)

TRENTON.—When New Jersey's summer school program for children of migrant farm labor families went into full swing this morning, twice as many enthusiastic youngsters as ever before passed through the classroom doors.

A program of giving a semblance of education, though only for 6 weeks, to 300 children of southern farmworkers in 15 classrooms may not seem herculean, even though it served only half that number a year ago. Yet New Jersey's Migrant Labor Board boasts that no other State matches its efforts.

This is the program's 14th year of operation and since its inception it has enjoyed the enlightened leadership of a man who is the product of the big management side of New Jersey agriculture. He is John W. Seabrook of Bridgeton, migrant labor board chairman.

FOUR SCHOOLS

The four schools, in Cranbury, Freehold and Fairton in Cumberland County and Woodstown in Salem, have no hope of producing Rhodes scholars from the ever-traveling group of 6- to 12-year-olds. In fact, few will ever get to high school. Lacking even vocational training, the chances are the children will follow in the footsteps of their 80-cent-an-hour, crop-picking parents.

The youngsters' education is handicapped not only by constant movement—following the planting and harvesting of crops annually between Florida, where they get only brief winter schooling, and New Jersey. They suffer also from lack of enforcement of compulsory education and antichild labor laws in States to the South, according to migrant board officials.

All the State-hired teachers can do is to instill some familiarity with the three R's, the social graces and the living habits of a world never seen by the children, who are 80 percent Negro and 20 percent Puerto Rican.

Yet Labor and Industry Commissioner Raymond F. Male and his special assistant on migrant education, Simeon A. Moss, a former Princeton public schoolteacher, say the annual 6-week courses produce results as gratifying as the enthusiasm and high attendance rate.

LOCAL DISINTEREST

There are plenty of problems. For instance, the introduction of the program in Woodstown this year is faced with a Spanish-speaking enrollment of more than half. But the Puerto Rican Migration Service, an island government agency, is lending a hand.

Local boards of education in problem areas, aside from the four locations, generally are not interested in the program. The West Windsor School Board in Mercer County recently refused to rent the migrant board badly needed classroom space.

The board's staff has found the Monmouth-Middlesex-Mercer area, as a rule, less willing to help than are southern counties like Cumberland and Salem. Single classrooms, at least, are needed for still neglected children in the West Windsor, Upper Burlington, and Hammonton-Vineland areas.

Buses had to be provided to carry the children on rides of up to 45 minutes each way and free lunches must be prepared. Increased weight and improved health during the courses suggest that the lunches probably are the best meals the children get.

In addition to the $25,000 being spent this year on the four summer schools, compared to $12,000 in 1959, the State's preventable diseases division has enlarged programs for migrant children and adults on polio, dental trouble, tuberculosis, and venereal disease.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to pay a modest tribute to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I think he richly deserves it. I have not always agreed with him, but I must say in his behalf that when he brings to this floor a treaty or a bill from his committee, he knows what is in it, and he is always prepared to meet every argument and to defend the position which he and the majority of his committee take.

I think he did a superb job in connection with the Antarctic Treaty, in disclosing its purposes and functions and the ground it covers and the commitments it makes. So I salute him for a job well done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the kind words of the minority leader. They touch me very deeply. I wish to express my great appreciation for the assistance the minority leader, particularly, has given in connection with this very difficult matter.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3758) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today we begin debate upon the minimum wage bill known as the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1960.

The bill has two major purposes. First, it will raise the minimum wage now received by 2½ million workers from $1.00 to $1.25 an hour. Second, it will extend the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act to 5 million additional employees, chiefly in large-scale interstate retail and service industries, thereby guaranteeing these employees a fair minimum wage and a just premium for overtime.

Conscience and good business sense join in demanding the enactment of this measure. The bill will extend to the lowest paid workers in the country—to 3½ million men and women and their families—a fairer opportunity to share our high standard of living. To pass them by—to water down the help they need—or merely assume that prosperity at the top will someday reach them—shocks the conscience of those who care.

The increases in purchasing power resulting from a higher minimum wage will help to restore consumer demand required to put our idle industrial capacity back to work; and, what is equally important, it will serve as a source of protection to employers who pay a decent wage and who must compete with employers who pay a substandard wage. The elimination of unfair competition based upon substandard wages will protect fair-minded employers anxious to maintain fair labor standards.

The pending bill is the result of long and careful study. It originally came from our Labor and Public Welfare Committee last summer. The Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held hearings on 10 days, in which it heard 77 witnesses. The relevant bills were reviewed in executive sessions in the course of which all members of the subcommittee, on both sides, made helpful contributions. The committee bill embodies a wide consensus of opinion among Senators from both sides of the aisle. The minority views are signed by only three Senators.

The full extent of the changes to be made in the present law is summarized in a memorandum which I ask unanimous consent to have printed after my remarks in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, at this point I desire to speak only of the principal provisions.

MINIMUM WAGE

The bill raises the minimum wage applicable to employees now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act in three stages: To $1.15 an hour, effective January 1, 1961; to $1.20 an hour, on January 1, 1962; and, on January 1, 1963, to $1.25 an hour.

In one sense, this is not new legislation. The Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted in 1938 in order "to protect this Nation from the evils and dangers resulting from wages too low to buy the bare necessities of life and from long hours of work injurious to health." When the original 40-cent minimum became inadequate Congress raised it to 75 cents and later to $1 an hour. Now economic progress again requires a higher wage if we are to carry out the central purpose. An increase from $1 to $1.25 an hour is necessary to put those wage earners who earn the minimum in the same position, relative to other segments of the economy, that they occupied after the 1955 amendment. Thus the present bill merely extends to lower paid workers the gains already achieved by more fortunate groups through increased productivity and collective bargaining.

Just a few figures make the point clear. In 1955, when the present $1 minimum was established, the average hourly earnings of employees in manufacturing industries were $1.88. By March 1960, average hourly earnings had increased 41 cents, or 22 percent. To maintain the same cents per hour differential, the statutory minimum would have to be raised to $1.41. To maintain even the same relative position, it would have to go immediately to $1.22 an hour instead of the $1.15 recommended by the committee. A small part of the change in average hourly earnings is probably the result of shifts into higher paid types of employment; but the comparison demonstrates beyond doubt that failure to enact the increases recommended by the committee would remit 2½ million wage earners to a declining status.

The need for action is the more acute because of the sharp increase in the number of employees dependent for a fair wage upon congressional action. In 1955 roughly half a million workers covered by the act were receiving either the statutory minimum wage or an hourly rate no more than 5 cents higher. The latest figures available show that 1⅓ million workers covered by the act are receiving either the statutory minimum or a rate no more than 5 cents higher. This is 2½ times the earlier figure.

Consider the meaning of this trend to the workers affected. Since 1955, there has been a 15-percent rise in productivity. They shared none of this gain. There has also been a 10-percent rise in the cost of living. The workers dependent upon the minimum wage have therefore suffered a 10-percent decline in real earnings—in their ability to provide food, clothes, homes, and health for their families.

Let me be still more precise. There are 35,000 workers in the apparel industry in New York City alone who depend upon the Fair Labor Standards Act for a fair minimum wage. The New York City Department of Welfare regards $74 a week as the minimum budget for health and safety for a family of four—a man and wife and two children. Working the standard 40 hours, a man would earn only $40 a week at the present minimum—$34 short of the pay check needed. Even the proposed minimum of $1.25 would leave his earnings $24 short of the sum required to support his family. In some families more than one person is employed; but even if the man and wife both worked full time every week, the present statutory minimum would hardly cover the budget; expenses rise when both adults are working.

The proposed increases will not injure business firms. They are not inflationary. They will not cause significant unemployment. If the dangers fancied by the minority were real, I would join them in opposing the measure. The welfare of the business community is essential to a prosperous economy. To drive firms out of business or to force them to curtail operations would defeat our very purpose. But the same arguments were presented against minimum wage legislation in 1938, 1949, and 1955. History disproved them. On each of these three occasions increases far sharper than those we propose today were put into effect without injury to employers, inflation or unemployment. The fancied dangers were never realized.

The experience after the 1955 amendments is the most instructive because their impact is traced in a careful study prepared by the U.S. Department of Labor. The Department found that the increase from 75 cents to $1.00 an hour did not substantially affect any of the standard statistical series measuring trends in hours of work, employment, or consumer prices. The impact was too small to be discernible in relation to overall economic activity.

More detailed study of 15 low-wage industries showed that employment rose in some industries after the $1 minimum was put into effect and declined in others. Evidently the change in the minimum wage was not a determinative factor. In order to obtain a still broader view, the study was extended in six communities so as to include both covered and noncovered industries. During the 2 months following the statutory increase employment in the covered industries rose in one, fell in two, and was virtually unchanged in the others. These changes in employment can hardly be attributed to the statutory increase but it is interesting to note that 3 years after the statutory increase employment in the same communities had risen 20 percent in the industries subject to the act and only 14 percent in those outside the statute.

In short, the Labor Department's study fully supports the conclusion that the 1955 minimum wage increase did not result in any substantial changes for the Nation in either price levels or employment.

The increases now proposed can have no greater impact. In 1955 the increase was 25 cents an hour, or an average of 15 cents for each employee directly affected. In 1960 the increase will be only 15 cents, or an average of 9 cents for each employee directly affected. Put another way, the 1955 increase raised the statutory minimum 33⅓ percent, whereas the 1960 increase will be only 15 percent. The increase in the total wage bill will also be markedly smaller. Since the 1955 increase was readily absorbed by the economy, we are bound to conclude that it can now absorb the smaller 1960 increase. The 5-cent-an-hour increases in 1960 and 1961 are no larger than might be expected in collective bargaining.

The exaggerated fear of adversely affecting costs, prices, and employment apparently results from the fallacious assumption that an increase in the statutory minimum requires corresponding wage increases all up and down the line. Secretary Mitchell disposed of this argument in his testimony before the House Labor Committee.

> As to the allegation that there is an upward, forward movement immediately corresponding to the wage increase, that experience has shown that this does not happen.

Any increase in the minimum would undoubtedly require some adjustment of the wages of other employees of the same business even though they earn more than the statutory minimum, but the increases would taper off rather quickly. As I pointed out earlier, since 1955 average hourly earnings have increased much faster than the statutory minimum. Generally speaking, wages at

the bottom of the scale can be brought up to their old relationship without unduly narrowing differentials.

It would be naive to deny that there will be no dislocations. In a few instances there may be an undesirable compression of the wage structure. But, fairly read, both history and the available studies show that the increases can be absorbed without damage to business, inflationary price increases, or unemployment.

NEW COVERAGE

The committee bill would extend to 5 million additional wage earners the guarantees of a fair minimum wage and a reasonable premium for overtime employment.

The major expansion of coverage brings under the act retail and service establishments whose annual gross sales exceed $1 million. Establishments grossing less than $1 million a year will not be affected. They will also continue to benefit from the present section 13(a)(2) exemption. I emphasize the point, because there has been widespread misunderstanding. The bill does not touch ordinary inns, hotels, restaurants, or motels in any part of the country. For example, a motel owner who charged $15 a unit and maintained 180 units which he rented every night of the year would be too small for the bill to affect him.

Likewise, the bill does not apply to the independent grocer or druggist, the country store, or even the independent department stores and supermarkets found in most American cities. Ninety-seven percent of all retail enterprises would not be affected.

We are concerned only with the large metropolitan department stores and vast chains which now dominate the retail industry. Their outlets spread through many States. The management is centralized. Prices are often uniform. Goods are purchased in large quantities from all over the Nation, often at prices which cannot be obtained by independent smaller merchants. Their operations depend upon the channels of interstate commerce. And where hotels and other service establishments are large enough to gross a million dollars, their conditions of employment also become matters of national import and concern.

It is grossly inaccurate to describe these million-dollar enterprises as local businesses which ought not to be regulated by the Federal Government. In 1938 the point was doubtful, but the constitutional power of Congress has now been established.

Many Federal statutes already apply to such large retail enterprises—the pure food and drug laws, the Wool Products Labeling Act, the Sherman Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act and the National Labor Relations Act. The NLRB conducts elections among the employees whom this bill would bring under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Their employers obtain Federal assistance against boycotts and picketing. Last year their trade associations were outspoken lobbyists for additional Federal restrictions upon the rights to strike and picket. At the present session some of them are actively sponsoring Federal legislation for resale price maintenance. Bringing under the Fair Labor Standards Act the employees of retail and service establishments grossing $1 million in annual sales conforms the law to otherwise uniform pattern of social legislation. There is no merit to the argument that the bill changes the balance between State and Federal authority.

The extension of coverage to retail and service establishments which gross $1 million annually will not even indirectly affect smaller businesses. Experience shows that a high-wage employer can move into a community with relatively little affect upon the wage scale of smaller local industries unless there is a shortage of qualified labor. Similarly, the wage scales of large metropolitan department stores and multiunit chains will exert no great influence upon smaller businesses.

I think it is vitally important that the Congress act upon this legislation in this session. We are talking about workers in the areas not now covered receiving $40 a week in January 1961.

I cannot believe that there is any employer in the country dealing in businesses of the size we are now discussing that cannot pay $40 a week. Some months ago the Bureau of Labor Statistics found it cost a single woman $51.50 to get by, even on a minimum standard, in an urban center of the United States.

We have been very careful in providing for the rise in amount to those who are going to be newly covered. It is a 3-year rise. There has been a steady increase in wages in this country every year, particularly in the manufacturing industries, for those that are widely organized who seek large-scale increases. Yet those who are unorganized, at the bottom of the ladder, who are unable to organize effectively, are the ones left behind. I point this out to any Senator who is concerned, in good faith, about the continuation of unemployment, because it is a problem which concerns us. We want to pay a decent wage. We do not want to pay wages so high that workers are thrown out of work.

In the newly covered area—and that is the area of controversy—we provide $1, and then a 3-year rise, before the figure of $1.25 is reached. By 1964, I believe those working in interstate activities, and getting $1.25 an hour, which is $50 a week, will find that amount is too low, because the cost of living is steadily rising.

The fiscal burden of an inadequate minimum wage law lies upon the community, and thus upon every taxpayer. In New York City, 44 percent of the families to whom relief is extended include those who are wage earners but whose incomes are inadequate. An economic burden also lies upon competitors whose ability to pay a just wage is frustrated by unfair, low-wage competition. But the burden which should concern us most lies upon the American conscience. We can no longer tolerate growing patches of poverty and injustice in America—substandard wages, unemployment, city slums, inadequate medical care, inferior education, and the sad plight of migratory workers. The enactment of this bill is only one step, but an essential step, forward, as we cross this frontier to grasp the high opportunities which face the Nation.

EXHIBIT 1

MEMORANDUM RE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1960

The bill (S. 3758) reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act has two major purposes. First, it will raise the minimum wage now received by 2½ million workers from $1.00 to $1.15 an hour—and 2 years later to $1.25 an hour. Second, it will extend the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act to 5 million additional employees, chiefly in large-scale interstate retail and service industries, thereby guaranteeing these employees a fair minimum wage and a just premium for overtime. Other minor changes are explained below.

The committee bill is the result of long and careful study. The Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held hearings on 10 days, in which it heard 77 witnesses. The relevant bills were then reviewed in executive sessions. The committee bill embodies a wide consensus of opinion among Senators from both sides of the aisle. The minority report is signed by only three Senators.

MINIMUM WAGE

The bill raises the minimum wage applicable to employees now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act in three stages: to $1.15 an hour, effective January 1, 1961, to $1.20 an hour on January 1, 1962, and on January 1, 1963, the minimum will become $1.25 an hour.

In one sense, this is not new legislation. The Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted in 1938 in order "to protect this Nation from the evils and dangers resulting from wages too low to buy the bare necessities of life and from long hours of work injurious to health." When the original 40-cent minimum became inadequate Congress raised it to 75 cents and later to $1 an hour. Now economic progress again requires a higher wage in order to carry out the central purpose. The increase from $1 to $1.25 an hour is necessary to put those wage earners who earn the minimum in the same position, relative to other segments of the economy, that they occupied after the 1955 amendment. Thus, the present bill merely extends to lower paid workers the gains already achieved by more fortunate groups through increased productivity and collective bargaining.

Just a few figures make the point clear. In 1955, when the present $1 minimum was established, the average hourly earnings of employees in manufacturing industries were $1.88. By March 1960, average hourly earnings had increased 41 cents, or 22 percent. To maintain the same cents-per-hour differential, the statutory minimum would have to be raised to $1.41. To maintain even the same relative position, it would have to go immediately to $1.22 an hour instead of the $1.15 recommended by the committee. A small part of the change in average hourly earnings is probably the result of shifts into higher paid types of employment but the comparison demonstrates beyond doubt that failure to enact the increases recommended by the committee would remit 2½ million wage earners to a declining status.

The need for action is the more acute because of the sharp increase in the number of employees dependent for a fair wage upon congressional action. In 1955 roughly half a million workers covered by the act were receiving either the statutory minimum wage or an hourly rate no more than 5 cents higher. The latest figures available show

that 1⅓ million workers covered by the act are receiving either the statutory minimum or a rate no more than 5 cents higher. This is two and one-half times the earlier figure.

The trend is highly damaging to the workers affected. Since 1955, there has been approximately a 15-percent rise in the productivity of labor. Workers receiving the minimum statutory wage shared none of this progress. There has also been a 10-percent rise in the cost of living. The workers dependent upon the minimum wage therefore suffer a 10-percent decline in real earnings—in their ability to provide food, clothes, homes and health for their families.

The point can be illustrated still more precisely. There are 35,000 apparel workers in New York City who depend upon the Fair Labor Standards Act for a fair minimum wage. The New York City Department of Welfare regards $74 a week as the minimum budget for health and safety for a family of four—a man and wife and two children. Working the standard 40 hours, a man would earn only $40 a week at the present minimum—$34 short of the pay check needed. Even the proposed minimum of $1.25 would leave his earnings $24 short of the sum required to support his family. In some families more than one person is employed; but even if the man and wife both worked full-time every week, the present statutory minimum would hardly cover the budget; expenses rise when both adults are working.

It may be argued that, despite the importance of raising the minimum, the businesses affected cannot afford to pay higher wages. The argument is important. The welfare of the business community is essential to a prosperous economy. To drive firms out of business or to force them to curtail operations would also defeat our very purpose by creating unemployment. Obviously, the money with which to pay the proposed $1.15, $1.20, and $1.25 minimums must come from employers in the first instance. The question is whether they can fairly be asked to absorb the increases—or can recover them through economies resulting from increases in managerial efficiency or worker productivity—or can pass them on to the community in price increases without causing inflation.

Here experience provides the answer. There is no need for speculation. The same arguments were presented against minimum wage legislation in 1938, 1949, and 1955. History disproved them. On these three occasions sharper increases than those proposed in the committee bill were put into effect without injury to employers, inflation or unemployment.

The 1955 amendments are the most instructive because they are the most recent and also because their impact is traced in a careful study prepared by the U.S. Department of Labor in 1957. The Department found that none of the standard statistical series regularly used to measure trends in hours, employment, or consumer prices was substantially affected by the increase from 75 cents to $1 an hour. Whatever impact the increase may have had was too small to be discernible in relation to overall economic activity.

More detailed study of 15 low-wage industries showed that employment rose in some industries after the $1 minimum was put into effect and declined in others. Apparently the change in the minimum wage was not a determinative factor.

In order to obtain a broader view, the study was extended in six communities to include both covered and noncovered industries. During the 2 months following the statutory increase employment in the covered industries rose in one, fell in two, and was virtually unchanged in the others. These changes in employment can hardly be attributed to the statutory increase but it is interesting to note that 3 years after the statutory increase employment in the same communities had risen 20 percent in the industries subject to the act and only 14 percent in those outside the statute.

In short, the Labor Department's study fully supports the conclusion that the 1955 minimum wage increase did not result in any substantial changes for the Nation in either price levels or employment.

The increases now proposed can have no greater impact. In 1955 the increase was 25 cents an hour, or an average of 15 cents for each employee directly affected. In 1960 the increase will be only 15 cents, or an average of 9 cents for each employee directly affected. Put another way, the 1955 increase raised the statutory minimum 33⅓ percent, whereas the 1960 increase will be only 15 percent. The increase in the total wage bill will also be markedly smaller. Since the 1955 increase was readily absorbed by the economy, we are bound to conclude that it can now absorb the smaller 1960 increase. The 5 cents an hour increases in 1960 and 1961 are no larger than might be expected in collective bargaining.

The exaggerated fear of adversely affecting costs, prices, and employment apparently results from the fallacious assumption that an increase in the statutory minimum requires corresponding wage increases all up and down the line. Secretary Mitchell disposed of this argument in his testimony before the House Labor Committee:

"As to the allegation that there is an upward, forward movement immediately corresponding to the wage increase, that experience has shown that this does not happen. * * * Even in the low-wage industries, workers paid $1 or more prior to March of 1956 did not receive increases proportional to those received by workers paid less than $1, so that I do not think it is true that an increase in the minimum wage is immediately reflected in an increase of the same kind in all other levels in our wage scales."

Any increase in the minimum would undoubtedly require some adjustment of the wages of other employees of the same business even though they earn more than the statutory minimum, but the increases would taper off rather quickly. As pointed out above, average hourly earnings have increased much faster since 1955 than the statutory minimum. This means that the wage structure was pulled out. Generally speaking, it can now be compressed again to the old relationships without distortion.

NEW COVERAGE

The second set of major amendments proposed by the committee bill would extend to 5 million additional wage-earners the guarantee of a fair minimum wage and place reasonable ceilings upon their hours of employment. The Fair Labor Standards Act now covers 23.7 million workers. The amendments would extend its coverage to the following groups: (1) 3½ million employees in interstate retail and service establishments whose annual sales exceed $1 million; (2) 1 million employees who are not presently covered although they work side-by-side with presently covered employees in establishments which affect interstate commerce; (3) 150,000 employees in laundries or dry-cleaning establishments whose annual sales exceed $1 million; (4) 107,000 employees of local transit companies; (5) 41,000 telephone switchboard operators; (6) 100,000 seamen; (7) 32,000 employees engaged in fish processing.

The committee recognized hardship might result if these industries were suddenly subjected to the full impact of the statutory minimum wage. The bill establishes a graduated scale applicable to all newly covered employees.

During first year after effective date, $1 an hour.

During second year after effective date, $1.05 an hour.

During third year after effective date, $1.15 an hour.

During fourth year and thereafter, $1.25 an hour.

Similarly the bill establishes a graduated scale of hours for employees newly covered.

During first year after effective date, no overtime requirement.

During second year after effective date, overtime after 44 hours.

During third year after effective date, overtime after 42 hours.

During fourth year and thereafter, overtime after 40 hours.

The major expansion of coverage lies in extending the act to retail and service establishments whose annual gross sales exceed $1 million. Establishments grossing less than $1 million will not be affected. They will continue to benefit from the present section 13(a)(2) exemption. The point is important because there has been widespread misunderstanding. The bill does not touch ordinary inns, hotels, restaurants or motels in any part of the country. For example, a motel owner who charged $15 a unit and maintained 180 units which he rented every night of the year would be too small for the bill to affect him.

Likewise, the bill does not apply to the independent grocer or druggist, the country store, or even the independent department stores and supermarkets found in most American cities. Ninety-seven percent of all retail enterprises would not be affected.

The bill affects only large metropolitan department stores and the vast chains which now dominate the retail industry. Their outlets spread through many States. The management is centralized. Prices are often uniform. Goods are purchased in large quantities from all over the Nation, often at prices which cannot be obtained by independent merchants. Their operations depend upon the channels of interstate commerce. And where hotels and other service establishments are large enough to gross a million dollars their conditions of employment also become matters of national import.

It is nonsense to describe these million dollar enterprises as local businesses which ought not to be regulated by the Federal Government. In 1938 the point was doubtful, but the constitutional power of Congress has now been established. Many Federal statutes already apply to such large retail enterprises—the Pure Food and Drug laws, the Wool Products Labeling Act, the Sherman Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act and the National Labor Relations Act. The NLRB conducts elections among the employees whom this bill would bring under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Their employers obtain Federal assistance against boycotts and picketing Last year their trade associations were outspoken lobbyists for additional Federal restrictions upon the rights to strike and picket. At the present session some of them are actively sponsoring Federal legislation for resale price maintenance. Thus, bringing under the Fair Labor Standards Act the employees of retail and service establishments grossing $1 million in annual sales conforms the law to the otherwise uniform pattern of social legislation. There is no merit to the argument that the bill changes the balance between State and Federal authority.

The extension of coverage to retail and service establishments which gross $1 million annually will not indirectly affect smaller businesses. Experience shows that a high wage employer can move into a community with relatively little effect upon the wage scale of smaller local industries unless

there is a shortage of qualified labor. Similarly, the wage scales of large metropolitan department stores and multi-unit chains will exert no great influence upon smaller businesses.

The other change in coverage will correct a historic accident. In 1937 and 1938, there was grave uncertainty concerning the constitutional power of the Congress to enact a minimum wage law. Various constitutional theories were suggested. The Senate bill followed one course; the House took another. The conference report based coverage on the work of the individual employee. Under the present law, therefore, a worker is covered only if he himself is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. The nature of the employer's business is irrelevant. Thus, there may be two employees, working side-by-side in the employ of the same employer, one of whom is protected by the statutory minimum wage and one who is not. For example, a wholesaler's order clerk who typed orders for goods purchased out of State would be entitled to the statutory minimum, but the billing clerk at the next desk who typed bills for customers inside the State would lack the same protection. The distinction is arbitrary and capricious.

The Fair Labor Standards Act is apparently the only statute under which coverage depends upon the work of the individual employee. The supposed constitutional justification no longer exists. Accordingly, the committee bill puts coverage upon an establishment basis, as under other labor legislation.

The change will greatly simplify enforcement of the statute. Employers and the officials of the Wage and Hour Division will be able to determine the status of all employees in an establishment without checking the individual work of every employee. The inequity between employees in the same establishment will be abolished.

The justification for applying the proposed new minimum wage to the newly covered employees is the same as the reasoning which supports the increase in the minimum. The employees have the same needs. Their wages have fallen behind average hourly earnings to the same, and possibly a greater, extent than the wages of employees earning the statutory minimum. They are equally entitled to share in economic progress.

The effect of other specific changes in coverage or exemptions is explained in the following paragraphs:

Laundries: Section 3(t)(2) of the bill will bring under the act employees in laundries and drycleaning enterprises with gross annual sales of $1 million or more, on the same wage and overtime scale as retail and service enterprises.

Of the total 448,000 workers in approximately 64,000 plants in the industry, the bill brings under the act an additional 150,000 workers employed in 1,800 plants in enterprises with $1 million or more in annual gross receipts. The remainder, 300,000 employees and 62,000 plants, about 97 percent of the total, will continue to be specifically exempt. Because cleaning plants are predominantly single unit, small plants, the bill will affect relatively few establishments in that industry.

This bill also adds a specific provision dealing with a situation where a presently exempt laundry or drycleaning establishment, with $250,000 or more in annual sales, competes substantially in the same metropolitan area with another laundry or drycleaning establishment which is not exempt under section 13(a)(3) of the act because it derives less than 50 percent of its annual receipts from sales made within the State, one of the requirements for exemption under that section. The amendment contained in a proviso added to section 13(a)(3) of the act, would treat both of these competing laundries or drycleaning establishments alike and neither would be exempt.

Local transit enterprises: The bill in section 3(t)(3) brings under the act any enterprise engaged in an activity affecting commerce which is "engaged in the business of operating a street, suburban, or interurban electric railway, or local trolley or motorbus carrier." Employees of such enterprises will be brought under the minimum wage provisions of the act on the same minimum wage scale as retail and service enterprises; but they will continue to be exempt from the overtime requirements.

Gasoline service stations: Section 3(t)(5) brings under the act any gasoline service station which has an annual gross volume of sales of $250,000 or more. It should be noted that with respect to gasoline service establishments, the test applies to each separate establishment. This would be true whether the establishment is part of a chain operation or whether it is independently owned.

Employees of a gasoline service establishment which has less than $250,000 in annual gross sales will continue to be exempt from the minimum wage and overtime requirements of the act under the provisions of the exemption in section 13(a)(2) of the act, even if it is part of an enterprise with more than $1 million in annual sales.

First processing, canning or packing fruits or vegetables: Employees employed in "the first processing of, or in canning or packing perishable or seasonal fresh fruits or vegetables, or in the first processing, within the area of production (as defined by the Secretary), of any agricultural or horticultural commodity during seasonal operations, or in handling, slaughtering, or dressing poultry or livestock" are now completely exempt from the overtime requirements of the act for a period of 14 workweeks in the aggregate in each calendar year by virtue of the exemption contained in section 7(c) and, in addition, they are exempt under section 7(b)(3) for another period of 14 workweeks in the aggregate during which overtime compensation is required only for work in excess of 12 hours a day or 56 hours a week.

The bill proposes to reduce somewhat these exemptions so as to provide a period of 10 weeks in the aggregate each year of complete exemption from overtime plus an additional period of 10 weeks in the aggregate each year during which overtime compensation will be required only for hours worked in excess of 12 in a day or 56 in a week.

The bill does not make any change in the other exemptions for agriculture and agricultural processing.

Seafood processing: The present law provides a complete exemption from both the minimum wage and overtime requirements for fishing operations and for the processing of seafood. Seafood canning, however, is now covered by the minimum wage under the existing law and has an exemption only from the overtime requirements.

The only change the bill makes in these exemptions is with respect to the processing of seafood. Employees engaged in such activities are brought under the minimum wage provisions on the same scale as newly covered employees in retail and service enterprises. They will continue to be exempt from the overtime requirements.

Telephone switchboard operators: The act in section 13(a)(11) now provides an exemption from both the minimum wage and overtime requirements for "any switchboard operator employed in a public telephone exchange which has not more than 750 stations."

The bill limits the exemption to "any switchboard operator employed by an independently owned public telephone exchange which has not more than 750 stations."

Seamen: The present act in section 13(a)(14) provides a complete exemption from both the minimum wage and overtime provisions for all seamen. The bill amends this exemption so as to cover for minimum wage requirements only those seamen who are employed on an American-flag vessel. They will continue to be exempt from overtime requirements.

The bill also contains a special provision which permits the calculation of wages for newly covered seamen to be made on the basis of a period longer than a workweek, such as an entire voyage. In calculating the hours worked by a seaman for the purpose of the act, only those hours need to be counted when the seaman is actually on duty.

Automobile salesmen: The bill adds a new section 13(b)(8) to the act exempting from the overtime requirements "any employee employed as an automobile salesman by an establishment engaged in the business of selling automobiles or trucks."

Small area broadcasters: The bill provides a new exemption from the overtime requirements but not from the minimum wage requirements, for any employee employed as an announcer, news editor, or chief engineer by a radio or television station which has its major studio in a city or town of not more than 50,000 population, according to the latest decennial census, provided that the city or town is not located within a "standard metropolitan area" with a total population in excess of 50,000, as defined and designated by the Bureau of the Census.

PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The bill would extend to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands the same coverage as on the mainland. Wage rates for such employees as well as for those already covered, are, however, set differently than on the mainland because of the special provisions contained in the act.

Those employees already covered will have their wage rates increased from year to year by the same percentages as the rates of mainland employees, but they will go into effect either 60 days after the effective date for the mainland or 1 year from the effective date of the most recent wage order, whichever is later. The first percentage increase in the rates will, however, be subject to appeal for review by special industry committees appointed by the Secretary of Labor. Such an appeal will have to be made by the industry involved, or by employers in the industry employing a majority of employees in the Puerto Rican or the Virgin Islands industry.

AMERICAN SAMOA

While the provisions of the act, as amended by the fair labor standards amendments of 1960, will also apply to American Samoa, the procedures for establishing minimum wages and overtime standards for such employees will remain the same as now provided in the present law. Thus no changes in the minimum wages or maximum hours for such employees are made by the bill except to set the higher standards as the new objectives of the committees and the Secretary in determining the minimum rates and maximum hours that shall apply to presently covered and newly covered workers in American Samoa.

WORKWEEK STANDARD

The bill adds, in several places in sections 6 and 7 of the act, the words "in any workweek." It is recognized that both the courts and the Department have interpreted the act so that the workweek is taken as the standard in determining its applicability. This is stated in title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, part 776, section 776.4.

The insertion of the words "in any workweek" in sections 6 and 7 of the act are designed to include in the statute the standards now being followed under the act.

PENALTIES AND INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

Under the present provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Secretary of Labor has no authority to require the payment of minimum wages and overtime compensation not paid in compliance with the law, except where an employee requests that an action be brought by the Secretary.

The bill amends sections 16 and 17 of the act so as to establish a more effective method of enforcement by authorizing the Federal courts to order the payment of the actual amount of unpaid minimum wages or overtime compensation to employees in injunctive actions brought under section 17. In this way, employers found by the courts to be unlawfully withholding from employees minimum wages and overtime compensation required to be paid them under the act could be required to make payment of the amounts found due by the courts without the necessity of the employee or employees involved initiating or requesting such action.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Massachusetts for the statement he has made in explanation of the economic and legal philosophies of the bill which our committee has brought to the Senate with only three Senators, as the Senator from Massachusetts has said, signing the minority views.

It has been my privilege to be associated with the Senator from Massachusetts for approximately 2 years as the coauthor of the original bill that was introduced in the Senate. We have brought to the Senate a committee version of a minimum wage bill, but I think it is due the Senator from Massachusetts to point out that we have succeeded in retaining at least the economic and legal philosophies, and principles on which those philosophies are based, as set forth in the original Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill.

Mr. President, as one of the coauthors of the original bill, I would have the RECORD show tonight, as we start debate on this subject matter in the Senate, that I think there are many shortcomings in the committee bill; and I would prefer that it went much further in implementing the very sound economic and legal philosophies of the original Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill.

But we try to be realists in the legislative process, and we have brought forth a bill which, in my judgment, is deserving of the support of the majority of the Senate, as it has received the support of a large majority in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Mr. President, supporting this bill in its present form does not mean that we are not free to support amendments to it on the floor of the Senate, or even offer some amendments if, in our judgment, the situation warrants it.

Furthermore, it does not mean that by supporting this bill from the committee we consider that we have passed any final Fair Labor Standards Act in the Congress, because I think session by session, for some years to come, it will be necessary for us to attempt to improve the Fair Labor Standards Act.

INCREASE IN COVERAGE

Our bill, as we have brought it to the Senate, will increase the coverage by some 5 million workers. The Senator from Massachusetts tonight has used the round figure of 5 million. I think that is a fair estimate, but none of us can be certain of the identical figure. The experts from the Department of Labor have assured us it will be in the neighborhood of 5 million.

The original bill which we introduced would have covered some 7 to 7½ million. In my judgment, there are at least a minimum of 11 million employees that ought to be covered, in the very near future, who are not now covered; and, in round numbers, there are some 22 million workers in this country that fall within the coverage of the commerce clause of the Constitution, who are not covered, but who, I hope, will be covered in the next few years.

In committee I offered a series of amendments that would seek to correct by eliminating exemptions what I think are some gross injustices that will continue to exist even under the bill we are offering the Senate. I would have the Senate keep in mind, if one wants to use the word "leniency," that this bill is lenient in connection with exemptions.

We have a practical problem in connection with the passage of general welfare legislation in a field such as minimum wages or social security or any of the subject matters that affect social reform and social improvement and social justice in our body politic.

It is necessary to get one vote more than one-half, to pass legislation. Thus we say that sometimes it is necessary to go more slowly than some of us think we should go in justice to the people of our country. As one who believes we should move even more rapidly, I am realistic enough to know that with this bill we shall be moving forward; we shall not be standing still.

MANY NEWLY COVERED ALREADY RECEIVING MINIMUM WAGE

I wish to point out, because I think we owe it to our colleagues in the Senate to do so, that when we talk about increasing the coverage by some 5 million workers it is not as good as it sounds, because a substantial number of them are already receiving the minimum wage, and a surprising percentage of them are even already receiving overtime. However, I think it is sound legislation to have these workers covered on the lawbooks. That is what we shall be doing for those employees under the bill.

It is also true that we are adding a considerable number of employees who are not receiving the minimum wage and who are not receiving the advantages of overtime payments.

I recognize the pressures which are on us in our States to seek to obtain an exemption for this group or an exemption for that group. I was the subject, along with every other Senator, of such pressures. I took the position, however, as the RECORD will show, that we ought to abolish all exemptions. I proposed such an amendment in the Senate committee. I will say for the RECORD tonight that I intend to work, as long as I have the privilege of serving the people of my State with the trust of being a Senator, for the elimination of the exemptions. We are not ready to go that far now, but in the interests of economic and social justice that ought to be our goal. Many of the exemptions which are written into the bill which we are offering the Senate are artificial, and discretionary, resulting in unfair discrimination within the American economy. That is always the risk we run when we start granting exceptions to one group or to another.

OREGON AUTO DEALERS

Last Sunday afternoon, as I told my friend the chairman of the subcommittee on which it has been my privilege to serve, the Senator from Massachusetts, a committee of automobile dealers waited on me in my home in Eugene, Oreg. The day before in a meeting the dealers had passed a resolution to send the committee to visit me on Sunday afternoon.

They came on Sunday afternoon rather than on Monday because they knew I was leaving for Washington, D.C., Sunday night. As they said, had that not been the case they would not have brought up the matter on the Sabbath, but they would have waited until Monday.

They made the argument—and there is a considerable amount of merit in their position—that the requirement of an automobile agency having to do a gross business of a million dollars is a very arbitrary one, and it will result in unfair discrimination against many automobile agencies to the competitive advantage of smaller agencies which are equally able to pay the minimum wage and also are equally able to grant the overtime premium wage.

The chairman of this committee happened to be the head of the Chevrolet agency in my hometown of Eugene, Oreg. He said: "Senator, you know, with our cars selling at from $3,000 for certain models up to as high as more than $4,000, it does not take very many automobile sales to result in a gross figure of more than a million dollars. When we add to that the supply division and the mechanic division of our garage, we are considerably over the million-dollar mark, but we are in competition with some smaller automobile agencies in our locality which do not gross a million dollars; so this provision puts us at a disadvantage."

I would be the first to admit that it is difficult to justify drawing the line at a million dollars. I think it would be better, if we could get the votes, to eliminate the million-dollar figure entirely and to take the position that any automobile agency ought to pay the minimum wage. I think that would be fair to all concerned.

DIFFICULTY IN SETTING STANDARDS

I know a case can be made with some plausibility in respect to the million-dollar gross income figure in the retail establishments, but again, except for the little family store, except for the little family operation, I think it is pretty difficult to make the million-dollar figure, as a basis for determining whether a store is to be exempt or is not to be exempt, stand up in a logical argument.

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

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I should like to finish this point.

When a business establishment incorporates or is a partnership establishment of some substance, which has executives to operate the business, when there is a retail establishment which is far removed from the old idea of the little corner grocery store operated by mother and father and the children, a case can be made for no exemption, and there should be a requirement for paying a minimum wage and overtime.

ABILITY TO PAY IS NOT ONLY ISSUE

The argument with which we are confronted—and we are met with it at almost every conference we have with anyone who wants to talk to us about the Fair Labor Standards Act—is that a proposal for an increase in the minimum wage is going to put employers out of business. I have lived with that argument now for more than a quarter of a century in my work in the field of labor relations. That is the argument which is made on the wage issue in every labor case one arbitrates. I first ran into it in 1934 in the first labor case I ever arbitrated.

I repeat what I have held in many decisions, which was a ruling held by leaders in the field of labor arbitration long before I arbitrated my first case. It was set forth, so far as my recollection goes, for the first time in a decision by Louis Brandeis, later one of the great Justices of the United States Supreme Court, who for many years was one of the great arbitrators, mediators, and labor lawyers in the field of labor economics. He pointed out as early as 1910 that the question of ability to pay on the part of an employer is not an issue which should have any standing in the consideration of what the wages ought to be when one is considering the issue of what is a wage which will maintain a standard of living of health and decency in a given establishment.

I take the point of view, which I have stated so many times, that the private enterprise system does not mean freedom to exploit human beings. I have taken the position many times that no employer in this country has the right to pay a wage less than what will support health and decency. Therefore, the question of ability to pay is generally excluded as an issue in any labor arbitration case or any wage case.

But the question of ability to pay does become a factor to be given weight when the evidence shows that the employer is paying a wage of health and decency. Then those sitting in judgment have not only the right but the clear duty to evaluate the evidence as to the ability of the employer to pay higher wages.

SUBSTANDARD WAGES REPRESENT EXPLOITATION

I take the position that no employer in our free enterprise system in America has any moral right to exploit his workers. He should not be allowed the legal privilege of exploiting his workers by having them subsidize his business by paying wages less than a wage of health and decency.

PERHAPS A SUBSIDY IS NECESSARY

I take the position that in a free economy such as ours there is a moral responsibility on the part of the Government to see to it that fellow Americans are not exploited by employers merely because they are economically stronger than the economically weak employees, who have no other choice but to work in the plants of such employers or not work at all.

So we come to the issue of whether workers should subsidize employers in "low wage" businesses or whether all the taxpayers of the country should subsidize them. Thus, as I offered a series of amendments in the Labor Committee, to bring more and more workers under the coverage of the bill, I was met with the argument that some businesses cannot pay more. I suggested that if it is a subsidy that they need, then the subsidy ought to come from all the taxpayers of the country and not from workers.

I am ready to support at any time anyone who wishes to offer such legislation. I do not think it is necessary to do so. I do not think it is necessary to do this in order to pass legislation that will require the payment of a decent minimum wage. But if there are those who are very much concerned about the fact that minimum wage legislation will put employers out of business because they cannot pay the minimum wage, then I take the position that it is the moral responsibility of all the people of this country to subsidize such employers.

My constructive suggestion—at least I hope it is a constructive suggestion—is to establish a procedure whereby the economic status of such an employer will be adjudged, and if there is a finding that he cannot pay a minimum wage and stay in business, assuming that he is operating efficiently and economically, and if it is adjudged further that it is in the public interest that he stay in business, then let us give him a Federal tax deduction for the amount of money necessary to increase his wage payments over the amount of money that he is paying as a fair minimum wage.

Let us recognize the burden of all the taxpayers of the country, rather than having employees to be exploited by taking less than a minimum wage.

My statement applies to a group of employees that I described while the Senate Labor Committee was considering the bill. I speak of the thousands of workers who, Mr. Goldberg, the expert who was assigned to us by the Labor Department to provide us with the statistical data in evaluating the amendments on the minimum wage bill, told us today have wages ranging around 53 cents an hour.

Does anyone really believe that in the year 1960, with all our boasts and expressions of pride about our economy, we can justify a wage of 53 cents an hour for fellow Americans, even though they may be laundry workers, and even though the color of their skin may be black? It is a great social injustice. In my judgment, it is an economic wrong that ought to be removed.

I regret that our bill does not cover a good many so-called service trade workers who are getting below $1 an hour.

EXPERIENCE IN THE PAPER PRODUCTS INDUSTRY

In 1939 I served as chairman of the Paper Products Industry Board, which in those days the law required to be appointed for the consideration of any proposals for increases in minimum wages. At that time there were many thousands of workers in the paper products industry in this country who were getting 25 cents an hour, but in 1939 the maximum wage that could be paid under the Fair Labor Standards Act was 40 cents an hour.

Those boards were composed of representatives of labor, representatives of industry, and representatives of the public. That hearing, held in Washington, D.C., lasted, as I recall, for about 10 days. I listened to able counsel for the employers in that case trying to justify 25 cents an hour as the pay for workers in the paper products industry.

One of the public members of the board was Professor Raushenbush, professor of economics at the University of Wisconsin. She is the daughter of the great Louis Brandeis. When we had been in session for several days, Professor Raushenbush said that her father and mother would like to have the public members come to their home for tea.

It was one of the richest experiences of my life as I sat at the feet of the great Justice Brandeis and listened to his discussion of some of the early problems which confronted us in this country when the labor movement was beginning to win new rights. With a twinkle in his eyes he said, "Well, what is the main argument of the employers in the case?"

I said, "Mr. Justice, the burden of their argument is that they do not have the ability to pay more; they will go broke if they pay more."

He laughed and said, "They have not changed their arguments since 1910, have they?"

Mr. President, that is a bewhiskered argument, the argument that they cannot pay a fair and decent living wage.

We granted the 40 cents an hour. I was sufficiently interested in the case to follow through, to see how many of these paper products businesses would go out of business because we granted the 40 cents an hour minimum wage, increasing it from 20 cents. Two years later not one company had gone out of business because of the increase in wages.

After I had been in the Senate 4 years, I happened to be in the hometown of the employer representative, and I was shown the great paper and pulp establishment of which he was president. I met him with the officers of that corporation. He introduced me by saying, "Senator MORSE is a man whose decision you had to learn to swallow in 1939."

My reply was, "Having just looked at your beautiful plant and at your operations, I have come to the conclusion that your employees have been able to do a lot more swallowing since 1939 as the result of the decision that we handed down."

LAUNDRY WORKERS UNDERPAID

I want to make this observation, with regard to the service trade employees, such as the laundry workers. In 1942, during the war, the War Labor Board had a case before it which required a review of the wages in the laundry industry. The record will show that the attorneys for one segment of the laun-

dry industry tried to justify a 19-cent-an-hour wage for the laundry workers in 1942.

They are the same group of workers who now are underpaid. I was shocked, as was every other member of the 12-member board, as we tried that case. When the case was completed, the Board unanimously voted the opinion that they asked me to write, which increased the wages of the laundry workers from 19 cents an hour to 40 cents an hour. We were told that it would put a great many laundries out of business. Here again subsequent reports made to us by the Department of Labor failed to bear out the hue and cry and the fear argument that was raised by the proprietors of laundries, that they would have to close shop if we granted a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour.

Likewise, I believe if we were to include these workers in the bill we would find that few laundries, few small bus station operators, few hotels, few of the so-called service trade establishments would go out of business because they were required under the law to pay a fair and decent minimum wage.

IMPORTANT FOR US TO PASS A BILL

I return to my introductory remarks. We are confronted with realities. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has very clearly stated the position of the majority of the committee. We are offering a bill which is a great improvement over the status quo. It is the least we should do in this session of Congress. Therefore, on the basis of that general approach to this subject matter, I am pleased to join the Senator from Massachusetts in recommending the adoption of the bill as the committee has reported it to the Senate.

If the Senator from Colorado wishes me to yield to him, I shall be pleased to do so; otherwise I will yield the floor.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I have had some experience with automobile dealers in my State. It is the same experience that the able Senator from Oregon has referred to. The difficulty seems to be with the automobile dealers in my State, who are concerned about the automobile salesmen. I do not speak for all of them, of course. I was under the impression, as I understood the Kennedy bill, that automobile salesmen were exempt from the provisions of the bill, because most of them are working on commission, some of them making $10,000 a year. However, they do not earn their money all in 1 month or in the form of a stable salary. It may be that in one period of time, perhaps in 1 week, they will work 70 hours, while in another week they do not work so hard. I should like to have an explanation of what this bill means to the automobile salesmen, because a great misconception has arisen, particularly on the part of people who are not affected by the bill. I should like to have the opinion of the Senator from Oregon or the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Massachusetts has already pointed out that a great deal of misinformation has been circulated among the automobile agencies of the country with respect to the bill as it affects salesmen.

The bill does not cover auto salesmen for overtime, and even as to the other employees, there is a $1 million gross income requirement.

Mr. CARROLL. Assume the situation of an automobile dealer. On the very point the able Senator from Oregon has stressed, many automobile dealers in my State, because of sales, supplies, and other factors, including mechanical operations and repairs, have gross incomes exceeding $1 million. Let us assume this provision applies to automobile dealers. I want to make it clear in the RECORD that it does not apply to automobile salesmen. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. Essentially, that is my understanding.

Mr. CARROLL. Let us assume the law does apply because the dealer has a gross income of $1 million.

Mr. KENNEDY. Supplementing what the Senator from Oregon has said, the bill does not cover automobile salesmen, so far as overtime is concerned. It covers them so far as the minimum wage is concerned. As the Senator from Colorado knows, automobile salesmen are paid, in nearly every case, more than the minimum wage. They are exempted from overtime.

Mr. MORSE. The automobile dealers are not concerned about the minimum wage; they are concerned about paying overtime. The bill specifically exempts salesmen from the overtime provision.

Mr. CARROLL. The man I had in mind is a small dealer, even though he grosses more than $1 million, when he takes into consideration his capital investment. One of the chief concerns, at least of this one dealer, was the reporting provided under the bill, which he has not heretofore had to do, because he has been exempt.

I said I would look into the question when the bill was under debate. But as I heard the bill presented by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and listened to the clarification given by the able Senator from Oregon, both of whom are members of the committee, it seems to me that if the particular individual were exempt by the bill, there would not be much reporting.

I know from years of experience under the act—I do not mean personal experience, but as I have read the history of the act—that employers would have to keep a type of record, so that some spot checking could be made.

Mr. MORSE. If he is exempt from overtime under the bill, the records he has to keep are minimal.

Mr. CARROLL. But the able Senator from Oregon says that the salesman is not subject to the overtime provision.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. We are not talking about the minimum wage. I think we have handled the automobile salesmen, as I now understand it.

Let us go back to the automobile mechanics. Most automobile mechanics in my area make far more than the minimum wage. Is this more than a minimum wage bill? Is there a provision for overtime for mechanics? Is this not only a minimum wage bill, but an overtime bill, as well?

Mr. MORSE. It is a fair labor standards bill; and a fair labor standards bill covers both wages and overtime. So, of course, mechanics will be covered by the overtime provision, and as to mechanics, the employer will have to keep a record of how much they are paid.

I have heard arguments made that there is a need to simplify the reporting system under the Fair Labor Standards Act, but I wish to make it clear that once employers come under the overtime provisions they must keep the same kind of record any other employer will have to keep with respect to overtime.

Mr. CARROLL. Let us assume a mechanic is making $3 an hour, to use a round figure, as of now, under present employment conditions. We now include mechanics in the bill. Does the overtime provision of the bill require the payment, therefore, of time and one-half for overtime over 40 hours?

Mr. MORSE. Of course.

Mr. CARROLL. That is one of the purposes of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Of course. There are many reasons, as a matter of policy, for such a requirement; but one reason, I may say, is to encourage a broader distribution of work opportunities.

Mr. CARROLL. I suggest to the Senator from Oregon that another reason may be observance of the law itself.

Mr. MORSE. Of course. We start with that premise. In the first place, we go back to the argument of the Fair Labor Standards Act. One of the cardinal reforms of the New Deal, and one of its purposes, was to meet the economic depression. One of the purposes of the New Deal was to help to create more job opportunities. Therefore, including the overtime requirement would have a tendency to cause the employer to employ more persons at straight-time rates.

Mr. CARROLL. I know of the Senator's vast experience in this field. When was the first minimum wage law passed?

Mr. MORSE. In 1938.

Mr. CARROLL. This information may be contained in the committee report; I am sure it is in the hearings.

Mr. MORSE. It is in the report.

Mr. CARROLL. What was the population of the country at that time? What was the national income at that time?

Mr. MORSE. I could not pass that examination except by estimating.

Mr. CARROLL. What has been the rate of increase in the cost of living since that time?

Mr. MORSE. The increase in the cost of living has been substantial; but there is one important statistic I want the Senator to keep in mind. When the minimum wage was set in 1938, it was 25 cents an hour. The average wage being paid was 63 cents an hour, a difference of 38 cents.

The difference between the minimum wage set by law and the average wage in the country then, was much less than the difference between the minimum wage now, of $1, and the average wage in the country. Today the gap is $1.29.

As the Senator from Colorado implies, the population of the Nation has increased at a rapid rate. My guess would be that as against 180 million now, in 1938 it was probably in the neighborhood of 138 million or 140 million.

Mr. CARROLL. I should say 120 million. I think the population increases at the rate of about 3 million a year.

Mr. MORSE. The increase in the cost of living has been terrific.

Mr. CARROLL. Would not the Senator from Oregon say, therefore, that the minimum we are talking about is the wage paid to the lowest economic income group in the country? Is it not that group which is especially affected by the bill?

Mr. MORSE. That is the group we are talking about.

Mr. CARROLL. When was this subject last passed upon?

Mr. MORSE. In 1955 amendments were made.

Mr. CARROLL. I was not in the Senate in 1955. What was the position of the Republican Party on the minimum wage in 1955?

Mr. MORSE. The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is present. I never speak for the Republicans, but he can, and I believe he can answer that question.

Mr. CARROLL. What were the Republicans advocating in 1955?

Mr. MORSE. It was my statement the last time the Fair Labor Standards Act was amended that there is an unfinished job in regard to coverage. That was in 1955. We have been waiting for 5 years to do our clear duty, in my judgment, in regard to the coverage problem. We now have an opportunity to improve the situation.

The bill does not begin to go nearly so far as I think it ought to go.

May I interrupt for one further moment on the coverage matter?

In my formal remarks I said that of the 4.5 million to 5 million new workers who would be covered by the law, a substantial percentage of them already are receiving a wage which equals the minimum and a substantial percentage of them also are getting overtime payments. So as to them we are merely making it legal now, in the sense we are bringing them under the written law.

But if we could cover the additional workers between the 5 million, in round numbers, let us say, that we are adding to the coverage, by means of this bill, and the 11 million that I would like to cover, it would be found that a large majority of the workers between the 5 million and the 11 million do not now get either the minimum wage or the overtime payments; and they are the workers who really are suffering the most in the wage and overtime structure in the country.

That is why I think that although by means of this bill we shall make some improvement, we never should forget the approximately 6 million more people who, in my judgment, should be covered in the very near future.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator refresh my memory—for I was not a Member of the Senate in 1955. It is my distinct recollection, however, that at that time the administration was advocating a 90-cent minimum wage. It is my recollection that in that year the Congress did pass a $1 minimum wage bill.

Mr. MORSE. There were many proposals. However, I shall speak only for myself.

Mr. CARROLL. But what does the record show?

Mr. MORSE. The record will show what the Senator from Colorado states.

Mr. CARROLL. I want to know whether as a result of making the change, in 1955, from 90 cents to $1, there was any catastrophic economic effect because of that 10-cent difference.

Mr. MORSE. On the contrary, I happen to think that the economy was strengthened. I think that as we increase the purchasing power of the mass of the people, we strengthen the economy and help expand it; and many times I have expressed the truism that every economist will state—namely, that the great need in our country is to ever expand our private-enterprise economy. I do not think the surface of it has yet been scratched.

Mr. CARROLL. Will not the Senator agree that in the 1955 bill, some of the retail trades were exempted?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. As regards the pending bill, what is the position of the administration? Does it stand for $1.10 or $1.15?

Mr. MORSE. A member of the staff has pointed out that in 1955 we did not change any exemptions. They had been there ever since 1938.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, Congress did not then extend the coverage?

Mr. MORSE. That is right.

Mr. CARROLL. What is the position of the administration today? In 1955 it was for 90 cents. Will the Senator state for the record what is the position of the administration today? He knows what the record is, for he is a member of the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Well, once I attempted to speak for the Republican Party. But I gave that up; and the Senator will not get me to speak for it tonight. [Laughter.] I simply give this general answer: It was not good.

Mr. CARROLL. Regardless of whether it is good or bad, I wish to know what it is. The Senator from Oregon is a member of the committee, and the evidence was submitted before him. What does the evidence reflect as to the position of the administration?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I shall be glad to relieve him of his embarrassment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am not at all embarrassed; I am simply trying to be kind. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOLDWATER. I appreciate that.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say the administration was against most of the proposals which those of us on the Democratic side of the table made. But there were some great exceptions among Republican Senators—to their everlasting credit.

Mr. CARROLL. But what did the administration propose? I want to know what is in the record, and then I shall be happy to discuss this matter further.

Mr. MORSE. I always believe in calling on the best qualified witness. So I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], to permit him to speak as to the Republican position.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I merely wish to answer the question the Senator from Colorado has propounded to my friend, the Senator from Oregon, because I realize that the Senator from Oregon looks with rather longing eyes, at times, back to his former association, and I realize that sometimes he wishes he had not made the change. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. I never experienced that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Well, at times I have seen the Senator from Oregon look at us with rather soulful, yearning eyes; and I thought I detected some regret on his part at making such a great mistake.

Mr. MORSE. No; my regret is that I was such a poor evangelist while I was on that side of the aisle. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOLDWATER. The position of the administration is that it would accept $1.15 an hour, with a limited coverage. I cannot state the exact amount of that limitation of coverage, but I would judge it to be somewhere between one and one-half million and two and one-half million. That is as far as I can go. It is necessary for them to rely on the judgment of the Secretary of Labor.

According to my knowledge, we have not heard on that score from the President, other than that he would entertain a change to this $1.15 amount, with limited coverage.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator. Will he state again what the coverage is?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have said that it is not clear to me, but I would judge it to be somewhere between 1½ million and 2½ million. I think the administration is trying to get at the retail businesses which truly are in interstate commerce.

I think the House bill probably would reflect the thinking of the administration—and I am speaking only on the basis of my own guessing—about as well as anything we could come to—retail establishments with at least five stores in two or more States.

Mr. MORSE. It is my understanding that Representative AYRES, of the House, who, I think it is fair to say, is one of their leaders in the matter of minimum-wage legislation—is reported to have said that the administration would look with favor upon the coverage as contained in the House bill. It is my understanding that would be in the neighborhood of 1 million employees.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think this is an important question. The fact is that when the Secretary of Labor came before our committee, in May of last year, and gave the administration's position, the administration was opposed to any increase in the minimum wage. The administration did favor extending the

coverage to 2½ million workers not now covered, of whom the majority—as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out—were already receiving a $1 minimum wage.

It was not until a later date, in testifying before the House committee—after some months had passed—in response to the position we had taken, that the administration indicated—as the Senator from Arizona has indicated—that it would accept $1.15. The administration was dragged to it, because the position it took in response to our first effort was in opposition to lifting the minimum wage even 1 cent, even though it had not been changed since 1956.

Mr. MORSE. On the ground that it would be inflationary.

Mr. KENNEDY. And what is true of the position of the administration in regard to this bill is also true of the position of the administration in regard to the bill for medical assistance to the aged and the bill for Federal aid to education and the Housing Act and the area redevelopment bill—every one of these pieces of legislation which were discussed in the President's message this week. The original position of the administration was always in opposition to any action. It was only when it appeared that we would take action anyway that, finally, the reluctant compromise came forth from the administration—namely, that it would accept a different position.

So I am glad the Senator brought up the history of the matter.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator. This is exactly what we need to have in the debate.

We have the history as to 1955. What is the difference? It is the difference between 90 cents and $1—in other words, 10 cents. No economic catastrophe happened after that.

I am very happy to have the information from the very able Senator from Massachusetts. In the beginning there was no relenting on the part of the administration. As the able Senator from Oregon has said, the administration said this would be inflationary. But because we blazed the trail and fought for these economic and social programs, now the administration is willing to go to $1.15 and to have a little bit more coverage.

What are we asking for? The very clear and lucid statement of the Senator from Massachusetts should allay all the fears of all those who have become "steamed up" by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. This happens in my own area. I have received hundreds of letters from small businessmen who are not covered by this bill at all. All the automobile dealers are stirred up about this bill. And I hope the RECORD tonight will satisfy them.

I want to make one correction in the RECORD. They do not have to report anything. All they have to do is keep their books in shape, if I understand the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. May I say to the Senator that I think we are discussing a very important point in the consideration of domestic legislation. Both parties are now committed to extending the minimum wage and increasing it. There is no difference between the general recommendation made by the President of the United States on Monday and the position which the Senator from Oregon and I and the Senator from Colorado take. It is, however, when we look into the specifics that the differences arise in the positions of the two parties.

We both favor an increase, but our party favors $1.25, and the other party reluctantly is willing to accept $1.15. It favors area redevelopment, but the bill is hopelessly inadequate, and it is only in answer to legislation that we put forward. So while the general vocabulary may be identical, while the President may call for these programs, if people will examine the record—and I hope they do—they will find that they opposed the bill in the first place, and this is a sop, which did not represent a conviction, but was only a political move.

Mr. CARROLL. That was my experience in the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Ten years ago we began to reform and reexamine the social security program for the first time since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt. We had the same trouble with social security.

I can remember our fighting for reforms at that time. All we wanted to do then was to move the maximum from $3,000 to $3,900. The Republicans knocked it down. We finally established the maximum at $3,600, when some of us were trying to establish it at $4,200.

The able Senator from Massachusetts well chose the slogan, "The challenge of a new frontier." We must blaze the way. We are the pioneers in reforms for economic justice. We have had to pull the Republicans, kicking and screaming, into the 20th century.

Mr. MORSE. I should add with reference to our earlier discussion that while the Wages and House Division does not send out a set of forms and reports to be filled out, employers do have to keep a set of books available to the investigators under the Fair Labor Standards Act and that, in many instances, quite a different set of books would be kept by them voluntarily if they were not subject to this inspection. Then, as the inspector comes in at the time he studies the books, he sometimes calls for additional information, which the critics say is nothing but redtape.

I am always willing to take a look at the administrative procedure in connection with some of these laws to see whether or not we are unduly increasing the clerical and bookkeeping work of the businessmen of the country.

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

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. What I sought to do at the very beginning was to establish one or two factors. It was not really to engage in criticism of the Republicans or in a eulogy of the Democrats. I merely wanted to show that in 1955 we were in the bargain-basement business for 10 cents, 90 cents for the administration, and we took one for a dollar, with no increase in coverage. I am an old hand at this, because I saw the increase in social security in 1950 to 11 million persons. I saw the Republican administration come in year after year and increase the coverage. I commend them for it, but they have had to be hauled and pulled step by step into a program that is good for the family life of America.

I make one final point. I commend the Senator from Arizona for telling us what the Republican position is—not his position, he says, but their position. Their position is for a little coverage. Their position is for a little increase. Just think of this bargain-basement treatment for 10 cents, a thin dime. We are asking for a little more coverage, for perhaps 2 or 3 million more Americans, for the lowest group in the economic pyramid, in the strongest, richest nation in the world, when we pour money into other nations all over the world; and some of our own people are complaining.

I say to the able Senator from Massachusetts that when this message goes out over the country and we are able to overcome the propaganda of the various chambers of commerce, they will not be able to stand up with their position. How can this administration defend its position—10 cents difference and a few hundred thousand less coverage?

The able Senator from Oregon is right. We ought to move forward in a broader field, and we should do it in this very modest bill.

If I correctly understood the able Senator from Massachusetts, it will be 3 or 4 years before a minimum wage of $1.25 is achieved. I say we should not bind ourselves. In the next year we will move ahead again, as we must, because we have an expanding economy and the cost of living index increases year by year.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

COUNTRY AWAITS ACTION

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Colorado very much for his very worthwhile contribution to this debate.

Before yielding the floor, I wish to make these final comments. I am very glad the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Massachusetts have brought out the position of some of the Republican administration leaders in respect to their proposals for Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments. It is well for it to be shown in the RECORD.

But, Mr. President, speaking only for myself, the problem before us must not be approached as a partisan problem at all, because, irrespective of party affiliation, Democrat or Republican or Independent, I am satisfied that there are many millions of people in our country who agree that we ought to proceed to do social and economic justice for the many exploited workers in America who are not receiving at the present time a decent minimum wage.

I say most respectfully that I think it will be a great mistake if we make it a partisan issue, because there are a great many Republican officeholders in this country who disagree with many of their top leaders with regard to this Fair Labor Standards Act issue.

I think we are truly dealing here not with a political issue in the narrow sense at all, but instead with an economic

and legal issue: How far we should go in 1960 to do greater economic and social justice to these thousands and thousands of fellow Americans who at the present time are the victims of exploitation in this country?

I propose, Mr. President, that we issue a welcome beyond political affiliation for support from all Americans, irrespective of party, for the bill described by the Senator from Massachusetts in his able presentation this evening. The bill represents a great step forward in producing greater social and economic justice for those who are being wronged in our economy today by being required, as a matter of economic circumstances, to work for less than a wage of health and decency.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it shall be my purpose during the debate to occupy the floor in my own right. I have asked the very diligent and devoted Senator from Oregon to yield so that I may say tonight, at this late hour—that I join with him and with the Senator from Colorado in commending the clarity with which the Senator from Massachusetts has explained the philosophy of as well as some of the actual provisions of the measure now before us for consideration.

I trust it is not inappropriate to indicate I was a Member of the House of Representatives in 1938 and its Committee on Labor, and the privilege and the responsibility was given me of cosponsoring the initial Fair Labor Standards Act. I am gratified to again have, 22 years later, the continuing privilege and the further responsibility of being a cosponsor of the proposed legislation now deserving our affirmative determination.

With no attempt to wave a flag, I recall the economic conditions and the human difficulties of a quarter of a century ago, and I remember well the unconscionably long hours, the unconscionably short pay, and the unconscionably bad working conditions under which millions of men and women who then toiled in America struggled.

Mr. President, I embrace this opportunity to share with these gentlemen who have spoken the desirability to discuss the pending legislation not from a partisan standpoint, but rather to join with them and with other Senators in doing now what needs to be done—raising the wages and increasing the coverage under the law, to strengthen the economy of our Union.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the committee I not only wish to thank the Senator from West Virginia for the remarks he has made but also to pay my respects to him and to give him my praise for the cooperation and the fine work he did as a member of our labor subcommittee in helping us to perfect the original bill and in helping us bring forth the bill which is now before the Senate on this subject.

I close, by asking unanimous consent that a memorandum prepared by the staff of the committee entitled "Summary of Minimum Wage Bill as Reported From the Senate Labor Committee," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Summary of minimum wage bill as reported from the Senate Labor Committee

Presently covered employees: For presently covered employees (23.7 million) the new rate will be $1.15 an hour the first year, $1.20 the second year, and $1.25 an hour thereafter.

Newly covered employees:	*Estimated number employees covered*
1. Retail and retail service enterprises—which have annual gross sales of $1,000,000 or more (exclusive of excise taxes at retail level), wage and hour coverage according to following schedule:	3,541,000

(6) (a) Effective date	Hourly rate	Overtime after
1st year	$1.00	No overtime requirement.
2d year	1.05	44 hours.
3d year	1.15	42 hours.
4th year	1.25	40 hours.

(b) Motion picture theaters—not covered.
(c) Waiters, waitresses and other employees, in hotels and restaurants, in occupations in which tips constitute a substantial part of the earnings, also not covered.
(d) Gasoline service stations with annual gross receipts of $250,000 or more will have minimum wage coverage but excluded from overtime requirements of act.

2. Laundries 150,000
(a) In enterprises with annual gross sales of $1,000,000 or more, same minimum wage and overtime schedule as retail service 1(a) above.
(b) Same coverage will apply to any laundry which has $250,000 or more in gross sales if it is in substantial competition in same metropolitan area with another laundry which is not exempt because more than half of its sales are made outside the State in which it is located.

3. Local transit—same minimum wage schedule as 1(a) above, no overtime coverage. 107,000

Newly covered employees—Continued	*Estimated number employees covered*
4. Seamen—on American flag vessels same minimum wage schedule as 1(a) above; no overtime coverage.	100,000
5. Telephone operators—changes existing exemption for switchboard operators limiting it to switchboard operators employed by an independently owned public telephone company with 750 or fewer telephones.	41,000
6. Fish processing (freezing, preserving)—same minimum wage schedule as 1(a) above; no overtime coverage. (Fish canning already covered for minimum wage.)	32,000
7. Establishment coverage—establishments (which have $250,000 or more in annual receipts) some of whose employees are already covered by existing law (except in construction companies where dollar cutoff is $350,000). Minimum wage and overtime coverage same as schedule 1(a) above.	1,000,000
Total	4,971,000

8. Other provisions:
(a) Nonprofit hospitals, educational and other eleemosynary institutions not covered.
(b) Canning and processing agricultural commodities—20 weeks' overtime exemption each year (10 weeks limited to 12 hours a day, 56 hours a week, plus 10 weeks' unlimited overtime exemption) instead of present 28 exempt overtime weeks each year.
(c) Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands, whose minimum wage rates are set by industry committees, will have their present rates increased by 15 percent first year and an additional 5 percent in each of the next 2 years, subject to review by an industry committee in hardship cases.
(d) Trucking and pipeline employees status under existing law unaffected by bill.
(e) Logging—the bill retains the exemption as in existing law.
(f) Small area broadcasting companies—announcers, newscasters and chief engineers of a broadcasting station in a town of not more than 50,000 population exempt from overtime requirements.
(g) Automobile salesmen employed by retail auto dealer will be exempt from overtime requirements even if dealer has more than $1,000,000 annual sales.
(h) Effective date—Jan. 1, 1961.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may have additional staff members present on the floor during consideration of the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I assume that naturally the request includes the minority?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words tonight very briefly, because I have a rather lengthy statement on this subject.

I commend my friend from Oregon for urging that, if we can, we should keep political considerations out of this discussion. It is very easy, I know, for the Democrats to look at the Republicans and to say, "They want everybody to work in sweatshops. They do not want to raise wages." We, on the other hand, can look at the Democrats and say, "They are following a will-o-the-wisp, for nobody has ever proved that the figure of a dollar and a quarter is economically correct."

I think we can argue this question out on the merits. My particular position is well known to everybody. I do not believe the Federal Government should be in the business of regulating wages at all. No measure is going to please me.

I have a number of amendments which I shall offer, which I hope will improve the palatability of the bill.

I certainly hope we can refrain from injecting politics into the consideration of the bill, because I think both parties sincerely desire to get at the same end. We go at it in different ways.

The administration, at the time it opposed any increase in the minimum wage or in coverage, honestly felt—and I be-

lieve a great number of economists in this country were convinced—that any increase in coverage or in minimum wages at that time would have resulted in inflation. I assume the President's advisers have informed him differently this year.

I do not think the President was dragged into or pushed into this at all. I think the President probably came to a conclusion through the normal processes of reasoning.

I hope we can follow the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon and can argue this matter out on an economic basis, realizing that the Republicans are not devils with horns and long tails and that the Democrats do not have only one horn and one tail each. We both wish to get to the same place. There is a difference in how we desire to get there.

I think the majority of the Republicans and some Democrats conscientiously feel that for the Federal Government to artificially raise wages is a stimulant to inflation, and that for the Federal Government to assume the responsibility, as the Senator from Oregon suggests, of requiring the paying of wages where the employer is not capable of paying a wage which is adequate, in the Senator's opinion, is detrimental to the incentive which has forever sparked the free enterprise system.

We cling to that thought as religiously as my Democratic friends cling to the idea that the Federal Government can, by its injections, increase the purchasing power and the total income.

Therefore, I am going to present my arguments, probably starting tomorrow, on the basis of economics and the humane treatment of people. I hope my arguments will prevail, but if they do not I shall accept the decision of the Senate.

I am not going to make further recitations tonight, because I have a rather lengthy text for tomorrow. I know my Democratic friends are tired. They have had long and tedious months of campaigning. I should like to have them go home and get a good night's rest, so that we can start fresh tomorrow. [Laughter.]

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MORSE, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 3832) to authorize the employment of retired personnel of the Federal Government by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and to authorize the employment of retired personnel of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, by the Federal Government, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1960—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HOLLAND submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3758) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senators desire to address the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, August 11, 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Senator Wiley Over Radio Station WIND, Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 10, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, apparently Soviet Premier Khrushchev is engaging in a kind of crazy, mixed-up pattern of troublemaking around the world. To paraphrase what Prime Minister Macmillan recently said in his letter to the Soviet Premier, "It's difficult to understand—or find any logic in—the capricious but dangerous way Mr. K. is meddling in world affairs."

Despite the fact that the United States is undergoing a political campaign it should be made clear—as Secretary Herter has done—that this does not create an open season for Communist troublemaking and aggression.

Recently I was privileged to review Khrushchev's seemingly schizophrenic policies in a broadcast over radio station WIND, Chicago. The program included in addition some of the major issues confronting our country. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY OVER RADIO STATION WIND, CHICAGO

Even though there is an upcoming political campaign in the United States, we should make it clear to Mr. Khrushchev and other world Communists that:

We are alert—not asleep;

We shall continue to vigorously support those fundamental policies that will improve the outlook for peace;

We will strongly oppose Communist efforts at expansion.

We, as Americans, need to keep our heads. During the upcoming campaign, there will be charges and countercharges. However, both political parties—Republican and Democratic—and their candidates have a great responsibility for presenting the real issues; for not distorting our Nation's accomplishments or its purposes; for underwriting a strong program for world peace; and for resolutely, clearly and realistically blueprinting future plans for security, progress and a better life for our people.

Along with Lincoln—whose ascendancy to the Presidency 100 years ago we now celebrate—I have great faith in the people—in their God-given intelligence and ability to find the right answers in these challenging times.

IN-BETWEEN STATE OF AFFAIRS

As American citizens, we now find ourselves in an in-between state of affairs.

The political conventions—Democratic and Republican—have just concluded.

Congress reopens in about a week for a final session that promises plenty of "hot battles."

The campaign for the elections of 1960—of which there have already been "skirmishes"—promises to mount higher in intensity, as we approach the November elections.

Abroad, too, we—and the free world—face the current cycles of unpredictable, chaotic, unprincipled actions by the Communists—as they disrupt efforts to promote peace, attempt to confuse us, distort our purposes by worldwide propaganda, and utilize any and all techniques—however reprehensible—to attempt to attain their ultimate purpose of world domination.

Despite the campaign barrages at home—and the wild, unpredictable Communist antics abroad—I am confident that you, the citizens of this great country, will be able to keep your feet on the ground. In fact, our survival depends upon it.

REVIEW OF MAJOR ISSUES OF 1960 POLITICAL CAMPAIGN

First, let's take a look at the upcoming political battles. Briefly, I would like to review some of the major challenges.

Maintaining the peace

1. The No. 1 issue is: Maintaining the peace. Among other things, this includes:

Further strengthening our defenses,

Continuing efforts to reach safeguarded agreements to reduce East-West tensions, including reducing world armaments, and cessation of nuclear tests,

A creative counterattack to the Communist ideological-propaganda offensive.

Cooperation to carry forward with our allies constructive, realistic programs for common defense and—particularly to progress and provide a better life for folks in the less developed areas of the world.

Effectively resolve problems arising out of differing economic, social, and political views among the free nations themselves—without "unsettling rifts" in our relationships.

Further strengthening our economy

2. We must maintain and further strengthen the economy at home. This involves: Encouragement of a sound money policy to stimulate growth and expansion of our free enterprise system and halt inflation; the surplus of over $1 billion for fiscal year 1960—like the dramatic "slowdown" of inflation—illustrates that it can be done. Encourage full employment—now at an alltime high of 68.6 million; also we must wipe out remaining pockets of unemployment. Further brighten the outlook for job-creating free enterprise—95 percent of which are small businesses, through appropriate modification of the tax laws; effective employment of the antitrust laws; and similar actions. Further expand our housing program—to provide new and better homes, apartments, and other types of housing for more Americans. Carry on constructive conservation of our natural resources; and other measures.

Programs for human progress

3. As our times are new, we must also adopt new programs for preservation of human rights and promoting human progress. In an economically healthy country, we should—and must—create ever greater opportunity for our people in all walks of life. This includes: Assuring opportunity for workers to engage—and succeed—in a chosen vocation; providing necessary care—as well as opportunity to continue to contribute to community and national life—for our aging folks; establishing more creative youth-development programs; expanding our educational opportunities for the increasing students of school age, as well as for adult education; assuring protection—and opportunity to exercise constitutional rights for all citizens.

These, of course, are only highlights of complex fields in which we need to keep moving forward with our fast-advancing times.

Analysis of Khrushchev's schizophrenic policies

Now, let's take a look around the world. We recognize, of course, that peace and security are necessary—in fact, essential to survival—in this nuclear-missile age. Any consideration of the outlook for peace, and threats to our security, almost magnetically focus upon the Communists—the major troublemakers and threats to peace.

Regrettably, we continue to witness sequences of erratic, contradictory, illogical action by Khrushchev and the Soviet Government. Currently, efforts are being made to analyze the motivations behind such on-and-off, hot-and-cold, alternative "missile-threats and sweet-talk" policies. For one who looks for logic, adherence to reason and principles, respect for national order and law, and desire for peace, however, the utterings and actions of Khrushchev almost defy interpretation.

Recently, Prime Minister Macmillan, of Great Britain, wrote to Premier Khrushchev, saying, "I simply do not understand what your purpose is today."

There is one theory—which, recently, has appeared to "shed some light" on Mr. Khrushchev's seemingly schizophrenic policies: A number of years ago, a Russian scientist named Pavlov—by experimentation—discovered that if one dealt consistently in an inconsistent way with animals, the result was confusion and hysteria. In practice, he would alternately "pat them"—then "kick them"—for the same thing.

Apparently, Khrushchev is adopting a similar theory in his world policy. However, I believe we should not—and must not—be fooled by his Pavlovian tactics.

SETTING THE COMMUNIST RECORD "STRAIGHT"

To better deal with these contradictory policies, we—and the world—need to do a little "skywriting"—nationally and internationally—to more clearly distinguish the great differences between the Soviets' "word and deed." Let me cite a few examples: (1) Since World War II, the Soviets—seemingly in good faith—entered into over 40 top-level agreements with the United States. As it served their purposes, however, they flagrantly have broken over 37 of these treaties. (2) Contradictorily, the Soviet Premier preaches against imperialism outside the Iron and Bamboo Curtains; meanwhile the Communist blocs are building within their orbits—and attempting to extend—a great Colonial Empire. (3) Indulging in wild—and many times refutable—accusations against the United States and the West, for espionage, the Sino-Soviet bloc has created the greatest international conspiratorial, criminal-type ring of espionage and subversion known in world history. (4) Under guise of creating a "classless society," communism—in practice—has created a new, privileged class, both in China and the Soviet Union. Although the Communists number only about 2–4 percent in Red China, and 4–6 percent of the population in the Soviet Union, they, as a new, privileged class, "get the plums," dominate and enrich themselves in power and wealth at the expense of the common people of their countries; as well, they "siphon off" the wealth, manpower and national resources of the countries they dominate. (5) Under the ruse of the oft-repeated "peaceful, or competitive coexistence," the Communists are carrying on—on a warlike schedule—espionage, sabotage, subversion and other penetrations of the free world. Among free people, the idea of coexistence, historically, has been considered an inherent right of all nations.

For the Communists, however, this does represent a deviation from the old, Leninist line—still adhered to by Red China—that there must ultimately be a war between the capitalist and Communist nations.

Fundamentally, this is one of the reasons for the recent "spat" between Moscow and Peiping. Still in the first stages of communism—Red China finds it convenient, perhaps to a large degree for internal, propaganda consumption—to advocate war, for ultimate conquest of the world by communism.

Even though Mr. K., however, professes adherence to the concept of peaceful coexistence, his alley-brawl tactics—translated into Soviet policies on the international level—include anything—right or wrong, legal or illegal—if it will forward the Communist efforts toward domination of the world.

CONCLUSION

In the days ahead, we must set Mr. K. straight. By this I mean: We should make it evident that as always we shall continuously be ready and willing—regardless of an election—to protect the ramparts of freedom.

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 11, 1960

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

Eternal Spirit, amid the tensions of these terrific days we seek in Thy presence a saving experience of inner quiet and certainty.

Our ears are filled with the world's angry din. We must find Thee as a strong foundation that storms cannot shake, as a deep well that droughts cannot exhaust, as a citadel of refuge that no foe can invade.

We come in deep anxiety concerning the world the next generation will inherit from our hands.

Facing decisions freighted with destiny, unite our hearts and minds, we beseech Thee, in a mighty purpose that our Nation's strength, material and spiritual, be dedicated to throw open the gates of more abundant life for all mankind. We ask it in the Name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 10, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

DEVELOPMENT OF LATIN AMERICA AND RECONSTRUCTION OF CHILE

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes (with an ac-