The FCC said it had noted that Western Electric earnings on Bell sales last year amounted to 10.2 percent, and asserted that this "appears excessive."

In a separate but related action the FCC announced a proposal to order both upward and downward adjustments in the rates charged by A.T. & T. and Western Union Telegraph Co. for private line service.

At the same time, the Commission tentatively rejected a petition by the American Newspaper Publishers Association and other press interests that the companies be required to reestablish a special reduced rate classification for press users of private lines such as was offered until 1943.

COST STUDY ASKED

The Commission also made public a letter to A.T. & T. in which it asked that company to go forward promptly with a cost study on its oversea communications services to "reflect the current level of earnings" on this international business. The Commission said it has never had sufficient data on which to properly evaluate the earnings level.

The announcements relating to private line charges, which have been under FCC investigation for 3 years, were in the form of an initial decision by the Commission, which will be subject to comment by interested parties before any final action is taken. The Commission said the initial decision itself will be made public next week.

RATE RAISED IN 1958

Private line service, widely used by newspapers, industries, and individual businessmen, involves the supplying of a private telephone line or private telegraph line for the exclusive use of the customer. The service may be on a continuous 24-hour basis or for given segments of the day. The rates are generally related to mileage and the types of terminal equipment used.

The FCC private line investigation evolved in part from an A.T. & T. increase in private telephone line rates in 1958 which its customers complained was not justified. In the proceeding, both A.T. & T. and Western Union contended their earnings on private telegraph line service were unreasonably low.

The Commission said it had tentatively decided to:

Require A.T. & T. to reduce the telephone line service on a formula which would bring its revenues from this service down by about $1.2 million a year.

Allow increases in telegraph private line service designed to give A.T. & T. about $2.7 million more per year and Western Union about $750,000 annually.

The Commission said specific rate schedules designed to carry out these objectives should be submitted by all interested parties by August 15. Comments on these submissions must be in before September 15.

[From the Office of Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, Third District of California]

WASHINGTON, D.C.—No responsible person denies that America urgently needs a worldwide satellite communication system as fast-moving events project us willy-nilly into the space age.

Such a system would permit the long-range transmission of higher frequencies (traveling in straight lines) and in consequence, could provide a vast increase in the number of additional channels for long-range telephone, telegraph, radio, and television service.

In my opinion and in that of a good many other Members of the Congress, ownership of these basic facilities should definitely be vested in Uncle Sam, and should not be thrown open to possible monopoly by one or more of the giant communications corporations. By this I do not mean that private enterprise should not operate various facets of the satellite communication system. On the contrary, I think they could and should do so under proper licensing provisions administered by an appropriate agency such as the Federal Communications Commission. However, the FCC and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have announced somewhat opposing views.

They feel that our "traditional policy of conducting international communications services through private enterprise, subject to Government regulations," should prevail.

Acting on these convictions, eight privately owned companies have been invited by FCC to organize a joint venture for operating the new system. These are the Radio Corporation of America, American Telephone & Telegraph, International Telephone & Telegraph, Tropical Radio & Telegraph (United Fruit), South Puerto Rico Sugar Co., U.S. Liberia Radio Corp. (Firestone), Press Wireless, and Hawaiian Telephone Co.

Obviously, only the first three of these have the financial capital, the research facilities and the manufacturing backup to handle the job. If it's to be a joint venture, it would seem pretty certain the A.T. & T. would gain financial control. It is the company with the "mostest" and the one that is pushing hardest to get the job. I don't go along with control by a single corporation. In my mind, greater opportunities should be given for participation by, say, domestic communication carriers, electronic manufacturers, and interests in the broadcast field.

There is no gainsaying the fact that private enterprise in space poses a Pandora's box of problems. Actually, satellite communications probably will revolutionize both international and domestic communications. Let's see what's involved.

Earth satellite relays relating to space radio communications include broadcasting (voice and television communications), meteorological communications, navigation communications, active and passive communication relays, space vehicle and research guidance, control tracking and telemetering, aircraft and aerospace communications relating to safety, and radio astronomy.

That's quite a bundle of highly important jobs for private enterprise to take on, even under strict Government guidance and control.

I should like particularly to point out that if FCC hands over this new satellite system to private industry, in the area mentioned above of "airplane and aerospace craft communications relating to safety," it would apparently be handing over some of the Federal Aviation Agency's own responsibility. This field, as I understand it, is within FAA's statutory area of operation.

Other thorns in the path of possible microwave communications partnership of European nations and one or several private American corporations would include sharing of benefits and costs. Who will pay for what and how much?

In this connection, NASA has been given an additional $50 million for fiscal year 1962 to assist in the new satellite communication system, and NASA Administrator Webb has indicated that this sum would provide capacity which the Government would like to see incorporated in a privately operated system.

This to me has the look of "pie in the sky." It is far from being explained to my satisfaction why the Government should provide the risk capital if one or a combination of big corporations are to have a guaranteed income, profits, and additional dividends.

Incidentally, the Department of Justice has apparently pounced on the implications of a private partnership—in which one member, the A.T. & T., would be the biggest corporation in the United States—and two members would have their own large manufacturing subsidies. Just to have the record clear, the Justice Department has spelled out the antitrust precautions it thinks should apply in case the negotiations go through for A.T. & T. and its partners. However, FCC seems to take Justice's suspicions lightly.

There is still time for Congress to consider the whole matter of private ownership versus governmental control of this new satellite system—a system which 15 years from now will be a $100 billion a year business.

This is no routine matter to be decided by a regulatory agency, and I do not feel that it should be treated as such. Not only is there a big question mark here as regards possible future monopoly of space communications, but in my opinion the success of our race with the Soviets to put the first man on the moon may well hinge on what is decided in the next few weeks about whether private industry or Uncle Sam controls our basic worldwide satellite communications system.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 18, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

St. John 16: 33: *In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.*

Most merciful and gracious God, who art daily challenging us with many glorious opportunities to serve our beloved country, grant that each may do so to the extent of his ability and all with equal fidelity.

Inspire us with a patriotism that never wavers and a courage that never falters as we strive to fulfill the high and holy mission with which we have been entrusted.

May we authenticate the glory and grandeur of the lofty ideals and principles of our Republic by manifesting these in our personal conduct and in our creed as a peace-loving nation, seeking the welfare of all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 16, 1961:

H.R. 1346. An act for the relief of John Napolis;

H.R. 4327. An act to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H.R. 4940. An act relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco;

H.R. 5178. An act for the relief of the Reynolds Feal Corp., New York, N.Y., and the Lydick Roofing Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; and

H.R. 6094. An act to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946.

On June 21, 1961:

H.R. 1293. An act for the relief of Djura Zelenbaba;

H.R. 1360. An act for the relief of Anna B. Prokop;

H.R. 1467. An act for the relief of Modesta Pitarch-Martin Dauphinais;

H.R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mary A. Combs;

H.R. 1523. An act for the relief of Kazimiera Marek;

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sato Yasuda;

H.R. 1578. An act for the relief of Mah Quock;

H.R. 1621. An act for the relief of Miss Kristina Voydanoff;

H.R. 1622. An act for the relief of Dr. George Berberian;

H.R. 1871. An act for the relief of Min Ja Lee;

H.R. 1873. An act for the relief of Anna Stanislawa Ziolo;

H.R. 1886. An act for the relief of Panagiotis Sotiropoulos;

H.R. 2101. An act for the relief of Evelina Scarpa;

H.R. 2107. An act for the relief of Pietro DiGregorio Bruno;

H.R. 2116. An act for the relief of Wanda Ferrara Spera;

H.R. 2141. An act for the relief of Henry Wu Chun and Arlene Wu Chun;

H.R. 2158. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

H.R. 3489. An act for the relief of Bernard Jacques Gerard Caradec;

H.R. 3846. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Louis Benedetti, retired;

H.R. 3850. An act for the relief of Clark L. Simpson;

H.R. 4217. An act for the relief of David Tao Chung Wang;

H.R. 4219. An act for the relief of the estate of William M. Farmer;

H.R. 4282. An act for the relief of Casimir Lazarz;

H.R. 4713. An act for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt; and

H.J. Res. 437. Joint resolution relating to the time for filing a report on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

On June 27, 1961:

H.R. 311. An act to authorize the acceptance by the Government of gifts to be used to reduce the public debt;

H.R. 1877. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of Plumbers Union Local No. 12 Pension Fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5000. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7218. An act to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 3,000 officers and members.

On June 29, 1961:

H.R. 6713. An act to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal aid highway program, and for other purposes.

On June 30, 1961:

H.R. 1425. An act for the relief of Marian Walczyk and Marya Marek;

H.R. 1441. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

H.R. 1642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lilyan Robinson;

H.R. 1677. An act for the relief of Elie Hara;

H.R. 1717. An act for the relief of Angelo Li Destri;

H.R. 1718. An act for the relief of Jaime E. Concepcion;

H.R. 1888. An act for the relief of Tomislav Lazarevich;

H.R. 2152. An act for the relief of Mrs. Francisca Hartman;

H.R. 2346. An act for the relief of Maria Cascarino and Carmelo Giuseppe Ferraro;

H.R. 2351. An act for the relief of Hans Hangartner;

H.R. 2671. An act for the relief of Giovanna Bonavita;

H.R. 2972. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cornelia Fales;

H.R. 2991. An act for the relief of Joseph Maz;

H.R. 3146. An act for the relief of Jozef Gromada;

H.R. 3283. An act to revise the boundaries and to change the name of Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4023. An act for the relief of Mieczyslaw Bajor;

H.R. 4201. An act for the relief of Evangelia Kurtales;

H.R. 4482. An act for the relief of Urszula Sikora, Radoslav Vulin, and Desanka Vulin;

H.R. 4913. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, relating to the District of Columbia Hospital Center to extend the time during which appropriations may be made for the purposes of that act;

H.R. 5416. An act to include within the boundaries of Joshua Tree National Monument, in the State of California, certain federally owned lands used in connection with said monument, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5475. An act to transfer a section of Blue Ridge Parkway to the Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5760. An act to revise the boundaries of the Scotts Bluff National Monument, Nebr., and for other purposes;

H.R. 5765. An act to authorize the purchase and exchange of land and interests therein on the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways;

H.R. 6027. An act to improve benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by increasing the minimum benefits and aged widow's benefits and by making additional persons eligible for benefits under the program, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6422. An act to add federally owned lands to, and exclude federally owned lands from, the Cedar Breaks National Monument, Utah, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7446. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates;

H.R. 7677. An act to increase for a 1-year period the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act;

H.R. 7712. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 384. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Organization signed by the Governments of the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America; and

H.J. Res. 465. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1962, and for other purposes.

On July 6, 1961:

H.R. 1710. An act for the relief of Marinder Singh Somal;

H.R. 1860. An act for the relief of Jovenal Gornes Verano;

H.R. 4500. An act to donate to the heirs of Anthony Bourbonnais approximately thirty-six one-hundredths acre of land in Pottawatomie County, Okla.; and

H.R. 5723. An act to extend the veterans' guaranteed and direct home loan program and to provide additional funds for the veterans' direct loan program.

On July 11, 1961:

H.R. 1575. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anneliese Franciska Guay;

H.R. 1602. An act for the relief of Ido Enrico Cassandro;

H.R. 1887. An act for the relief of Helen Tilford Lowery;

H.R. 2155. An act for the relief of Reoko Kawaguchi Moore;

H.R. 2156. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tui Hing Tow Woo;

H.R. 2165. An act for the relief of Marie F. Balish;

H.R. 2835. An act for the relief of Jose Lauchengco, Jr.;

H.R. 3371. An act for the relief of George Sauter (also known as Georgois Makkas);

H.R. 3722. An act for the relief of Maria Czyz Krupa;

H.R. 4636. An act for the relief of Ralph B. Cleveland; and

H.R. 4796. An act for the relief of Richard A. Hartman.

On July 14, 1961:

H.R. 1258. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 929. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the prepaid dues income of certain membership organizations to be included in gross income for the taxable years to which the dues relate;

H.R. 1353. An act for the relief of Max Bleier;

H.R. 1477. An act for the relief of Mansureh Rinehart;

H.R. 1620. An act for the relief of Kejen Pi Corsa;

H.R. 1626. An act for the relief of Jack Konko;

H.R. 1911. An act for the relief of Ricaredo Bernabe Dela Cena;

H.R. 1915. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sode Hatta;

H.R. 2360. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tome Takamoto;

H.R. 4557. An act for the relief of Manuel Martinez-Lopez;

H.R. 5432. An act to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund;

H.R. 5548. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 9 acres of land for addition to Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 392. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives to provide that Members having constituencies of 500,000 shall be entitled to an additional $500 worth of equipment; to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished Members; and for other purposes;

H. Con. Res. 308. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of parts 1, 2, and 3 of hearings entitled "Communist Training Operations—Communist Activites and Propaganda Among Youth Groups";

H. Con. Res. 309. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of hearings

entitled "The Northern California District of the Communist Party—Structure—Objectives—Leadership";

H. Con. Res. 320. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the inaugural addresses of the Presidents as a House document and providing for additional copies; and

H. Con. Res. 327. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 198 of the 84th Congress, entitled "The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 879. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6611. An act to amend paragraph 1798(c) (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes;

H. Con. Res. 311. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of House Document 336, 86th Congress, 2d session, entitled "Facts of Communism—Volume I, the Communist Ideology"; and

H. Con. Res. 342. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the tributes extended to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, and providing for additional copies.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 320. An act to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State;

S. 333. An act for the relief of Godofredo M. Herzog;

S. 763. An act to authorize annual appropriation to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained during any fiscal year in lieu of annual appropriations to restore capital impairment based on annual Treasury appraisals, and for other purposes;

S. 1054. An act for the relief of Huan-pin Tso;

S. 1070. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for an additional unit of life insurance;

S. 1088. An act for the relief of Ivan Balog;

S. 1205. An act for the relief of Roger Chong Yeun Dunne;

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Kazuo Ito and Satomi Ito;

S. 1459. An act to amend the provisions of law relating to longevity step increases for postal employees;

S. 1492. An act to amend the act of March 24, 1948, which establishes special requirements governing the selection of superintendents of national cemeteries;

S. 1527. An act for the relief of James D. Jalili;

S. 1716. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Corpacius;

S. 1775. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to expend appropriated funds to acquire approximately 12 acres of land for the Richmond National Battlefield Park, and for other purposes;

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution authorizing attendance of delegations from the Senate and House of Representatives at meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association; and

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution relating to certain aliens.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS, 1962

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7577) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President, the Department of Commerce, and sundry agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ANDREWS, GARY, CANNON, FENTON, and TABER.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 726)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 21, 29, 30, 34, and 36.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 16, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 31, 32, 33, and 40, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "a total of $100,000 for"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$77,311,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$55,352,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,053,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,553,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$58,020,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$59,590,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,464,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,360,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,748,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,740,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$33,299,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$175,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$132,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,590,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "$1,028,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 5, 17, 19, 22, 23, 35, and 38.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
LISTER HILL,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
HENRY DWORSHAK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service

Amendment No. 1—Salaries and expenses: Provides a maximum of $100,000 for conversion of research facilities at Beltsville, Md., instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2—Research: Appropriates $77,311,000 instead of $76,558,000 as proposed by the House and $78,015,500 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to includes the following increases above funds approved by the House:

(1) $10,000 to expand research on dodder;

(2) $25,000 to accelerate research on the cucumber beetle;

(3) $15,000 to accelerate research on sugarbeets;

(4) $25,000 to study the feasability of special engineering research on mechanical aids in the harvesting of citrus crops and report the findings to the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses;

(5) $20,000 to strengthen research on crown rot and bacterial diseases affecting peach production in North Carolina and South Carolina;

(6) $20,000 to expand research on windbreak shrubs at Cheyenne, Wyo.;

(7) $60,000 to accelerate research on rust strains affecting wheat, oats, and barley;

(8) $50,000 to step up research on wheat breeding and quality studies;

(9) $150,000 to accelerate research on airsac diseases of broilers and turkeys;

(10) $35,000 to strengthen soybean breeding, basic physiology and nodulation research;

(11) $200,000 to institute research on the southwest range hydrology watershed. The transfer of $25,000 to this facility will provide $225,000 each for this facility and the north central hydrology research watershed;

(12) $5,000 for housing of research machinery and equipment at Madison, S. Dak.;

(13) $5,000 for drainage research at East Franklin, Vt. In addition, not to exceed $15,000 of the contingency research fund may be used to complete terracing, subsurface drainage, and instrumentation at this location;

(14) $30,000 to accelerate research on saltcedars and other phreatophytes;

(15) $37,500 to restore funds for soil and water research at Morris, Minn.

(16) $65,500 to provide full operating funds for soil and water conservation laboratories at Tempe, Ariz.; Oxford, Miss.; Boise, Idaho; and Watkinsville, Ga.

Amendment No. 3—Plant and animal disease and pest control: Appropriates $55,352,500 instead of $55,165,000 as proposed by the House and $55,540,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes $87,500 for plant quarantine work at ports of entry and $100,000 for eradication of sheep scabies.

Amendment No. 4—Special foreign currency program: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5—Construction of facilities: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 6 and 7—State experiment stations: Appropriate $35,553,000 instead of $34,553,000 as proposed by the House and $36,553,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees request and expect that the additional $1 million will be used to step up the research program on weed investigations.

Extension Service

Amendments Nos. 8 and 9—Payments to States and Puerto Rico: Appropriate $59,590,000 instead of $58,790,000 as proposed by the House and $59,790,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10—Federal Extension Service: Appropriates $2,464,500 instead of $2,452,000 as proposed by the House and $2,477,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 11—Flood prevention: Appropriates $25,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $22,231,500 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement that of the funds provided for watershed protection, a total of $6 million may be used for investigations and planning if determined to be necessary. This is in addition to some $1.5 million expected to be expended by States and local organizations for watershed planning purposes.

Economic Research Service

Amendment No. 12—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $9,360,000 instead of $9,049,000 as proposed by the House and $9,364,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum of $11,000 is provided for studies on coffee produced in the Kona district of Hawaii.

Statistical Reporting Service

Amendment No. 13—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $8,748,000 instead of $8,688,000 as proposed by the House and $8,978,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes $15,000 for a special study and report on the practicability and feasibility of a timber price reporting service, including firm estimates on the costs involved and the proper method of financing the project; i.e., whether or not it should be financed from funds available to the Forest Service. The increase also includes $45,000 to expand cattle-on-feed reports; those proposed for Nebraska have been omitted.

Agricultural Marketing Service

Amendment No. 14—Marketing research: Appropriates $4,740,000 instead of $4,515,000 as proposed by the House and $4,870,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to includes the following increases over the House bill:

(1) $130,000 to develop plans and specifications for a research facility for peanuts and to accelerate marketing research on peanuts;

(2) $10,000 for research on maintenance of quality in citrus;

(3) $10,000 to study methods for gaging maturity of apples;

(4) $75,000 for a marketing research project in Boston, Mass.

Amendment No. 15—Marketing services: Appropriates $33,299,500 instead of $33,187,000 as proposed by the House and $33,370,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes:

(1) $50,000 for administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act. The conferees concur in the Senate recommendation that the Secretary establish a separate agency for enforcement of this act, reporting directly to an Assistant Secretary;

(2) $50,000 to strengthen supervision of U.S. grain grading;

(3) $12,500 for the Midwest carlot meat trades reports, such amount to be matched by funds from State or private sources.

Amendment No. 16—Payments to States and possessions: Appropriates $1,325,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17—School lunch program: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to earmark an additional $10 million for commodity purchases under section 6 of the School Lunch Act, $2,500,000 of which may be used to furnish special assistance where essential to provide a school lunch program. Since this is an experimental project, the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses should be kept currently advised of developments in the program.

Foreign Agricultural Service

Amendment No. 18—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes $35,000 for representation allowances as proposed by the Senate in lieu of $30,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19—Special foreign currency program: Reported in disagreement.

Commodity Exchange Authority

Amendment No. 20—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,007,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1 million as proposed by the House.

Commodity Stabilization Service

Amendment No. 21—Agricultural conservation program: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate relative to use of unexpended balances.

Amendments Nos. 22 and 23—Agricultural conservation program: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24—Special agricultural conservation program: Appropriates $18,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $15 million as proposed by the House. The conferees direct, however, that the additional $3,500,000 be placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, to be released only in such amounts and at such time as may become necessary to carry out program operations.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26—Conservation reserve programs: Appropriate $312 million as proposed by the Senate instead of $300 million as proposed by the House, and adjust administrative funds as proposed by the Senate.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendments Nos. 27 through 30—Loan authorizations: Provide $245 million for rural electrification loans as proposed by the Senate, $70 million of which is placed in a contingency reserve as proposed by the House, and provide $162,500,000 for rural telephone loans as proposed by the Senate, $30 million of which is placed in a contingency reserve as proposed by the House.

Farmers Home Administration

Amendment No. 31—Loan authorizations: Authorizes $40 million for farmownership loans as proposed by the Senate instead of $31,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 32 and 33—Loan authorizations: Authorize $275 million for farm operating loans as proposed by the Senate. The conferees direct that the additional

amount provided under Amendment No. 32 be placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget to be handled in the same manner as the contingency fund provided under Amendment No. 33.

Amendment No. 34—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $33,017,000 as proposed by the House instead of $33,167,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the General Counsel

Amendment No. 35—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to concur in the provision inserted by the Senate with the understanding that this is temporary language under which only temporary increases in staff may be made.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 36—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $3,096,000 as proposed by the House instead of $3,103,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Information

Amendment No. 37—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,590,500 instead of $1,584,000 as proposed by the House and $1,597,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38—Centennial observance of Agriculture: Reported in disagreement.

Library

Amendment No. 39—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,028,500 instead of $1 million as proposed by the House and $1,057,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 40—Limitation on administrative expenses: Provides $47,916,000 for administrative costs as proposed by the Senate instead of $47,500,000 as proposed by the House.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it takes so few, 12 percent, to produce food, clothing, and shelter for the rest of us, that the rest of us, 88 percent, provide the highest standard of living for all of us.

In that short statement lies the secret of our wonderful standard of living. Also in those few words, "It takes so few of us," is found the underlying cause of most of our present farm problems and an invitation for even greater ones for the future because the appeal by the press and by political leaders will be to the 88 percent, the nonfarm group.

Truly when the press says "$7 billion have been provided to run the Department of Agriculture" for the next year, it is evident what agriculture is up against.

Such a statement is completely misleading. The figure used includes cost of last year's foreign aid, and funds heretofore expended for numerous nonfarm programs, for the soil bank of 4 years ago, which was no good to start with but on which we are "hooked" with outstanding contracts.

Such a figure also includes the total amount authorized for loans which will be repaid with interest. Whoever heard of any responsible person contending that the sound loans of a bank should be charged up as an annual cost of operation? Only the American farmer takes such a beating before the public.

Such a statement also ignores the more than $1 billion the Department takes in each year, which goes into the general fund of the Treasury.

I would point out that only $1.4 billion in the bill is for research, extension, protection against diseases and pestilence, soil conservation, watershed protection, school lunch, and other programs for primary protection to agriculture for the good of all. It is to the farmers we must look for food, clothing, and shelter.

Seven hundred and twenty-five million dollars of the amount in the bill is for loans which will be repaid in full with interest; $312 million is to pay off previous contractual commitments made under the soil bank; $170 million is for school lunch.

More than $3 billion in the bill is to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for expenditures made for various foreign assistance and other special programs, plus price support costs of last year, for which our committee had to pick up the tab.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the administration's farm bill is hardly a cure. Frankly, to me it appears to be a grant of authority.

Despite defects in the present farm program, a comparison of its cost with costs passed to the consumer as part of the retail price by labor and industry as a result of protective laws is small indeed.

The farmer receives only 38 cents of the consumer's dollar spent for farm products. Even with all elements of cost that are paid by the consumer and by the Government, including the 163 percent markup after products leave the farmer's hands, food and fiber still remain the best bargain the American public receives.

I am particularly pleased that funds have been provided in this bill for increased attention to quarantine service, meat and poultry inspection, research and extension work, and disease and pest control. To stay ahead of insects, disease, and pestilence requires an all-out and continuous effort.

I am glad, too, that we were able to increase the school lunch funds to provide for an increasing school population.

Also, our conferees are gratified that we were able to provide increased funds for new soil conservation districts and for watershed protection and flood prevention programs. We are especially happy that we were able to get the Senate conferees to back up on their cut of $2,768,500, in flood prevention and to agree to restore half of the $1 million cut in planning funds for watershed protection. If these funds had not been restored, the Senate cut would have adversely affected perhaps the best investment the Federal Government makes in the future of our Nation.

The bigger our debt, the greater our problems, the more imperative it is that we keep a nation strong at home. We must protect our food supply.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a summary table which sets forth and compares the budget estimates, amounts passed by both Houses, and final conference action for the appropriations and loan authorizations contained in the bill.

Summary of agriculture appropriation bill, fiscal year 1962 (H.R. 7444)

Title or item	Budget estimate (revised)	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimates	House	Senate
Appropriations:							
Title I.—Regular activities	$1,409,835,000	$1,378,906,000	$1,397,897,500	$1,397,934,500	−$11,900,500	+$19,028,500	+$37,000
Title II.—Foreign assistance programs	1,709,849,000	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000	−109,849,000		
Title III.—Corporations	2,969,525,000	2,969,525,000	2,969,525,000	2,969,525,000			
Title IV.—Related agencies	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000			
Total appropriations	6,089,244,000	5,948,466,000	5,967,457,500	5,967,494,500	−121,749,500	+19,028,500	+37,000
Loan authorizations:							
Rural Electrification Administration:							
Electrification loans:							
Direct authorization	195,000,000	125,000,000	195,000,000	175,000,000	−20,000,000	+50,000,000	−20,000,000
Contingency authorization		70,000,000	50,000,000	70,000,000	+70,000,000		+20,000,000
Total	195,000,000	195,000,000	245,000,000	245,000,000	+50,000,000	+50,000,000	
Telephone loans:							
Direct authorization	150,000,000	120,000,000	150,000,000	132,500,000	−17,500,000	+12,500,000	−17,500,000
Contingency authorization		30,000,000	12,500,000	30,000,000	+30,000,000		+17,500,000
Total	150,000,000	150,000,000	162,500,000	162,500,000	+12,500,000	+12,500,000	
Total, REA loans	345,000,000	345,000,000	407,500,000	407,500,000	+62,500,000	+62,500,000	

Summary of agriculture appropriation bill, fiscal year 1962 (H.R. 7444)—Continued

Title or item	Budget estimate (revised)	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimates	House	Senate
Farmers Home Administration:							
Farm ownership loans	$31,900,000	$31,900,000	$40,000,000	$40,000,000	+$8,100,000	+$8,100,000	
Farm operating loans:							
Direct authorization	232,100,000	225,000,000	237,500,000	237,500,000	+5,400,000	+12,500,000	
Contingency authorization		25,000,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	+37,500,000	+12,500,000	
Total	232,100,000	250,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	+42,900,000	+25,000,000	
Soil and water conservation loans	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000			
Total, FHA loans	267,000,000	284,900,000	318,000,000	318,000,000	+51,000,000	+33,100,000	
Total, loan authorizations	612,000,000	629,900,000	725,500,000	725,500,000	+113,500,000	+95,600,000	

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and wish to commend him for his statements.

Mr. Speaker, our Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations has spent many days in hearings, developing all of the information which is necessary in order to render fair judgment on these matters. We had over 300 witnesses appear before us in those hearings and the information and testimony filled some 2,200 pages in the report. We on the committee made a searching inquiry into each and every one of the items in this bill, during the hearings.

As one of the five conferees from the House chosen to meet with the conferees from the Senate, I would like to say that this report of the conferees represents our combined decisions. Some of us felt that additional adjustments should have been made in a few items, but the will of the majority has prevailed, and I am giving my support to the bill as reported even though I, like other members of the conferees' committee, have not in every instance had my way.

This bill represents a compromise. It represents the group judgment of men who have literally lived with the agriculture buget in recent months. They are able men and they represent a complete range of interests from consumers to producers of various commodities.

What the future will bring in the way of new legislation and new programs, no one knows. It is, therefore, of vital importance to American agriculture, to farm people, to the food and fiber processing industries, and to the public as a whole that we properly and adequately finance the farm programs now in being and provide for the continuation of such vital matters as research, conservation, disease eradication, and school lunch programs.

The American consumer is better fed than ever before in our history, and at a lower cost in relation to hourly earnings than ever before. American agriculture has eliminated, here in America, mankind's oldest anxiety—the fear of hunger and famine. Yet agriculture, in the minds of many, is associated with the word "surplus" or "subsidy" rather than with the word "success" or "efficiency."

We must continue to make every effort to see that there is sufficient production of food and fiber to supply our Nation in the years ahead, through more effective distribution of our tremendous production; through adequate disease and pest control research; through utilization of our agricultural production with special concern for our schoolchildren and our needy.

We must assure the efficient farmers of this Nation the opportunity to achieve a decent income, without exploiting either the consumers or taxpayers, through continuation of present farm programs until better ones are enacted; through continuation and expansion of conservation of soil and water; through research aimed at control or elimination of the enormous toll taken yearly by diseases of plants, animals and poultry; through price supports for the production of agricultural commodities where needed.

At the moment we have more land than we need. Our granaries are overflowing with surplus crops in spite of land-retirement programs. But let us look at the world in which we live. In 1830, only 130 years ago, there were a billion people on this earth. In 1935 the world population had increased to 2 billion. Today the population is 3 billion, and in only 5 more years the population of the world will reach 4 billion. We are increasing at the rate of 2½ million every 10 days. The whole problem of our ability to produce in the future rests primarily with our water and soil resources and our ability to use them wisely.

In the combination of research, field experimentation, conservation, and utilization lies the hope of meeting the Nation's agricultural needs of the future.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 5, line 8, strike out lines 8 to 21 inclusive and insert: "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 market development research authorized by section 104 (a), and for agricultural and forestry research authorized by section 104(k) of that Act, to remain available until expended, $5,265,000: *Provided*, That the dollar value of the unexpended balances, as of June 30, 1960, of allocations of foreign currencies heretofore made available to the Agricultural Research Service for the foregoing purposes of section 104(a) is appropriated as of that date and shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be used to purchase such foreign currencies as the Department determines are needed and can be used most effectively to carry out the purposes of this paragraph, and such foreign currencies shall, pursuant to the provisions of section 104(a), be set aside for sale to the Department before foreign currencies which accrue under said title I are made available for other United States uses."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concure therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 6, line 20, insert: ": *Provided*, That the Secretary may purchase land at a price not in excess of $10 for construction of facilities at Columbia, Missouri."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. About how much did the Senate add to the bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. Nineteen million dollars.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Nineteen million dollars?

Mr. WHITTEN. Nineteen million dollars, which is $121 million below the budget.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 16, line 18, strike out lines 18 to 25, inclusive, and on page 17 strike out lines 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by the Senate insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That $10,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for assistance under section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, in addition to amounts normally expended for commodity procurement under that section, $2,500,000 of which may be distributed to provide special assistance to needy schools which because of poor local economic conditions (1) have not been operating a school lunch program or (2) have been serving free or at substantially reduced prices at least 20 percent of the lunches to the children".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 18, line 3, strike out lines 3 to 15, inclusive, and insert:

"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 of market development activities under section 104(a) of that Act, $3,444,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the dollar value of the unexpended balances, as of June 30, 1960, of allocations of foreign currencies heretofore made available to the Foreign Agricultural Service for the foregoing purposes of section 104(a) is appropriated as of that date and shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be used to purchase such foreign currencies as the Department determines are needed and can be used most effectively to carry out the purposes of this paragraph, and such foreign currencies shall, pursuant to the provisions of section 104(a), be set aside for sale to the Department before foreign currencies which accrue under said title I are made available for other United States uses."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 21, line 14, insert "including related wildlife conserving practices."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 21, line 16, insert: "except that hereafter not to exceed 15 per centum of the basic allocation for any State may be used to increase the State's preceding program,".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figure "15" contained in said amendment insert the figure "10."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have not read the report, as perhaps I should have, but did the House recede every time?

Mr. WHITTEN. No. The Senate receded quite a number of times. The ones that we are taking up here now are those where we disagreed with the Senate. Of course, we had to reach some agreement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The House receded sometimes?

Mr. WHITTEN. My attention is called to the fact that the House receded on 10 out of 40 amendments.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Would it save any time if we let the Senate write the bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. I have sometimes wondered, if they wrote it, whether they might "up" everything; but at least we held it down to where we receded on 10 out of 40 items, which is not a bad batting average, based on my own experience.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let me compliment the gentleman on winning at least one victory, if we did.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 28, line 21, "*Provided*, That the Secretary may, if he finds it necessary for the more effective and efficient operation of the Department, transfer additional amounts to this appropriation from other appropriations available to the Department for salaries and expenses for the current fiscal year, but this appropriation shall not be increased by more than 7 per centum by reason of such transfers."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 35 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 30, line 16:

"CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE OF AGRICULTURE

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for planning, promoting, coordinating, and assisting participation by industry, trade associations, commodity groups, and similar interests in the celebration of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture; and employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); $100,000, including not to exceed $20,000 for additional printing costs of the 1962 Yearbook of Agriculture, to remain available until December 31, 1962."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 38 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

NATIONAL LOTTERY OF DENMARK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members of this House the benevolent influence of the National Lottery of Denmark.

Denmark, like the other nations of Scandinavia, has reduced gambling to an orderly minimum by complete state control. There is no underworld problem, and illegal betting is not the source of difficulty to the police that it is in most other nations.

The gross annual receipts of the Danish National Lottery came to $6 million in 1960, and profits were applied to the general fund of the treasury.

Perhaps the greatest blessing of the Danish National Lottery, as has been indicated, is the effect it has on the underworld. State control of gambling has struck at a pillar of organized crime. Here in the United States, we could derive a similar social profit, in addition to a financial profit, from the institution of a national lottery.

FREE AIR PASSENGER SERVICE FOR AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to urge all American taxpayers who want to fly to Europe to contact the Air Force to arrange free passenger service in the same way Pierre Salinger and his daughter went to Europe on June 30.

In response to an inquiry, Air Force Secretary Zuckert tells me that Salinger and his daughter made the trip to Europe on a "space available" basis along with other nonofficial tourists. Zuckert

claims the space would have gone unused had not Salinger, his daughter, and the others taken it.

Mr. Speaker, the Salinger daughter has no connection with the Government, and I suggest all American taxpayers and their families should be allowed to take advantage of this no-cost tourist service across the Atlantic. Apparently the "space available" free-flight line forms on the left at the Air Force ticket counter.

FREE PASSENGER SERVICE TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker—may I have the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]—what was said here a moment ago is all very well, but I do not want to go to Europe. I want to go to Newfoundland. There is fine salmon fishing there and I have heard indirectly that Members of Congress can go there every weekend by Government plane. Then if they pay a little something for private transportation to some of the streams, they can get very good salmon fishing. Will the gentleman advise me by communication with my office because I do not want all the Members in on this, how we can get up there?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Wait a minute. I do not want this made public. My constituents would not approve of it. They believe we should not use tax dollars for personal pleasure and so do I.

TRANSPORTATION ABROAD

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa that a better way to get transportation abroad if he could arrange it would be the way Secretary Benson used to do it for his whole family, in a special, private plane with no other people except Secretary Benson, his family, and certain selected newspaper reporters.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. If I had had my way, Mr. Benson would not have been around to spend $227,000 on that.

Mr. HAYS. It is too bad the gentleman did not have his way, but he seemed to be a minority in his own party when Mr. Benson was around.

BOYS NATION

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is much in the newspapers and in the public mind on juvenile delinquency. I do not think we hear enough on the other, the bigger and the brighter side.

It is a matter of great pride that I announce to the House that James Nicholas Alexander, a young man from the district I have the honor to represent, was one of two young men chosen statewide to represent the great State of Illinois at the Boys Nation to be convened in Washington this week. The other young man is J. Stephen Hogland of Riverside, Ill. These two young men were selected as possessing the highest qualifications as model citizens of all the youth in our great State.

This is the sort of thing that more accurately reflects the high moral character of the modern youth of America than sensational stories of the misdeeds of delinquents, who, I hope and believe, always will be in a great minority in our United States of America.

James Nicholas Alexander is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Nicholas Alexander, residing at 7325 South Luella Avenue, Chicago, not only in the district that I represent but in the ward in which I have lived for half a century. He will be a senior at South Shore High School this fall. He has been active in all the school activities and has been president of the student council of one of the outstanding high schools in Chicago. He, with J. Stephen Hogland, were among the 1,400 Illinois high school juniors who gathered at the Boys State in Illinois, a youth activity sponsored by the American Legion for the purpose of acquainting the boys with the functioning of government on the local, county, and State level and instructing them in the duties and responsibilities accompanying the right of citizenship. Of this 1,400, young Alexander and young Hogland were selected to represent Illinois at the Boys Nation in Washington, at which there will be two boys from each of the other States of the Union selected in similar manner. As his Congressman, I am very proud of Jim Alexander. He has brought honor and distinction to the Second Congressional District, has set a pattern in deportment, morality, and patriotism.

I cannot close without expressing my thanks to the American Legion for what it is doing in its work of encouraging American youth to reach the highest traditions of our country. There is no project in the youth field that is reaching more deeply and more effectively into the problem of juvenile delinquency than this project of the American Legion. It is based upon the principle that youth can be encouraged by the setting of high ideals. This is a much better way than that of scolding and chiding.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 6 years the Congress reduced the President's requests for foreign aid funds by an aggregate of $4,565 million. During that same period the executive branch overstated the needs for the program by at least an additional $1,535 million, because that is the total amount of unobligated funds for the 6 years. Their misleading information, calculated misrepresentation, and gross lack of knowledge of the program's needs and operations now prompt the people handling foreign aid to try to get their funds directly out of the Treasury without the scrutiny of the appropriate congressional committees.

These people claim that borrowing authority, through the backdoor of the Treasury, would not weaken or lessen congressional control of the program. This is flatly misstating the facts, and those who are making these misrepresentations know that it is.

If this approach is correct, why not put the Defense Department, for example, on the same basis?

If the Congress ever releases the purse-strings to the executive branch, in the manner that is now being sought for foreign aid, the action could prove to be a direct path to socialism, or to an indirect form of dictatorship.

May the Supreme Power, at this crucial moment, give our leaders and the manipulators the courage and the sober sense of fairplay to withdraw immediately their unsound proposal to expend funds for the worldwide foreign aid program without the committees of the Congress having the right of examination and recommendation of the amounts needed, as under the present law.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the embarrassment, extravagance, waste, and abandoned projects have become so great that the dreamers and the schemers must think that unless they can hoodwink the people through this new approach, then the program would fall of its own weight, and in that process also lead to the repudiation of those people who so blandly follow bureaucratic whims from downtown.

Mr. Speaker, the great leader that you have been for so many years, can you not justify coming to the rescue of the Congress at this time, and helping it to maintain some degree of respectability from the American public? Is it not true, Mr. Speaker, that it is contrary to the Constitution and our concepts of the legislative duty and function, for the executive branch—without any legislation, or even a partial authorization, much less an appropriation—to be making such commitments, a billion to this country, a billion to that country, and hundreds of millions to

other countries? They are, through such plans, moving toward making a mockery of this legislative body that all of us love.

Let me add that if the present administration succeeds in getting the foreign-aid money through the back-door approach, when Mr. and Mrs. America finally realize what has happened to them, and to generations to follow, then in all probability there might very well be a mass involuntary retirement of members from the Congress.

INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1956—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Ninth Semiannual Report of operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 18, 1961.*

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

WORTHINGTON OIL REFINERS, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1414) for the relief of the Worthington Oil Refiners, Inc.

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MAURICIA REYES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3843) for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mauricia Reyes, the sum of $50,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Mauricia Reyes against the United States arising out of the personal injuries sustained by the said Mrs. Mauricia Reyes on November 29, 1949, at Brooke Army Hospital, San Antonio, Texas, as the result of the negligent administration of a caudal anesthetic. This claim is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11; Strike "negligent".

Page 2, line 3: Strike "10" and insert "5".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AVERY: On page 1, line 5, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$20,000".

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

Mr. AVERY. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has that amendment been agreed to?

Mr. AVERY. I would report to the majority leader that this amendment has been agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ADOLPHE C. VERHEYN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6158) for the relief of Adolphe C. Verheyn.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a)(9) and section 212(a)(19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Adolphe C. Verheyn may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "this exemption" and substitute the words "these exemptions".

On page 1, line 9, strike out the words "a ground" and substitute the word "grounds".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

FRANCISCO JOAQUIM ALVES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5138) for the relief of Francisco Joaquim Alves.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the case of Francisco Joaquim Alves. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Francisco Joaquim Alves shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to waive the provisions of section 315 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

MRS. KAZUKO (WM. R.) ZITTLE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 331) for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Wm. R.) Zittle.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Kazuko (Wm. R.) Zittle may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That if the said Mrs. Kazuko (Wm. R.) Zittle is not entitled to medical care under the Dependent's Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *And provided further,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

MRS. MARIA GIOVANNA HOPKINS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 438) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Giovanna Hopkins.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Maria Giovanna Hopkins shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 20, 1950, and her residence in the United States since July 20, 1950, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of that Act.

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

GEORGES KHOURY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1322) for the relief of Georges Khoury.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Georges Khoury shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

ZSUZSANNA REISZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1369) for the relief of Zsuzsanna Reisz.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Zsuzsanna Reisz may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ELSABETTA ROSA COLANGECCO DI CARLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1712) for the relief of Elsabetta Rosa Colangecco Di Carlo.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Elsabetta Rosa Colangecco Di Carlo, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401(e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Elsabetta Rosa Colangecco Di Carlo shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3 strike out the name "Elsabetta Rosa Colangecco Di Carlo" and substitute the name "Elizabeth Rose Di-Carlo".

On page 1, lines 11 and 12, strike out the name "Elsabetta Rosa Colangecco Di Carlo" and substitute the name "Elizabeth Rose Di-Carlo".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rose Di-Carlo."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICHOLAS J. KATSAROS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1714) for the relief of Nicholas J. Katsaros.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nicholas J. Katsaros shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of August 28, 1955.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, at the end of the bill, add the following: "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JOSEPH MICHAEL STAHL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1715) for the relief of Joseph Michael Stahl.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205, of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joseph Michael Stahl shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor child of C. Richard Stahl, Junior, and Naomi Ruth Stahl, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

HABIB MATTAR NACOL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2616) for the relief of Habib Mattar.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Habib Mattar, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Charles S. and Ida Mae Nacol, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment: On page 1, line 5, strike out the name "Habib Mattar" and substitute the name "Habib Mattar Nacol".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Habib Mattar Nacol."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORNELIS JACOBUS OVERBEEKE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3485) for the relief of Cornelis Jacobus Overbeeke.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cornelis Jacobus Overbeeke shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

RICHARD FORDHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4384) for the relief of Richard Fordham.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of section 301(a) (7) and (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Richard Fordham shall be held to have come to the United States prior to July 1, 1960.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, at the end of the bill, change the period to a comma and add the following: "and to have retained his United States citizenship acquired at birth."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

VITO RECCHIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5141) for the relief of Vito Recchia.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vito Recchia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Vito Recchia. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Vito Recchia shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

STEVEN MARK HALLINAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5735) for the relief of Steven Mark Hallinan.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Steven Mark Hallinan, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of Mr. and Mrs. James P. Hallinan.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, at the end of line 6, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT ON WEATHER MODIFICATION—FOR FISCAL YEAR 1960 (H. DOC. NO. 213)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress the Second Annual Report on Weather Modification (for Fiscal Year 1960) as submitted by the Director of the National Science Foundation.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 18, 1961.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 7

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the event a motion is made to discharge the Committee on Government Operations on the resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 7, that the time for debate be extended from 1 hour to 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the proponent of the motion and one-half by a Member designated by the Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL CAPITAL OF THE UNITED STATES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to appoint a select committee to make an investigation and study to determine whether a supplemental Capital of the United States should be established elsewhere in the country.

The resolution calls for the select committee to study and report to the House on the following:

First. Whether it is desirable for a supplemental Capital to be established;

Second. Whether the U.S. Capital should be removed to another point in the United States;

Third. Whether certain departments or agencies of our Government could be administered just as efficiently and well at places removed from the seat of the government;

Fourth. Determine what action, if any, should be taken concerning the removal of the Capital, or any of its agencies or functions, from the Capital area in Washington, D.C.

ONE WELL-PLACED BOMB

Many reasons have been advanced for a supplemental Capital, or at least a wide dispersal of Government agencies to other areas, but the one heard most often is that one well-placed bomb could knock out the entire Government.

Surely, it is time to consider whether our National Government now is so tightly concentrated as to become unwieldy. We should determine if this concentration has reached a saturation point or if it ever will.

There have been some proposals that the President maintain the Executive Mansion in one section of the Nation while Congress sits in another with the Supreme Court of the United States in still a third location. Others stoutly maintain that only nonpolicymaking agencies should be dispersed to other areas, keeping the Chief Executive, the Congress, the Supreme Court, and Departments headed by Cabinet officers in Washington, D.C.

We know our Government is big. We keep saying it is big, and it keeps getting bigger, and we know it is getting bigger. Under those circumstances, do you not think it is time we have some responsible group, like a select committee, make a study to determine what should be done for the good of our country and for good government?

MANY RESOLUTIONS

I have introduced a similar resolution in each Congress for many years. Resolutions have been introduced by others, and hundreds of thousands of words have been written on the subject for many years. We all know the problem of big government exists, so let us face the fact and do something about it.

My resolution does not select any area of the country for location of a supplemental Capital. It does not even recommend that a supplemental Capital should be established. It does call for a study with recommendations to be made by the select committee. If it is determined that a supplemental Capital should be established, it would be time, then, to decide on a site or sites.

REVOLVING LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS—THE BEST WAY TO MAINTAIN CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OVER FOREIGN AID

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter, charts, and tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly convinced that a proper solution of the foreign aid program is essential to the security of the United States and the entire free world. Therefore, although I do not purport to be an expert in the foreign aid program, I now seek recognition to present a proposal for a technique of financing the program which will, I believe, answer many of the objections to the present bill.

The strongest objections have been to the proposal for the Congress to grant long-term borrowing authority for economic development of the underdeveloped countries. These objections were described in the Sunday, July 9, 1961, edition of the New York Times in an article by Felix Belair, Jr., entitled "Foreign Aid's Hurdles," wherein he said:

Among these the scheme that has stirred the loudest and most general protest is an old idea—now revived—of financing repayable long-term economic development loans through Presidential authority to draw on

the Treasury for a total of $7,300 million in the 5 years ahead. * * *

The objection is directed not so much to the amount as the fact that it asks Congress—particularly the House—to abdicate its responsibility for making annual appropriations. The real objection here is, once authorized, the scheme would deprive Congress of its present power to call administrators to task and demand correction of wasteful and inefficient management.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Pittsburgh did not elect me to abdicate my responsibilities. They did not elect me to vote to deprive Congress of its present power to call administrators to task and demand correction of wasteful and inefficient management.

On the other hand, the people of Pittsburgh want me to support any program that will make a more efficient and economical use of the taxpayers' dollar. I am convinced that long-term borrowing authority is essential for the most efficient and economical use of our aid dollars. There are two major reasons for this: No amount of aid from the United States will help an underdeveloped country unless that country wants to help itself. If we are to persuade the recipient countries to adopt the long-term, self-help programs which are essential for them to succeed in their development efforts, it is vital for us to be able to make long-term commitments to them.

The second major reason for the necessity of long-term borrowing authority is that only if we have this form of aid can we persuade other industrialized countries to establish aid programs of their own. The development of the underdeveloped countries is too big and too expensive a job for the U.S. taxpayers to carry alone. Every effort should be made to persuade the other industrialized countries of the free world to participate. A long-term program by the United States is the best way to persuade these countries to make commitments to the underdeveloped countries. Other countries do not want to start or expand programs of their own without assurance that our program will continue. The annual appropriation method does not give this assurance. Long-term borrowing authority does.

Finally, long-term borrowing authority will result in the most efficient use of our own funds. As long as development loans are administered on an annual basis, there will be strong pressures to use available funds within the fiscal year without sufficient regard to the soundness of their use. Under such circumstances, aid dollars cannot accomplish as much as the American taxpayer has a right to expect of them.

Are these two positions irreconcilable? Must Congress decide either to give up the efficiencies and economies of long-term fnding on the one hand or, on the other hand, give up continuing congressional control over the foreign-aid program?

I think not. I think that the two positions can be reconciled.

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

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. As the gentleman knows, I have been a strong advocate of the foreign-aid program since my coming to the Congress 3 years ago. I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his well-prepared discussion today on this timely subject.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. I am quite concerned about the so-called long-term spending and backdoor borrowing. We had Secretary Rusk before our Committee on Appropriations on Foreign Operations. I asked him this question: Why cannot the administration do exactly the same thing by coming to the Congress and asking for a 5-year authorization bill with annual appropriations? You can go to Latin America, Africa, or Asia and tell them, "Here is the sense of the Congress; this is the policy of the Congress. It has passed a 5-year authorization bill." Past experience and the record will show that the Appropriations Committee has granted a very high percentage of what the administration has asked for, for foreign aid; therefore, the Congress under this proposal would not relinquish any of its authority to the executive branch of the Government. Then I said to the Secretary of State, "Let me give you an example." Last year in September the executive branch came to the Congress and asked for a half billion dollars for Latin America. Based on that authorization bill, officials of the State Department went down to Bogotá; they signed an agreement with 19 Latin American countries merely on an authorization bill. Then this year they came into the Congress and asked for a half million dollars in foreign aid for Latin America, which the Congress appropriated. It worked in this instance and I believe it can continue to work with a 5-year authorization, with annual appropriations. This is troublesome to me as a firm believer in keeping as much authority in the House of Representatives without relinquishing all of this power to the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. I concur with the objectives the gentleman has in mind. Congress should maintain control. If the gentleman will permit me, I will continue my statement and show how, under this proposal, ultimate control of foreign aid will be maintained in the Congress.

What am I proposing? I have a chart here in the well of the House which sets forth my proposal. This chart is as follows:

Proposal for foreign aid long-term borrowing authority

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Legislative years	Total new borrowing authority to be requested	Amount which could be paid out in loans by fiscal years									Cumulative total borrowing authority [1]	Cumulative borrowing authority as a percent of the administration request
		1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970		
1961	$3.8	$1.6	$0.8	$0.6	$0.4	$0.4	------	------	------	------	$3.8	52
1962	2.5	------	.8	.6	.4	.3	$0.4	------	------	------	6.3	86
1963	1.8	------	------	.4	.4	.3	.3	$0.4	------	------	8.1	110
1964	1.7	------	------	------	.4	.3	.3	.3	$0.4	------	9.8	134
1965	1.6	------	------	------	------	.3	.3	.3	.3	$0.4	11.4	156
Total	------	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(1)

[1] Without including repayment of prior loans.
[2] Totals subject to further legislation.

Mr. Speaker, what do I propose? I propose an immediate cutback of 48 percent in the amount of borrowing authority requested by the administration for fiscal 1962. I propose that this year instead of authorizing borrowing in the amount of $7.3 billion, Congress should authorize new borrowing authority in the amount of $3.8 billion. These proposed authorizations would be limited to actual payments out of the Treasury in fiscal years as follows: 1962, $1.6 billion; 1963, $0.8 billion; 1964, $0.6 billion; 1965, $0.4 billion; 1966, $0.4 billion. The total amount of borrowing authority would be $3.8 billion or 52 percent of the amount requested by the administration. Added to this amount are the anticipated repayments of Marshall plan and other loans in the amount of $300 million this year or a grand total of $4.1 billion loans to be authorized this year. Surely this account leaves the administration sufficient elbow room in the next 12 months to start a dramatic new program and yet be limited to wise and reasonable commitments.

Less than 12 months from now, under my proposal, I would anticipate that the administration would come to Congress for further borrowing authority. Under my proposal I anticipate that the administration would come back to Congress in 1962 asking for some $2.5 billion of additional borrowing authority. This would be divided over the fiscal years as follows: $0.8 billion for fiscal 1963; $0.6 billion for 1964; $0.4 billion for 1965; $0.3 billion for 1966; and $0.4 billion for 1967. When these new authorizations are added to the amounts I have proposed to be authorized this year, the administration would have $6.3 billion in loan authorization or 86 percent of the amount requested this year.

As shown on the chart, each year the administration would come back to Congress for additional loan authorizations in order to renew the loan authority which had expired. Thus the essential

power of Congress—the power of the purse—would be maintained. At the same time the administration would have the flexibility which long-term borrowing authority permits.

In short, I propose, that Congress should maintain its proper power over the foreign aid program by establishing a program of revolving loan authorizations—always subject to congressional renewal. It is a program which is flexible and fiscally sound.

Mr. Speaker, the figures which I have inserted in the chart are not inflexible. For this, and for future review of the program, I rely on the able Foreign Affairs Committee headed by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN]. What I suggest today is a technique of financing. It is the technique of "rollover" or revolving loan authorizations. Each year the Congress of the United States will have an opportunity to review the foreign aid program because each year the administration must return to Congress to request authorization for new borrowing power to replace the authorizations which have expired. This is the concept of revolving loan authorizations, always subject to congressional control.

In making this proposal I do not speak for the administration—I do not speak for the Foreign Affairs Committee—I speak as one Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. I speak as one Member of Congress who supports foreign aid. I speak as one Member of Congress who believes strongly in the importance of congressional control over the spending of the taxpayers' money. For that reason I hope that my proposal will receive the serious consideration of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and of others more directly involved in administering the foreign aid program.

Today we are in a dilemma. A new administration is saying to Congress, "Give us new tools and we will prove that we can build a more efficient and effective foreign aid program." Congress replies, "Prove that you can do it and then we will give you the new tools." The administration responds, "We can't prove we can do better unless we have the new tools."

Which comes first—the chicken or the egg?

How can this dilemma be resolved?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest for an answer to this problem that serious consideration be given to establishing a program of revolving loan authorizations, such as I have described.

I think that such a program will establish proper relationships with respect to foreign aid. There will be the right relation between Congress and the administration and the right relation between the United States and the developed and the underdeveloped countries.

Mr. Speaker, I favor foreign aid, I favor borrowing authority as the most efficient and least costly method of providing development assistance. There should, however, be congressional control. I believe that the way of reconciling these two conflicting ideas, the way of compromise, lies in the establishment of revolving loan authorizations.

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

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Under the proposal of the gentleman from Pennsylvania you are bypassing the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. That is correct. I think that my proposal is that it is in the Congress that the control should lie, whether it is via this committee or that committee. The important thing is that the House of Representatives and the other body have as complete as possible control over the program.

Mr. CONTE. If the gentleman will yield further, the difference between the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Appropriations Committee is that I believe the Foreign Affairs Committee is more concerned with the foreign policy involved; whereas, the Appropriations Committee is involved and interested in the spending. It goes through this appropriation with a fine-tooth comb. I do not always agree with what the committee does in the ultimate result, but I must agree that they do a thorough job in investigating and sifting the evidence and working on the particular programs throughout the world. This would be eliminated entirely by your proposal or by the executive branch proposal?

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. That is correct, but the important thing, it seems to me again, is that the Congress can act, not so much the committee; because if the Congress does not think a particular committee is giving sufficient review, then the Congress can act to overrule a committee.

To me the important thing is that the power be in the Congress rather than in a particular committee in Congress.

Mr. CONTE. The Appropriations Committee is a part of the Congress, too.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Of course.

Mr. CONTE. They have done an excellent job. I do not know in the 3 years I have been here when they have ever denied a commitment made by the U.S. Government. For this reason, and this reason alone, I cannot understand why you want to change the policy.

I might say that under a 5-year authorization bill we could go to any country and say, "Look, this is the policy set by the Congress of the United States and therefore we want you to put through certain social progress reforms in your country. The Congress has spoken here." I do not think that you could find one instance where the Appropriations Committee has ever denied a commitment made by the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. The position as I understand it on the request for the $7.3 billion was that in order to get the underdeveloped countries to really take serious measures of reform such as land reform, tax reform, and fiscal reform, it is necessary to give them more assurance than the promise that probably there will be an appropriation forthcoming.

Mr. CONTE. The example which I gave to the gentleman from Pennsylvania earlier definitely points up that that is not so. When we passed the Latin American Authorization Act last September, the then Under Secretary of State, Mr. Dillon, went down to Bogotá and had 19 Latin American countries join with the United States in signing this Act of Bogotá. In the act these 19 countries committed themselves to a social progress program such as land reform, education, and many other social reforms that they were going to put through.

It was merely based on an authorization bill. Then based on that they came back this year and received an appropriation from the Congress.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. I again state that I am not an expert in foreign affairs. These people who are experts say that in order to get the undeveloped countries to take up really far-reaching programs of self-help and commit themselves to them, they have to have a greater commitment from us. They also say that in order for us to persuade, say, Japan to give aid to underdeveloped countries we have to give Japan greater assurance we will continue our aid program. These are matters more properly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that that of my committee, which is the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am suggesting that if Congress is to consider this $7.3 billion 5-year look-ahead program it would be better to have a revolving fund loan authorization so that the ultimate power would always remain in the representatives of the people here in the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. I would disagree with the gentleman that it is necessary to have further inducement to have these undeveloped countries put their hands in our pockets. Under the plan the gentleman suggests here this afternoon, he anticipates the $1.6 billion should be supplemental to our annual appropriations of approximately $4 billion under the Mutual Security Act.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. My suggestion is limited merely to section 202 of the bill now before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. In other words, I do not propose any change in the other programs of mutual security and defense support, which already require appropriation.

Mr. DEVINE. The gentleman's amendment is not to add the $1.6 billion a year to the mutual security plan?

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. No, it is not.

Mr. DEVINE. This is supplemental to the $4 billion we have been appropriating for years?

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. The suggestion I am making today is directed only to changing the form of the proposal of $7.3 billion for loans for the economic development of the undeveloped countries.

Mr. DEVINE. It is somewhat of a compromise with the administration's $7.3 billion proposal?

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. CONTE. If the gentleman will yield further, I have listened attentively to the plan the gentleman has presented to the Congress today. I again want to compliment the gentleman on his study of this very important issue and on his compromise version on this vexing problem. I can say that his plan is more palatable to me than the proposal offered by the administration. However, I still am concerned that we are giving away a great deal of our authority here in the Congress. This is not a partisan statement. This has happened under the Eisenhower administration. It has happened under both Democratic and Republican administrations. They have chiseled away and chiseled away the authority of Congress. Finally, I think, we will not even have to be elected to come here and vote for these bills, we will just give the authority to the President and he will do everything. This bothers me.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. It bothers me, too.

Mr. CONTE. Under the gentleman's proposal he is submitting a 5-year backdoor spending proposition, year by year, but for those first 5 years we would have no say on that unless we repeal the act. The gentleman knows how difficult it is to repeal an act, such as in connection with housing and education or any other legislation. Once you give the authority it is very difficult to repeal it. Furthermore, the executive branch can obligate these funds for 5 years under your proposal and there is nothing we can do.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. I agree with the gentleman. I do not think we can repeal these programs. But I do not think it would be so difficult, if events prove the program was not being properly carried out to refuse to continue the loan authorizations. If, after we observe the first 12 months of operation, the Executive comes back and asks for more, the power to refuse or reduce is a real power that gives us control over the program as it goes ahead.

Mr. CONTE. That is true.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. That is the fundamental difference I was trying to get across.

Mr. CONTE. That is true, but then the horse will have been stolen when the barn door is closed and this involves $3,800 million—nothing can be done about that.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. If it is bad enough, we can repeal it.

Mr. CONTE. That would be very difficult.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. As I say, if it is bad enough, we can repeal any future aid programs in the future, and I do not like that fact, but it is a fact of life and a fact of this world that there will be continuing requests in the future which the Congress can refuse or modify and there, in my opinion, is where congressional control over the foreign-aid program will be maintained.

ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, Adm. Arleigh Burke is soon to retire from active Naval duty. The entire period of his almost 40 years of service, in peace and in war, has been characterized by devotion, courage, determination, good judgment, and action in the discharge of his duties. During these past 6 years he has rendered outstanding performance as Chief of Naval Operations, and it has been during these years of world upheaval and intensive cold-war harassments that the selfless application of his talents has made maximum contribution to the Nation. Under his direction the Navy has met every challenge throughout the world, and his counsel as a member of the Joint Chiefs has been invaluable to our overall defense.

Arleigh Burke has had a profound influence on Naval strategy. He has kept the Navy in tune with changes and developments in naval warfare, and has been the guiding force in building a Navy, which employs the newest and most effective weapons systems. We can see his handiwork and inspiration in the increased development and application of nuclear propulsion, both in submarines and surface vessels. I am sure that without his foresight the Polaris submarine program would be far behind its present status, both in effectiveness of the system and in numerical strength.

The headquarters of the 5th Naval District and of the Atlantic Fleet are located in my district, and so I am particularly aware of Admiral Burke's contributions to the operation of the Navy. In a wider application he is the man who focused attention of the world on the capabilities of seapower in the nuclear age, when people of lesser vision were saying that there was only a limited place for the Navy in the future defense of our country. Through the force of his personality, and the wisdom to see where trouble spots were likely to occur, powerful naval units have been located at key world positions. It could not have been an accident that the 7th Fleet was near the Taiwan Straits when the Chinese Communists boasted of their intentions to take the offshore islands. Nor do I think it was accidental that a carrier was available in the Caribbean when Guatemala and Nicaragua asked assistance from the United States to prevent a threatened invasion. Things like this do not just happen. They are tangible evidence of his uncanny foresight and his ability to plan and to act with courage, and conviction.

Arleigh Burke is one of the most revered and respected naval officers, not only in the eyes of his fellow countrymen and the men of the U.S. Navy, but in the hearts of navy men of many nations throughout the world. In the discharge of my duties as Representative of Virginia's Second District, and as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, it has been my good fortune to have frequent contact with Admiral Burke, and through this association to recognize his fine professional qualities, as well as the warmth of his personality. His has been outstanding service in the highest naval position our country offers. Although he is on the eve of retirement, his interest in the Navy and in the Nation's defense will never wane. I am gratified with the knowledge that the Navy and the Defense Department will long feel the influence of his service and of the plans and policies with which he has been so intimately associated.

WORLD SPORT PARACHUTING CHAMPIONSHIP

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a joint resolution, companion to the one recently filed by my able and distinguished friend and colleague, from Massachusetts, Congressman SILVIO CONTE, which would establish a temporary loan guarantee program in connection with the 1962 World Sport Parachuting Championship, to be held at Orange, Mass., next year.

The scheduled event will be the sixth world sport parachuting championship and is being held in the United States in 1962, pursuant to an invitation by the Congress and the President as provided by the provisions of Public Law 86-796.

The invitation to attend this great event was delivered by an official of the American Embassy in Vienna to the Parachuting Committee of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale, and was accepted by the 15 nations represented.

The selection of the United States as the host for 1962 was opposed publicly by the Soviet Union on the grounds that this country could not conduct a championship parachuting event as well as the previous three events which were held behind the Iron Curtain. This constitutes a real challenge to this Nation which we must cheerfully accept now.

As planned, this sixth championship will be the largest international aviation competition ever held in the Western Hemisphere. The championship will be conducted over a 26-day period in August of 1962. Fourteen of these days will be competition days—the remainder scheduled for rest and recreation of the competitors. It is expected that from 15 to 20 nations of the world will be represented and that up to 500,000 spectators will attend. In 1958, 600,000 people attended the fourth biannual competition at Bratislava, Czechoslovakia. Can we not beat this record?

I am informed that as host State, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has

appropriated $125,000, and that $100,000 of this appropriation is contingent upon at least a matching amount from a Federal source.

For that reason, if this important championship is to be assured for the United States, the Congress must immediately approve legislation guaranteeing a loan by private banks to the nonprofit championship corporation in an amount not to exceed $500,000.

These funds would be employed to promote the championship on a national and international level and as operating funds for the competition period—August 9 to September 4, 1962. The $100,000 provided by the Commonwealth will be allocated for promotion on a statewide basis, improving the present facility and planning and coordinating the event.

I am informed that management consultants retained by the commission promoting the event have estimated that if the championship is promoted on a modest scale, it will gross proceeds sufficient to pay the expenses of the event.

In that case, of course, the proposed loan guarantee of the Federal Government would be inoperative and the Government would never have to pay out 1 cent.

So far as I am concerned, I would not be concerned even if the Federal Government would underwrite the entire obligation because I feel strongly that, apart from promoting international good will and encouraging a rather unique and very valuable sport, there are extremely vital overtones of the national interest involved in this proposal.

The Soviet has long since been following the policy of encouraging and supporting organized sport in all fields. The Soviet has not only set up, but has financially supported, an extensive and huge international sports program in Russia itself and in the satellite countries to promote athletic sports of every kind, and this has accounted in large measure for the fine showing that Russia has been able to make in the past two Olympic games. There can be no question that this type of activity has been strongly subsidized by the Soviet.

But as meritorious as this sports feature of the proposal is, I am not arguing for the program provided for by the bill on this ground alone. I am absolutely convinced that this is but another field in which we should and must eagerly enter into determined and extensive competition with the Soviet and other nations of the world.

We cannot afford to be behind any nation in this kind of activity. The encouragement of sport is involved here, to be sure, but so is the entire gamut of competitive activity in which in this time of stress, anxiety, and pressure, this Nation must be prompted to engage, in order to retain its prestige in the world, adequately meet its international commitments and properly defend the United States.

In the active and aspiring Soviet world, hundreds of thousands, yes millions of boys are engaged in parachute jumping and related sports. The roll is growing larger every day so that, indeed, we are assured that millions of boys are participating in this once unique, but now vital activity.

Whether you call this activity sport, as it certainly is viewed in one sense, or whether you call it preparation for national fitness in time of emergency and danger, it seems to me that the proposal is of such merit as to be mandatory and imperative for this Nation.

In fact, for my part, I do not see how it could be rejected and ignored at a time when the Soviet and all nations in the Communist orbit are forging ahead in this important field.

Even if the Congress has to subsidize this activity, and the bill I have introduced does not require this, but calls merely for a loan guarantee that probably never will be exercised, I would still feel that the proposal was justified and should be undertaken without slightest hesitancy or delay.

Whether we like it or not, as a matter of survival, we are competing with the Soviet in every field that relates to our total national potential, and if we fail to do so, through inadvertence, miscalculation or underestimation of our opponents, we will live to regret our indifference, and complacency and tragic failure to understand the stark realities of the world in which we live.

I recognize that there will be some who consider this proposal as a waste of money, and intrusion by the Government into fields in which it has no concern. There were those who opposed Federal support of the Olympic games on this basis just as there were and are those who opposed building up the mutual assistance and defense potentials of our own Nation and the free world.

There are those who very clearly underestimate the nature of the threat we face today and perhaps overestimate our own long-range potential, even as they languish in smug complacency and apathy while the enemy stands without the gates and is, in fact, entrenched within the gates to a greater degree than many people are willing or able to recognize.

But I sincerely hope that the Members of the Congress will not adopt this attitude. On the contrary, I hope and pray that we may be awakened to a deep, moving awareness of the challenge confronting us and act in this matter which, in itself, calls only at the worst, a most improbable contingency, for assumption by the Government of relatively meager obligations.

Before our overall strength and readiness dangerously decline and fail to keep pace with the ruthless forces that oppose us in this confused, perilous, and crucial time in world history, I respectfully urge the very able and patriotic chairman and members of our great Foreign Affairs Committee of the House that this bill be considered and adopted in our best national interests, and that this Congress go on record as favoring closing at least this one small, but vital part of the gap which presently separates us from the powerful totalitarian complex that is surreptitiously and brazenly working for our destruction and the destruction of freedom in the world.

RIGHT TO WORSHIP IS PRECIOUS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point, I include therein an excerpt of some of the remarks I made at New Braintree, Mass., in my district, July 2, 1961, at the groundbreaking ceremonies for the new Pioneer Valley Academy of the Seventh-Day Adventists community to be constructed in that very beautiful town.

The site embraces about 430 acres of highland in a natural setting of surpassing beauty and scenic view—an ideal location for a school.

These ceremonies were very well attended and the program most impressive.

As part of my remarks I also include the program as well as a summary of my own remarks.

PIONEER VALLEY ACADEMY GROUND BREAKING SERVICES, SUNDAY, JULY 2, 1961

PROGRAM

The following is the program held Sunday afternoon at 3 o'clock on the Pioneer Valley Academy grounds in New Braintree:

Presentation of colors: Medical Cadet Corps, South Lancaster Academy.

National Anthem: Congregation.

Prayer: C. P. Anderson.

Adelphian Male Chorus: Director, Elder Wayne Thurber.

Speeches: Elder Merle L. Mills, Elder Willis J. Hackett, and Elder Ralph S. Watts.

Adelphian Male Chorus: Director, Elder Wayne Thurber.

Speeches: Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, and Layman B. E. Sooy.

Benediction: Elder Wayne Thurber.

Ground breaking ceremonies: Representatives of churches, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut: Elder Ralph S. Watts, general conference; Elder Willis Hackett, Atlantic Union Conference; Elder Merle Mills, Southern New England Conference; Congressman Philip J. Philbin, U.S. Government; Elder Willis Graves, pastor, John Knowles, teacher; and Franklin Greene, layman.

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN, SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS' DEDICATION, NEW BRAINTREE, JULY 2, 1961

Speaking at ground-breaking exercises for the new Seventh-Day Adventist Academy at New Braintree, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN of Clinton said "Religious liberty is one of the most precious rights guaranteed by the Constitution and we must zealously preserve free religious worship, if we would be true to our rich heritage."

"There is no time limit on the worship of God," said PHILBIN. "Freedom of belief and the right to worship in our own way is a solemn commitment of our American constitutional system. It must never be abridged, limited or weakened, because it is a great and necessary element in preserving the national unity."

PHILBIN called for firmness and strength to meet current problems which he said were challenging but could be solved, if the Nation resolves to protect freedom in all its aspects and ramifications.

"There must be a strong will to tackle our problems at the grassroots," he said. "If every community will work at solving its own particular problems, social, political, and spiritual the whole tone of national morality

and well-being can be raised. Remember that no chain is stronger than its weakest link, and we can no longer tolerate lax standards in government or in the homes of America which are sapping our vitality and dissipating our great potentials.

"Liberty, justice, democracy, and the quest for peace in our time, must be our watchwords and constant concern in these dangerous times," he said. "If we but persevere in the right, and keep ourselves strong at every level and in every way, we have nothing to fear."

PHILBIN complimented the Adventist community for its high order of citizenship, patriotism, dedicated spirit, and very able leadership.

THE IMMORTAL TY COBB

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and particularly the baseball world was greatly saddened today by news of the passing of the immortal Tyrus Raymond Cobb.

In the long history of baseball, few would doubt that there was a greater exponent or more illustrious competitor in our great national game.

Ty Cobb was born in the historic State of Georgia 74 years ago and started his baseball career when he was but 17 years of age. After a year or so of training in the minor leagues, he came to the majors where for the next 24 years he put on the greatest show and achieved the finest record ever accomplished by a baseball player.

Ty Cobb broke most of the records and still holds many of them. Who would dare to predict what his performance would be in these days of the lively ball? His performances on the diamond were phenomenal, fantastic, and unparalleled. During three seasons, he hit over .400, and throughout his entire career, his batting average was .367.

He ran the bases with daring and cunning, and in his baseball career was credited with stealing 892 bases. He possessed a mastery of hitting the baseball scarcely ever even approached in the big leagues.

He was the first to put scientific methods into the difficult art of hitting a baseball. Several other stars of the diamond made famous records as hitters and as all-around baseball players, but which of them could excel Ty Cobb? Which of them could come up to him? Was there ever such a consistent high average hitter in the game? Was there ever such an expert, daring, sensational base stealer, or such a bold, smart, aggressive competitor?

I would not attempt to answer any of these questions on my own, because the records and the exploits of Ty Cobb for 24 years on the diamond of big league baseball furnish the answers, and I have no intention of trying to set myself up as an expert in this field.

Those who know baseball best willingly attest to Ty Cobb's superiority. Anyone who has seen him play, as I have on several occasions as a youth, will agree, I am sure, he was the most colorful personality, the greatest competitor, and the best all-around baseball player who ever played the game.

Rogers Hornsby who, on his own account, would be regarded I think by baseball men as ranking close to the immortal Cobb as a hitter, put it well in his tribute when he said: "Ty Cobb was the greatest ballplayer of all time. He will never be equaled. He was a winner all the time. Ty would do anything to win a ball game, but when he got off the field, he was a perfect gentleman.

"Ty was a tremendous outfielder. Most record books simply talk about his hitting and base stealing, but he was a great outfielder."

Other famous baseball stars speak of Cobb's greatness in the same tenor. There certainly would never be another one like him, because like most everything else, baseball has changed and the greats of the past are not to be found.

Moreover, methods and tactics have changed. Seldom today do we see such precise, consistent, scientific hitting; fleet, aggressive base running; and the rough, abandoned, competitive play of Ty Cobb and baseball men of his era.

Ty Cobb was out to win and he used every ounce of his skill, daring, cunning, energy, and strength to do so. Judged by modern methods, perhaps he cut some corners, and used tactics that would be frowned upon today. He came into the bases with his spikes showing; he relished physical encounter; he practiced the show and use of force, even though he was a man of supreme skill in all departments of the game; he would not hesitate to jump into the stands, when bottles or epithets were thrown at him in order to resent personal affront with some well-directed blows.

Taking Ty Cobb's record on the whole, carefully going over his tremendous ability as a consistent hitter, his demonstrated skill and daring on the bases, his sure fielding and, above all, his inspirational qualities, which so often carried his teammates along with him to victory. Ty Cobb was certainly without an equal on the diamond.

He carried his quick thinking, shrewdness and good judgment into the business world with him and amassed a substantial fortune in a comparatively short time, much of which is generously distributed to worthwhile charities of his own selection.

Ty Cobb represented the kind of colorful, inspiring American who played the game to win and kept fighting to the end on the diamond and in life. He never gave up the ship.

He always played one more inning, sought one more time at bat and broke up many ball games. Great competitor and great American, his memory will never fade among those who like our great national game. To baseball lovers and American youth he has bequeathed a precious legacy.

He is indeed baseball's immortal and the American people deeply lament his passing. It is with a most sorrowful heart that I note the passing of the great Ty Cobb and pay my heartfelt tribute to his memory. To his family and dear ones and his great State, I express my most sincere and heartfelt sympathy. May he find eternal rest in his heavenly home. May he revel forever on the perpetually green diamonds of the sweet Elysian fields.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD news accounts of the passing of Ty Cobb.

(The material follows:)

[From the Boston Herald, July 18, 1961]

DIAMOND DAREDEVIL, 74, DIES IN GEORGIA HOSPITAL: TY COBB VICTIM OF CANCER

(By Vernon Butler)

ATLANTA.—Ty Cobb, the choice of countless fans as the greatest baseball player of all time, died Monday of cancer. He was 74.

Death claimed the fabulous Georgia Peach at 1:18 p.m., e.s.t., in Emory University Hospital. His physician, Dr. Hugh Wood, disclosed Cobb had been under treatment for cancer of the prostate gland since December 1959. The malignancy had spread to the pelvic bones and the vertebrae.

The doctor, who was also Cobb's personal friend, said he was not permitted to reveal the diagnosis before Cobb's death.

"He died peacefully and without pain," Wood reported. The doctor said Cobb also "had diabetes and chronic heart disease. While his general condition had deteriorated during the past two weeks, the end came rather suddenly."

With Cobb in his last hours were his son, James, his daughters, Miss Shirley Cobb and Mrs. Beverly McLauren, all of California; and his first wife, the former Charlie Marion Lombard of Augusta, Ga. The Cobbs were divorced in 1947 after 39 years. Cobb married Mrs. Frances Case of Buffalo, N.Y., 2 years later, and they were divorced.

Cobb, his full given name was Tyrus Raymond, retired from baseball in 1928 after 24 years of successful assault on almost every record in the books. He broke into the major leagues at Detroit in 1905 and batted only .240, but that was his first—and last—season of mediocrity. For 23 consecutive years he batted over .300 and compiled a lifetime average of .367. He played all except 2 of his 24 seasons with Detroit and managed the Tigers for 6 years. He spent his last two seasons with Connie Mack's Philadelphia Athletics.

PLAYERS, FANS DETESTED COBB

He led the American League in hitting for 12 seasons, nine of them consecutive, and three times he broke the .400 barrier. His .420 average in 1911 still stands as the highest in the history of the American League. He led the league that year in 12 categories.

When baseball people balloted in 1936 for the first group to be enshrined in Baseball's Hall of Fame, Cobb polled 222 of a possible 226 votes and drew more acclaim than Babe Ruth, Hans Wagner, and Christy Mathewson—his chief rivals for the "greatest of all-time" label.

Always fiery, always aggressive, Cobb was never rated high in popularity with his fellow players, and many fans detested the sight of the Georgian's flashing spikes.

He was the acknowledged king of all the hitters and all the baserunners, especially the latter. He stole 96 bases in 1915 for a record and had a career total of 892. He wound up his amazing career with 4,191 hits and 2,444 runs, both records.

His base-running tactics led to frequent fights with opponents, and on occasion Cobb would even dash into the stands after heckling fans. But Cobb, who did more than any other player to bring science to baseball was foxy enough not to scrap with the umpires.

Cobb spent most of his retirement in his ranch-type mansion at Atherton, Calif., and his Glenbrook retreat on Lake Tahoe, Nev., but he lived recently in a secluded apartment nook in Cornelia, Ga.

DEATH FOILS PLAN TO BUILD A HOME

His death cut short his plans to build a home "in which to die"—as Cobb himself put it—on his 76-acre tract atop a mountain at Cornelia, only 4 miles from the settlement of Narrows, Ga., where he was born December 18, 1886.

Cobb played sandlot ball near his northeast Georgia birthplace and made his professional debut at 17 with Augusta, Ga., in the South Atlantic League.

Cobb's shrewdness extended beyond baseball and into the business world. Portions of his salary, nothing like the astronomical amounts paid to lesser stars today, went into blue-chip stocks, and Cobb became a millionaire. Cobb's annual baseball pay ranged from $1,800 to $40,000.

In 1950, he established the Cobb Memorial Hospital at Royston, Ga., a few miles from his birthplace in honor of his mother and father. At the same time he set up a $100,000 endowment fund for the care of indigent patients.

AIDED DESERVING GEORGIA STUDENTS

Three years later, he endowed the Cobb Educational Foundation to help deserving Georgia students obtain college educations. He took an active interest in this undertaking and spent much time working with the committee that handled the scholarships.

Cobb had been in and out of Emory University Hospital several times in recent years. He entered for the last time June 5.

Funeral plans will be announced later.

[From the Worcester Telegram, July 18, 1961]

"COBB'S COMPETITIVE SPIRIT MUST BE CONTINUED"—FRICK

(By the Associated Press)

The late Ty Cobb was called by Commissioner Ford Frick a "great baseball player who was representative of a competitive spirit that must be continued if baseball is to continue."

Frick said Monday the death of Cobb "marks the passage of one of the few remaining links between the old and the new."

"We have many baseball players," said Frick. "But very few Ty Cobbs. He belongs with the Ruths, Mathewsons, Alexanders, and Johnsons of a golden era."

GREATEST OF ALL

George Weiss, president of the New York Mets, said:

"There was no denying that Cobb stood alone as a baseball player, undoubtedly the greatest of all.

"Ours was a friendship of long standing. He played for me at New Haven when there was no Sunday baseball in New York and was a stockholder with me at New Haven. Only last summer he was my guest at a Baltimore series in Yankee Stadium.

"His death is still a real shock although we knew he was failing.

"Baseball and the Detroit Tigers owe more to Ty Cobb than either of them will be able to repay, regardless of the well-deserved honors heaped upon the greatest of all Detroit players."

GAVE TIGERS DISTINCTION

Detroit Tiger President John Fetzer used these words in commenting on Cobb's death.

"His inspired performance more than 50 years ago enabled the Tigers to acquire distinction in the American League almost from the moment of its birth—a respected position they might not have attained without the impetus provided by Cobb's history making feats," Fetzer added.

"The world of baseball has suffered one of its greatest losses in his death."

Paul Kerr, vice president and secretary of the Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum:

"Sorry to hear about Ty," said Stan Musial, St. Louis Cardinals' star, when informed of Cobb's death. "He was a great baseball figure, a great credit to the game. He always followed the game closely, even when he was no longer directly connected with it."

General Manager Bill DeWitt of the Cincinnati Reds, said, "Cobb was one of the first great ball players I ever saw. He was colorful and exciting and his alertness, aggressiveness, and determination will be long remembered."

"BROKE ME UP"—BAKER

J. Franklin (Home Run) Baker said Cobb's death "really broke me all up."

Baker said Cobb "was one of the great baseball men we had." The 85-year-old former third baseman in the famous $100,000 infield of the old Philadelphia Athletics said Cobb "was one of the greatest base runners the game has ever seen * * * I've never seen one in a class with Ty."

Casey Stengel, former New York Yankee pilot, called Cobb "the most sensational of all the players I had seen in all my life."

"By sensational," Stengel elaborated, "I mean he surprised all his opponents. He would shock them with startling base running plays, and he could always out hit any opponent even if they were great players."

Stengel recalled once seeing Cobb tag up and score from third on an infield pop-up. "He just waited until the infielder got ready to throw to the pitcher," said Stengel.

PLAYED AGAINST COBB

Sisler, now with the Pittsburgh organization, played against Cobb with the old St. Louis Browns.

"He was a good friend of mine, and I consider him a fine man and gentleman," Sisler said. "And, of course, everyone knows he was a wonderful player."

Tom Yawkey, owner of the Boston Red Sox:

"I have lost a longtime friend with the death of Ty Cobb. Much of my early interest in baseball was aroused by meeting and knowing Ty at a very young age and there is no doubt in my mind that he was the greatest all-round ballplayer of all time. I was privileged to have the opportunity to associate with him, not only in baseball but also as a good friend and hunting companion on many occasions. I will miss him personally and baseball has lost one of its greatest competitors."

GILES' COMMENT

Warren Giles, president of the National League, said baseball "lost one of the greatest players of all time. Cobb will be missed greatly at the Hall of Fame ceremonies he attended regularly."

Mickey Mantle of the New York Yankees appeared shocked when he heard the news of Cobb's death.

"I'm sorry to hear it," Mantle said. "He used to come see me in the dugout when he visited New York and give me some batting tips."

Rogers Hornsby called Cobb "the greatest ballplayer of all time" and said the Georgia Peach would never be equaled.

"He was a winner all the time," he said. "Ty would do anything to win a ball game, but when he got off the field, he was a perfect gentleman.

"Ty was a tremendous outfielder. Most record books simply talk about his hitting and base stealing. But he was a great outfielder."

TWENTY-ONE RECORDS

ATLANTA.—Ty Cobb held 16 major league records and shared five at the time of his death.

The records still unsurpassed:

Highest percentage, 10 or more seasons, .367.

Most years leading league percentage, 12.

Most consecutive years, leading league, percentage, 9.

Most years batting .300 or better, 23.

Most games played in major leagues, 3,033.

Most times at bat, lifetime, 11,429.

Most runs scored, lifetime, 2,244.

Most hits, lifetime, 4,191.

Most one-base hits, lifetime, 3,052.

Most years leading league in hits, 8.

Most years 200 or more hits, 9.

Most times, 4 or more hits in a game, lifetime, 14.

Most stolen bases, lifetime, 892.

Most stolen bases, season, 96.

Most total bases, lifetime, 5,863.

Most triples, lifetime, one league, 297.

The records tied:

Most years batting .400 or better, 3.

Most consecutive years batting .400 or better, 2.

Most years playing 100 or more games, 19.

Most times 5 hits in a game, season, 4.

Most home runs, two consecutive games, 5.

Year-by-year major league playing record of Hall of Famer Ty Cobb

Year	Games	At bat	Runs	Hits	Stolen bases	Percent
1905	41	150	19	36	2	0.240
1906	97	350	44	112	23	.322
1907	150	605	97	212	49	.350
1908	150	581	88	188	39	.324
1909	156	573	116	216	76	.377
1910	40	509	106	96	65	.385
1911	146	591	147	248	83	.420
1912	140	553	119	227	61	.410
1913	122	428	70	167	52	.390
1914	97	345	69	127	35	.368
1915	156	563	144	208	96	.370
1916	145	542	113	201	68	.371
1917	152	588	107	225	55	.383
1918	111	421	83	161	34	.382
1919	124	497	92	190	28	.384
1920	112	428	86	143	14	.334
1921	128	507	124	197	22	.389
1922	137	526	99	211	9	.401
1923	145	556	103	189	9	.340
1924	155	625	115	211	23	.338
1925	125	314	97	157	3	.378
1926	79	233	48	79	9	.339
1927	134	490	104	175	22	.357
1928	95	353	54	114	5	.323
Total	3,033	11,429	2,244	4,191	892	.367

[From the Boston Herald, July 18, 1961]

TY ALWAYS PLAYED HARD, NEVER DIRTY

ROCKY MOUNT, N.C.—Baseball immortal Ty Cobb was described Monday by a former roommate as a man "who simply played the game hard, but never dirty."

Frank Walker, who as a Detroit player roomed on the road with Cobb from 1914–16, said the Georgia Peach was a perfect gentleman and a close friend.

"He was a terror and an enemy to anyone who stood in his way," said Walker, a semiretired Rocky Mount Printing Co. executive. "In running bases, all he asked for was his half of the bag. If you didn't give him that, he would take it." But Walker rejected any idea that Cobb was a dirty base runner.

Walker said one of the most amazing feats Cobb ever pulled occurred in Washington in 1914. "With the score tied, 1–1, going into the 12th, Cobb was the first batter up. When he left the dugout, he said he was going to break up the game," Walker recalled.

"Cobb bunted and raced to first for a single. Then he stole second, third, and then stole home with the winning run."

"He was a wonderful ballplayer and a great athlete," said Walker.

[From the Boston Globe, July 18, 1961]

COBB'S GREATEST FEATS NOT IN BOOKS—CAN'T EVALUATE HIS DARING, INTELLIGENCE, AND INNOVATIONS BY STATISTICS

(By Jerry Nason)

Ty Cobb left behind him a column of baseball records as long as an NBA rebounder's arm.

It will be a travesty, though, if Cobb's monument to himself is confined to statistics, however startling—because his greater contributions were not of that kin.

How do you evaluate the intelligence, imagination, daring, and innovations this remarkable man brought to baseball?

In this latter day of the power theory in baseball few are aware, or care, that Cobb:

1. Was the first ball player in history to score from second base on an outfield putout;

2. First base runner to ever sprint from first base to third on a sacrifice bunt (he even did it twice in one game);

3. First man to score from first base on a single.

4. Nobody thought of sliding into first base until Cobb did it.

Where, in the glory-be record book, can you find anything about Cobb saying to Cleveland's Bill Bradley, rated the best defensive third baseman of his era, "Today I'm going to bunt down the third base line every time I'm at bat"—then beating out four bunts to Bradley?

Oh, the record book—long genuflected to in our trade—cannot tell the true story of this impetuous, imaginative hero of the past.

TALKED JACKSON OUT OF TITLE

Do the records tell the great tale of Cobb, the psychologist, who talked mighty Joe Jackson, the illiterate, out of the 1911 batting championship of the American League?

(They were deadlocked, .412 apiece, when Cobb told Jackson, "Joe, too bad you're not in the National League. You'd win the bat title over there.")

Two weeks later Cobb finished at .420, Jackson at .408.

You can peruse the record book through your grandmother's bifocals and you will never find mention of the day Cobb, the "scientific" hitter, growled at reporters, "Home runs are easy to hit!"

He proved it, that day and the next, hitting three in one game and two the following day.

And no amount of diligent inspection of the revered little red bound volume will uncover that epic of Cobbian confidence when he told Lou Criger of the Boston Americans, a great catcher in any day, "Lou, today I'm going to steal the shirt off your back."

Cobb got on base in the first inning—stole second, third, and home. This was a blatant piece of pilfering, and Cobb was proudest of it.

"Criger was a great catcher," he later confessed at a Fenway Park Old Timers' Day, "but it was mostly the pitcher I was stealing against."

POWER GAME BROKE HIS HEART

To his final day on earth, yesterday, Ty Cobb maintained a lively interest in baseball players, rather than in baseball. The game itself, as it is accentuated to power, broke his heart.

"When the value of one run was destroyed," he grieved, "something went out of baseball for me.

"Today, anybody can score from second base on a routine single. The stolen base has no value, because a runner on first base is automatically in scoring position in this 'long ball' type of game.

"The livelier baseball forces outfielders to play so far back that they are just caddies now."

You knew in your heart, however, that if this day had been Ty Cobb's day, his genius with a bat, his agility, strength, intelligence, and daring would have permitted him to dominate it, even as he did in his youth.

THE MYTH OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION WITHOUT CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a great number of citizens in this country are honestly in favor of Federal aid to education. Whether or not they represent a minority or majority is something which, of course, is a subject of debate. It is my firm belief that those who want Federal aid to education represent a minority. There is no debate, however, on the argument that most of those who favor Federal aid in the new, direct general aid sense believe this can be done without control of local school districts from Washington. I feel that a majority of those who honestly favor aid to education in the manner provided in the administration proposals also believe that there should not be control.

It is my opinion that it has been folly to argue that we could have a comprehensive aid to education program without controls. The current bills which are stalled in Congress do have controls. Of course, they are given other names by the sponsors and supporters of these bills. When asked how they reconcile these obvious controls in the aid to education bill with their protestations that no controls exist, the sponsors merely say "These aren't controls—they are merely 'criteria' by which you determine the aid." It matters not whether you refer to controls as criteria, standards, or any other words if they basically designate and set out controls.

That there was any doubt of the Federal bureaucrats' intentions in this matter was laid to rest with the discovery of a Health, Education, and Welfare publication, "A Federal Education Agency for the Future," which is a report of the Office of Education, dated April 1961. The report was compiled over the preceding 5 months, according to the foreword, and I feel that its pronouncements are a blueprint for complete domination and direction of our schools from Washington. The publication was not popularly distributed and there was some difficulty in obtaining a copy.

Fifty-six pages of findings contain recommendations which call for more and more Federal participation and control and repeatedly stress the need for Federal activity in formulating educational policies. It recommends a review of teacher preparation, curriculum, and textbooks. It calls for an implementation of international educational projects in cooperation with UNESCO in the U.N. and ministries of education abroad. Of course, it recommends an enlarged Office of Education and the use of social scientists as key advisers. In typical Federal bureaucratic style, it builds the need for these programs and cites self-serving protestations that there has been a change in public belief which supports more Federal intrusion. This is based to a large extent on what they term as popular acceptance of other foot-in-the-door educational programs of Federal aid.

On page 6, the report boldly calls for an additional function of the Office of Education, that of "extensive involvement in formulation"—this is italicized for emphasis—"of national policy." On page 31, referring again to the agency of the future, it states:

> It must also prepare itself to assume larger responsibilities in carrying out Federal policy through the administration of operating programs. It must assume a new role, speaking within the Federal Government for the long-term interests of education. And it must render assistance in the development of public educational policy.

With the declaration that "it is almost equally evident that national observers are especially well qualified to assess the international deficiencies of our domestic educational system," it places stress on "implementing international educational projects in the United States and in bringing maximum effectiveness to the total international educational effort." Would not the Communists with their footholds and infiltrations in these organizations, love this.

No detail has been overlooked—"curriculum will have to undergo continual reshaping and upgrading; and new techniques and tools of instruction will have to be developed" and "teacher preparation, textbooks, and the curriculum in these subject fields must be improved in the decade ahead." These goals are laudable but this demonstrates who intends to take the responsibility.

This report indicates beyond a shadow of a doubt that Federal bureaucracy does have a plan for Federal control of education. One of the most interesting statements in the entire document is contained in the foreword which was written

by Sterling M. McMurrin, Commissioner of Education. He concludes the foreword with these words:

While the full evaluation and adoption of recommendations made in this report will require a period of review, I anticipate that much of this activity will take place through normal administrative processes within the Office and the Department.

What is meant when he says "I anticipate that much of this activity will take place through normal administrative processes within the Office and the Department"? In the jargon of Washington bureaucracy this means that the report will be largely implemented on the administrative level without congressional action and approval. Let those who think this is an idle threat study closely the Office of Education. There is very little of a definitive nature in our laws which sets out the functions of this Office and it is in an ideal position to accomplish its goals in a quiet, methodical way.

While every overt effort is made by the Office of Education to conceal their design for control of the Nation's educational system, their actions and words make it clear that our Washington educationists will control every facet of our educational processes. The House Committee on Education and Labor recently voted out H.R. 7904 which would extend the National Defense Education Act. It is evident that the administration has chosen this vehicle for enacting piecemeal the recommendations of "A Federal Education Agency for the Future." I am including the minority report on this bill at the conclusion of these remarks. It gives a penetrating analysis of the real intentions of the NDEA amendments. This is but one of the actions which speak louder than words.

However, the "words" tell a very interesting story also. Carroll Hanson, Director, Publications Services, Office of Education, transmitted an unpublicized memorandum to the Committee on Mission and Organization of the U.S. Office of Education when it started its work which ultimately wound up in the report in question. In it he laid bare the real nemesis of the Federal bureaucrats—the tradition of local control. On one hand he referred to this doctrine as a "valuable tradition" but this window dressing was brushed completely aside with these prophetic words:

However, the tradition of local control has been used by certain groups to forestall increased expenditures for education; it has been used to frighten the Office of Education out of areas where the national interest is involved and where the Office does have a legitimate concern. The tradition of local control should no longer be permitted to inhibit Office of Education leadership.

There can be little doubt what this means. The blueprint for Federal control of our educational processes comes from this view which holds to the necessity of overcoming the tradition of local control.

Another staff report of the Office of Education, written by E. Glenn Featherston, Assistant Commissioner and Director of State and Local School Systems, cites the life adjustment movement as an example of the areas where the Office might lead the schools to sound agreements on education. He recommends a deliberate and planned effort to influence on an extensive nationwide scale, thinking on American education.

He explains:

I mean the Office of Education trying to bring together the representatives of the many varied interests in education and trying to lead them to sound agreements on American education and "selling" them the results of such efforts.

When was it ever decided that diversity of education was not a good thing? Is it so necessary to have uniformity in our educational system?

Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of the indications of thought from the Office of Education. In the report which is printed below we find the vehicle for Federal domination of our schools. It is a real and present danger. The battle lines are now drawn between those who seek control and uniformity of our local schools and those who oppose this further bureaucratic centralization in Washington. It is my sincere hope that the Congress will respond to this challenge and defeat the aid to education bills which will implement the goals incorporated in "A Federal Education Agency for the Future":

A FEDERAL EDUCATION AGENCY FOR THE FUTURE

DOCUMENT NO. OE-10010

(Report of the Committee on Mission and Organization of the U.S. Office of Education, by U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham A. Ribicoff, Secretary)

(NOTE.—Page numbers of the report are shown in parentheses and are inserted at the end of the page's contents)

FOREWORD

The report that follows, "A Federal Education Agency for the Future," is the result of the efforts over the past 5 months of the Committee on the Mission and Organization of the Office of Education. This committee, consisting of several distinguished members of the career staff of the Office, was charged by Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, former Commissioner of Education, with developing: a clear-cut and balanced statement of the mission proper to the Office of Education over the next decade, and a reasonably detailed outline of an organizational structure that would be most conducive to the effective and efficient accomplishment of that mission.

I wish to commend the members of the Committee and their Chairman, Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., for their well-considered recommendations. It is my conviction that the spirit and purpose of the report deserves the hearty endorsement of the staff of the Office of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. While the full evaluation and adoption of recommendations made in this report will require a period of review, I anticipate that much of this activity will take place through normal administrative processes within the Office and the Department.

STERLING M. MCMURRIN,
Commissioner of Education.

STUDY GROUP ON MISSION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Committee: Homer D. Babbidge, Chairman; Rall I. Grigsby, Vice Chairman; Lane C. Ash, David Clark, Thomas E. Cotner, Charles P. Dennison, Herbert Espy, Arthur L. Harris, John G. Lorenz, B. Harold Williams.

Ex officio members: Ralph C. M. Flynt, John F. Hughes.

Liaison representative with the Office of the Secretary: David T. Stanley.

Staff: Russell A. Wood, director, Sally H. Bond, recorder; Sonia Ashworth, Donald S. Conley, Edward Cunningham, Chalmers G. Norris.

Consultants: John J. Corson, Thomas D. Morris, Don K. Price.

THE MISSION

The basic mission of the Office, to "promote the cause of education," remains unchanged since its establishment in 1867. What has changed is the American public's conception of the role of its Federal Government in education.

For three quarters of a century, the Office of Education was regarded as an agency for the collection and dissemination of information describing the state of American education. As the American educational system became increasingly complex, the Office of Education assumed the responsibility for analyzing and interpreting this descriptive information. The knowledge born of such study made the Office a source of professional consultative service to organized education. Thus did the Office mature from a censuslike statistics gathering agency into a broader professional resource for American education and, more particularly, American educators.

It is of fundamental importance to note that throughout its development in its first three quarters of a century, the Office existed in a society in which virtually all responsibility for the conduct of American education rested outside the Federal Government. Given a situation in which the directive force of American education resided in States, local communities, and autonomous institutions, it was inevitable that the pattern of the Office of Education's activities would be formed largely by outside forces—by the demands and needs of those who were responsible for the actual conduct of American education. In the words of a contemporary student of society, the Office of Education was "other-directed."

However imperfectly it may have performed it, the Office of Education had, during this period of its development, a clear responsibility to assist educators throughout the Nation to do their work as they saw their work. Problems identified by working educators were referred to the Office for study and analysis, and solutions frequently emerged. But these solutions were—quite properly—the solutions to local problems, advocated only by those with actual responsibility for local education. The value of the Office's function in this process is, to the Committee, obvious. The failure of the Office to do all that it might have done, and all that it might have wished to do in this role (p. 1) must be attributed to a combination of factors that include the great variety of local needs and problems, and the absence of adequate mechanisms for the identification of common, recurring, and broadly pertinent problems. The latter obstacle has always been critical, in view of the obvious impossibility of creating a Federal agency that could meet all demands for educational service. The Office has had to be highly selective in its areas of professional service, not always in the confidence that it was selecting the most important areas of service, but always in the certainty that it was neglecting many important areas.

The need for service to organized education—service based upon sophisticated analysis and study—has not abated in recent years, nor will it in the future. Indeed, the need for such service is growing and will continue to grow at a rate that poses a real test of the responsiveness of the Federal Government. Despite the significant changes that have taken place in the Federal

role in education, the center of gravity in American education rests well outside the Federal Government, and will in the opinion of this Committee continue to do so. So long as the doers of American education are in local, State and independent enterprises; so long as they confront problems beyond the reach of their professional resources; and so long as a Federal agency exists to "promote the cause of education," then for just that long there must exist an extensive program of research-based service within the Office of Education.

This Committee will recommend in this report that the Office of Education assume new and important responsibilities. But before doing so, it wishes to underscore as forcibly as it can, the need for strengthening of the Office's time-honored functions in the area of professional assistance to education as it is organized. To be sure, the Committee will suggest significant modification of the manner in which such assistance is rendered; but these modifications have as their sole objective the enhancement of the quality of service to organized education. The need for effective service to organized education is so great and is growing so fast, the complexity of educational challenges multiplying so rapidly, that the Committee urges the simultaneous expansion and streamlining of Office activity in this area. Principally, the knowledge resources of the Office (including statistical data and research findings) must be greatly enhanced and their dissemination made fully effective through the use of modern techniques; methods for the planned identification of priority service needs and their effective programing developed; and a greater degree of mobility and flexibility of service activities effected. Only (p. 2) in these ways can the most historic of Office functions be performed in the key and on the scale that the future demands.

New responsibilities have fallen to the Office of Education during the past decade, supplementing but not replacing those that emerge from its more historic role. These new responsibilities reflect nothing more or less than a change in public conviction as to the role of the Federal Government in the area of education. We have said that responsibility for the conduct of American education—at all levels—remains and will remain outside the Federal Government. But the American people have come to use the one Government they have in common to augment and strengthen the activities of the several governments they have separately. The reasons for this are perhaps better analyzed by economists and political scientists; this Committee acknowledges it as a fact. The Committee foresees an extension of the active Federal role in education.

The Federal Government has become an active participant in the effort to promote the cause of American education. Two examples will suffice to point out the extent of this shift in attitude, and to suggest certain major reasons for that shift.

School assistance in federally affected areas: In 1950, the Congress enacted Public Laws 815 and 874, authorizing Federal payments to local school districts for the construction, and the maintenance and operation, of public elementary and secondary schools. This legislation acknowledges, in effect, the unavoidable interrelationships of public actions taken at different levels of government. By this congressional action alone, the Office of Education has been called upon to administer funds in excess of two billion dollars during the last decade.

The National Defense Education Act: In 1958, the Congress enacted Public Law 85-864, a complex and far-reaching program involving elementary, secondary, and higher education, and having the twofold objective of improving the quality of instruction in the Nation and of encouraging and enabling the fullest development of able youth. The Congress here acknowledged the existence of an identifiable national interest in strong instruction in certain fields, and a national need for highly trained manpower. Careful always to work in ways that strengthen local autonomy, the Congress nevertheless acknowledged the propriety of Federal stimulus at those points and in those areas of education in which the Nation as a whole has a greater stake than might be recognized locally. This congressional action makes (p. 3) the Office responsible for the administration of $187,480,000 of current appropriations.

These two congressional actions indicate the extent to which the Office of Education has recently been called upon to execute Federal policy affecting education. It is estimated that about 60 percent of the total Office of Education staff is now engaged principally in the performance of this function. The Office is responsible for the execution of public policy as expressed in over 20 separate pieces of legislation, with grant and contract responsibilities amounting to approximately half a billion dollars a year. The Committee anticipates further extensive growth in this area of Office responsibility. Pending before the Congress at the time of this writing are recommendations of the President that would, if enacted, almost treble the grant budget of the Office of Education.

But not all Federal programs affecting American education are or should be the administrative responsibility of the Office of Education. In higher education alone, it is estimated that some 1.5 billion Federal dollars flow annually to or through colleges and universities, but the Office is responsible for administering less than 10 percent of this amount. Research expenditures of the Department of Defense, the National Institutes of Health, and others, are among the items that account for the bulk of Federal expenditures. Increasing concern has been expressed in and out of Government over the possible ill effects of such expenditures on American institutions of higher education.

The Office of Education, as a result of a specific congressional mandate in title X of the National Defense Education Act, has been delegated the responsibility of advising and consulting "with the heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of scholarship, fellowship, or other educational programs with a view to securing full information concerning" such programs and "to developing policies and procedures which will strengthen the educational programs and objectives of the institutions of higher education utilized for such purposes." No less urgent need exists for the assessment of the impact of aggregate Federal action upon the elementary and secondary schools of the Nation. Thus, out of the increasingly active role of the Federal Government in our society, emerges yet another new function and responsibility of the Office of Education. It is to be responsible for the monitoring (in the communications rather than the schoolmaster's sense of the term) of Federal activities that affect the Nation's educational well-being. As such, it must assume the role of a voice of conscience (p. 4) within the Federal Government, speaking for the long-term national interest in education, in contrast to the voices that speak of a shorter-range Federal interest in the many uses to which education can be put.

Still another new dimension of Office responsibility has emerged during the last decade, the future implications of which impress this Committee as being of substantial magnitude and extraordinary significance. We refer to the area of international education. The compelling character of world developments inevitably affects educational practices and, as inevitably, educational organization. As the United States has acknowledged its international responsibilities, this has been mirrored in educational affairs, for the educational foundations of international understanding have been among the Nation's important discoveries during this process of maturation. Not only have we, as a Nation, recognized the need to learn more about the peoples of the world and their ways; we have come to realize that other nations may need our help in their efforts to learn more of us and of the rest of the world. We must strengthen and improve our educational system and we must help many others to improve theirs.

The responsibilities of the Federal Government in this effort are marked. Not only is it the constitutional responsibility of the Federal Government to conduct the foreign affairs of the Nation; it is almost equally evident that national observers are especially well qualified to assess the international deficiencies of our domestic educational system. The modern foreign language development program authorized by the NDEA is an instance of Federal identification of an international need imperfectly acknowledged by local and State educational agencies. It seems to the Committee axiomatic that intimate involvement of the United States in international affairs will lead to the identification of other educational needs that could hardly be so readily seen by local, State, and institutional authorities. And for precisely the reason that the Federal Government feels these deficiencies most acutely, it has a unique responsibility to sponsor and subvene their remedies.

Given an unusually great Federal interest in this area of education, it is evident that a Federal education agency must be especially prepared to cope with problems, issues, and programs in international education. That these activities must be closely related to the Federal agencies responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs is equally obvious. But without the existence of a strong Federal education agency versed in international needs, the phrase "education as an instrument of foreign policy" would take on ominous significance for the future integrity of our educational enterprise (p 5). Thus the Committee sees an urgent need to embrace international educational activities within the Office of Education, and to embrace them not as unavoidable tests of capacity (which they are) but as an extraordinary opportunity to serve the national interest in education.

The last decade has seen added to the historic functions of the Office, then, a variety of new responsibilities: growing responsibilities in the carrying out of established Federal policy; responsibility as the Federal Government's educational auditor; and distinctive responsibility in the field of international education. All three of these new major functions are an outgrowth of increasingly active national concern for education. All three of these new major functions point to what may be identified as a fourth—extensive involvement in the formulation of national policy.

Every agency of the executive branch of Government serves, to a greater or lesser degree, in a staff capacity to the President of the United States. The President alone is responsible for the formulation of executive branch policy, but he can be and is aided enormously by the staff of his executive agencies. Historically, with the Federal Government in a passive attitude toward educational affairs, the Office of Education had little responsibility for staff services in the formulation of national policy. Its own staff, indeed, was virtually dedicated to serving local, State and institutional policies

rather than a national policy. In more recent years, as the Federal Government has begun to search out the dimensions of a national policy, it is not surprising that it has relied only partially on its own educational agency for staff assistance. Small, staffed by persons primarily concerned in the rendering of service to their counterparts in the field, and inexperienced in the administration of Federal programs, the Office of Education may have appeared a weak reed on which to lean. Its orientation to the needs of education as it is organized led not infrequently to the charge that the Office of Education was too professionally minded to render staff assistance in the formulation of public policy.

The members of this Committee acknowledge without apology that the Office has not been able to render the staff services now required. We would observe that until recently virtually no one has wanted the Office of Education to be anything other than what it was. Such inadequacies as the Office may have displayed in recent years reflect the speed with which its functions and responsibilities are changing; to have today's responsibilities with yesterday's resources has proven embarrassing (p. 6).

This Committee, having as its charge the assessment of tomorrow's responsibilities, will urge action to insure that the Office of Education is prepared to render vastly increased staff services to the President (and through him to the Congress and the American people) in the initiation and formulation of broad national policies in the field of education.

In the United States, more so than in any other nation in the world, educational policy is shaped by the people. This is true whether one thinks of the Nation's 42,000 local school boards or of the Congress of the United States. It is the American conviction that the destiny of the Nation is secure only in the hands of the people.

This critical fact of American life has great significance for the future of the U.S. Office of Education. Most importantly, it means that the Federal educational agency must never isolate itself from the public. Indeed it must do all in its power both to hear the voice of the people and to speak to the people on matters of education. It must, in a current phrase, be an office of education, not an office of educators.

More specifically, the popular foundations of American education argue for the treatment of educational problems in the larger context of American life. Questions of educational finance cannot be studied without regard to public finance and taxation generally; the problems of juvenile delinquency cannot be disregarded simply because they are only partially of educational origin; nor can the educational needs of Americans be neglected simply because the individuals have matured beyond the traditional school years. They argue, too, for a staff that is broadly concerned with and sensitive to all aspects of American life. Finally, the popular nature of American education argues for the creation of a national lay advisory body in the field of education.

Given these general observations about the future role and functions of the U.S. Office of Education,[1] the Committee believes that the present organization of the Office is not adequate. We have endeavored, in the remainder of this report, to describe an organizational structure that we believe would facilitate the effective exercise of responsibilities we see in store for the Office. We cannot in good conscience say it is perfect or that it is necessarily the best organizational pattern for the Office. Certainly there are a variety of other suggestions that could be made. We are, however, agreed that the organizational structure recommended is the best expression of our views that can be offered after many months of earnest study (p. 7).

The Committee is unanimously agreed upon one other thing. No organizational structure will permit the Office of Education to contribute to American life, as we conceive that it should, without persons whose personal qualities, professional preparation and sense of dedication to the cause of education are of the highest order. Without these, and without vigorous and imaginative leadership from the Commissioner of Education, no table of organization will be adequate to the tasks ahead (p. 8).

THE ORGANIZATION

Name

The Committee recommends that the name of the Office of Education be changed to the U.S. Education Agency. This step should be taken at once to reflect the more active role of this unit of government, and to acknowledge the importance attached to education by the Government of the United States. We recognize that consistent application of Federal terminology, in accord with recommendations of the Hoover Commission, might argue for the term "Service" rather than "Agency." We feel, however, that the term "Service" has connotations in the context of the traditional activities of the Agency that would give a misleading impression of the nature of the organization contemplated. As vital as service is in the traditional sense, the Committee feels that it now constitutes but one of the major functions of the Agency.

The Committee recommends that the U.S. Education Agency be headed by a Commissioner, authorized to use the title, "U.S. Commissioner of Education."

A Board of Advisers

The Committee recommends the appointment, by the President of the United States, of a Board of Advisers to the Commissioner of Education. This Board should consist of laymen, except that the President might appoint a few persons of broad experience in the field of organized education. The Board would be purely advisory and would report solely to the Commissioner of Education. The criteria for selection of members should stress breadth of view, understanding of the public relationship to education, intelligence, and imagination. The President should be under no obligation to make the Board representative in the sense that various educational and other interest groups are represented in its membership. It should be representative only of the ablest citizens available for such service.

The function of the Board of Advisers would, of course, be to keep the Commissioner of Education constantly aware of the relationship (p. 9) of his activities to other facets of American life, and to assist him in the formulation of policies that serve effectively the broadest objectives of American society.

The Committee feels that the existence of such a Board of Advisers would, in addition to rendering substantial assistance to the Commissioner, offer to the American people an evidence that the U.S. Education Agency was intended to be truly an agency representing the whole public.

Bureau structure

In addition to these general recommendations, the Committee recommends the adoption of a bureau structure for the U.S. Education Agency. It believes that the creation of four major bureaus within the agency, when coupled with the strengthening of the Office of the Commissioner and certain centralized staff services, would permit the Agency effectively to carry out its present responsibilities, and readily to assume those that now appear on the horizon. The basic structure recommended is shown in chart I (chart omitted in RECORD), and consists of the following Bureaus:

1. The Bureau of Higher Education Assistance Programs: This Bureau would have similar responsibilities, insofar as public policy incorporates major programs of assistance involving relationships with institutions of higher education.

2. The Bureau of State Assistance Programs: This Bureau would have essential responsibility for the execution of national policy insofar as it is reflected in major programs of financial assistance to States and political subdivisions thereof.

3. The Bureau of International Education: A frank departure from the concept of the organization of bureaus on the basis of major function, this Bureau would have essential responsibility for all functions related to the Agency's role in international educational affairs.

4. The Bureau of Educational Research and Development: This Bureau would serve as the center of virtually all Agency activities designed to assist organized education through the mediums of study, analysis, and dissemination of findings on current educational problems.

The advantages of bureau structure are numerous, but the Committee would call attention especially to the fact that it permits a higher degree of decentralization in the performance of clear-cut areas (p. 10) of Agency program. It is contemplated that the several Bureau chiefs—with few exceptions—would have at their command adequate resources for the full execution of their duties, with only policy guidance from the Commissioner.

The Office of the Commissioner

The Committee is aware of an immediate need to strengthen the Office of the Commissioner to insure the Commissioner's effective exercise of those responsibilities most deserving of his attention. The Office of the Commissioner needs strengthening in order to perform better the following major functions:

The analysis and evaluation of the operations of the Agency, and the planning and direction of these operations.

The identification of major educational problems and the formulation of solutions thereto.

The rendering of assistance to the President and others responsible for the development of national education policy.

Serving as the focal point of the Federal Government's long-term interest in education.

The maintenance of mutually helpful relationships with the public at large (p. 11).

1. The immediate Office of the Commissioner:

The Commissioner, personally, must of necessity concentrate his talents, energies and judgments on certain of his extensive areas of concern. The Committee believes that the Deputy Commissioner can effectively lengthen the reach of the Commissioner by supervising and directing those activities to which the Commissioner is least able to give personal attention. Since these areas will vary from time to time and from Commissioner to Commissioner, it is not deemed desirable to assign fixed duties to the Deputy Commissioner, but rather to regard him as an adaptable alter ego to his superior.

The Commissioner will require, nonetheless, staff assistants with particular areas of concern. Even with a bureau structure (which the Committee believes will serve greatly to free the Commissioner from detailed, day-to-day concern with the activities of major operating areas of the Agency) the Commissioner will be in need of strong

[1] See app. B for a fuller statement of the future mission of the Office of Education, prepared by the Committee in December 1960, as a preparation for its discussion of organizational needs.

and even specialized support. In addition to his immediate staff of (p. 12) assistants and clerical staff, the Commissioner should have, virtually at his elbow, an Assistant for Public Information. This recommendation, like that for a Board of Advisers, is designed to insure that attention to broad public interests and, particularly, the needs of the public for information is not neglected.

2. Staff divisions:

The Division of Administration: The Committee recommends that the activities now contained in the Administrative Management Branch be assumed by a new Division of Administration. The principal activities to be identified, that would determine the branch substructure of this Division, include personnel management, financial management, management analysis operations, and general services. The growing scope of Office programs, and the complexity of organizational structure would make essential the provision of high level staff assistance to the Commissioner in all of these areas. The implementation of the broad organizational changes recommended by this Committee would for example place a heavy demand on the staff services of this Division.

It is the view of the Committee that many operational aspects of administrative management could be assumed by the new Bureau units. In some cases, fiscal accounting services could be decentralized, and certain managerial phases of personnel services could be assumed by the bureaus. Much of the budget preparation work could be assigned to qualified staff persons in the bureaus. The amount of such decentralization would, of course, vary with the needs of the various bureaus, but the Committee believes that such decentralization will permit needed concentration on policy level matters in the Office of the Commissioner.

The Division would work in close relationship with the Division of Policy and Program Development in management planning and budget planning as related to program development.

The Division of Policy and Program Development: Urgently needed, in the opinion of the Committee, is a staff division concerned with those activities which we have earlier described as involved in the evaluation and formulation of public policy. These activities fall into four general categories that would constitute branches within the Division.

One is a unit that looks broadly toward the total program of the Agency itself, for the purposes of analysis and evaluation. This we have called the Program Analysis Branch. It would have the added function of looking ahead to the identification of educational (p. 13) problems that warrant Federal attention, and of working with other staff of the Agency in the formulation of Federal programs.

A second looks at the whole range of Federal activities in much the same light, but is designed to carry out the monitoring function previously decribed. It would embrace, among other activities, those now carried on under authority of section 1001(d) of title X, National Defense Education Act, on a permanent and expanded basis. This would be known as the Federal Education Programs Branch.

A third branch would be the Legislative Relations Branch, responsible even more extensively than now for preparation, presentation and evaluation of legislative proposals affecting education.

A fourth branch—the Estimates and Forecasts Branch—would act as a statistical resource for the Office of the Commissioner. It would be responsible for making analyses of statistical material needed to clarify policy and program considerations. The Committee feels that this unit would render statistical services that are needed by the Office of the Commissioner as distinct from those statistical activities closely related to the substantive program of the Agency.

The Committee believes that the organization of these valuable activities in a staff division will do much to strengthen the hand of the Commissioner in dealing with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the President, other executive agencies and the Congress. Such a Division would permit effective staff services without undue demands upon other operating and professional staff of the Office.

It would also offer to the several Bureaus an avenue of access to the Commissioner on matters of program and policy, other than the route of budget proposal and review. The Committee believes that it is vital to sound program development that the Bureau chiefs have direct access to the Commissioner; they believe it also vital that the Commissioner have staff of his own to assist in review and evaluation of program proposals; and finally, vital that the Commissioner's staff advice not derive solely from budgetary or legislative considerations.

A further function of the Division of Policy and Program Development would be to render staff services directly to the Board of Advisers to the Commissioner. The head of the Division, indeed, might serve as Executive Secretary of the Board.

The kind of activities and responsibilities contemplated for the Division of Policy and Program Development call for distinctive (p. 14) talents, skills and backgrounds among the professional personnel involved. The Committee believes that this Division will operate best if staffed with persons whose substantial experience in American education is broad, and whose professional fields of interest and competence range all across the social sciences. The Committee cannot conceive of truly effective performance without the presence on this Division staff of persons trained in economics, sociology, government and political science, statistics and other similar fields. We believe the accommodation of varied disciplines will contribute to the strength of the Agency.

3. Central service units:

Among the oldest activities of the present U.S. Office of Education are the publication and dissemination of information. In considering how these activities could best be accommodated in the structure of a Federal Education Agency for the future, the Committee encountered certain difficulties, stemming largely from the fact that there is a need both for central policy direction and for the rendering of technical, advisory, and supporting activity to the several Bureaus and Divisions. At the same time, the Committee, having agreed on a bureau structure partly for the decentralization value it has, and aware that the Bureaus' needs for central service would be markedly uneven, desired to encourage the greatest possible degree of decentralization consistent with efficiency and suitable policy control. The Committee has decided, therefore, to recommend against a central Publications Divison, as such, and to recommend, instead, the creation of a Center for Information Services, responsible for the preparation and dissemination of information designed to meet the needs of the general public, the management and allocation of centralized editorial and advisory resources, and quality control of the total Agency program of information dissemination. Within this Center, a Publications Services Branch and an Educational Information Branch would carry out these responsibilities.

The Committee makes these recommendations in the belief that these activities warrant direct access to the Commissioner for the purposes of overall policy direction and because certain publications activity is intimately related to the Commissioner's broad responsibilities to the public at large. There is also the indisputable consideration that certain service functions can be performed most efficiently if centralized. A final and compelling reason for the central location of activities for publication and dissemination of information stems from the Committee's conviction that this historic function must undergo (p. 15) revolutionary change if it is to serve the needs of the future. Every modern communications medium, including films and television, must be brought to bear in support of the Agency's efforts in the years ahead.

The Committee would like to make clear, at the same time it recommends the creation of this Center, its opinion that extensive decentralization of publications services can and should be made, especially to the Bureau of Educational Research and Development. As we shall point out, this Bureau will have the greatest need for such services, and it would contribute significantly both to efficiency and to the morale of this Bureau if it were to have located within it editors and others needed to carry out its publications activities.

4. Field staff:

The Committee anticipates that the Agency will need an enlarged field staff in its various operating areas in the next decade. Since these field staffs are likely to be extensions of operating programs within the Agency, they should be directed by those responsible for the actual programs. Field services for different divisions, or programs within a Bureau requiring in general the same competencies or background of experience, might well be performed by a consolidated field staff for the Bureau, thus avoiding overstaffing in a region with relatively light program workloads, and making possible economies in time and cost of providing adequate geographic coverage.

Experience over the past 12 to 18 months indicates the value of and the need for a minimum regional field staff responsible to the Office of the Commissioner. The responsibilities to be assumed by the Agency in case of a national emergency require cooperative planning in the field with State and other Federal agencies, and the assumption of leadership responsibilities of the Commissioner in any actual national emergency. The presence of several program field staffs in each region requires the performance of regional administrative services and coordination by a field supervisor. Cooperation with other Federal agencies of the Department in regional programs involving education, stimulating cooperative State and institutional efforts toward the improvement of education, providing more effective dissemination of educational information where its effect will be functional, identifying educational problems, needs and trends—all these activities call for the services of the well-qualified generalist in the field (p. 16).

The Bureaus

Two of the Bureaus contemplated in this report are designed, as we have said, primarily to execute established policies of the Federal Government—to administer laws. The arguments for separating grant administration from other professional activities such as research are several. The Committee has found some of these persuasive. There is the advantage of separating Federal funds from consultant services on educational problems to avoid any suggestion that the Agency seeks to use its grant funds to effect modification of educational practices unintended by Congress. More important to the Committee, however, are the arguments that (a) different kinds of personnel are required to perform the very different functions of research and administration, and (b) the mingling of grant administration and professional research in a single unit inevitably leads to the undermining of the latter.

Clearly, not all program administration can be separated from research or advisory services; in some cases the separation of the two would be damaging to both. But the Committee is of the opinion that there are several major programs—and the prospect of others—in which the Congress has given sufficiently explicit instructions, and in which the amounts and administrative tasks are so significant, that they can wisely and efficiently be grouped together under a program administration bureau.

It is possible, under present circumstances, to think of one bureau for all such grant programs. But the rate of growth of these programs in recent years is sufficient warning not to plan for the accommodation of present responsibilities only. The prospect of probable future growth leads the Committee to conclude that the aggregate of major grant programs is already beyond the span of effective control of a single bureau. Added support for the concept of two grant bureaus flows from the significant differences in patterns of Federal relationships with States on the one hand, and colleges and universities on the other.

The Bureau of Higher Education Assistance Programs

The Mission and Organization Committee believes that the programs of the Agency that are characterized by (1) the disbursement of relatively large amounts of funds to institutions of higher education, or to (p. 17) students attending these institutions, and by (2) explicit congressional authorizations, will be best administered within a single bureau. It believes that the competencies required by the staff of such a bureau are those of the skilled administrator with sound educational judgment rather than those of the educational specialist or researcher.

The Chief of this Bureau would have staff serevices comprising:

1. An Administrative Services Branch that would have responsibility for budget, personnel, and management activities.

2. An assistant for program operations who would, with a small staff, assist the Bureau Chief in the development of Bureau-wide operating plans, and in the analysis and evaluation of the operations of the various units within the Bureau.

3. A field services staff, the head of which would supervise the field staff that would represent the Bureau, as a whole, in the various regional offices of the Department.

The Committee recommends the establishment of three divisions as operating units within the Bureau of Higher Education Assistance Programs.

The Division of Student Assistance: The Division of Student Assistance would have responsibility for administering, for example, the student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act. In addition, it would administer any new student assistance provisions enacted by the Congress, such as the proposal for scholarship support that has been made by the administration (p. 18).

The Division of Facilities: The establishment of the Division of Facilities would depend on the enactment of proposed legislation of assistance to colleges and universities in the construction of academic facilities, and on the possible transfer of the college housing facilities program to the United States Education Agency (in the event it is regarded by the President as inappropriate to his proposed Department of Housing and Urban Affairs).

The Division of Program Assistance: The Division of Program Assistance would administer the training institute provisions of the National Defense Education Act, the land-grant college funds, and all other programs that may be enacted that have as their objective the development and strengthening of specific activities in higher education.

Bureau of State Assistance Programs

The Mission and Organization Committee recommends the establishment of a Bureau of State Assistance Programs to administer those programs for which the Office is responsible which involve the disbursement of relatively large amounts of funds to State or local educational agencies as a result of explicit legislative authorization. As indicated previously, the Committee believes that the personal competencies required to administer large-scale financial assistance programs differ substantially from those required to conduct programs of research, development and service.

The Bureau Chief would have staff services comprising:

1. An administrative services staff that would have responsibility for budget, personnel, and management activities.

2. An assistant for program operations who would, with a small staff, assist the Bureau Chief in the development of Bureau-wide operating plans, and in the analysis and evaluation of the operations of the various units within the Bureau.

3. A field services staff, the head of which would coordinate the operations of the field representatives of the program divisions within the Bureau.

The Committee recommends the establishment of three operating divisions within this Bureau (p. 19).

A Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: The maintaining of the Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas as a unit reflects (1) its unique position within the office in dealing directly with local school districts and (2) the operational effectiveness of the present Division.

A Division of Vocational Education: While the Committee recognizes that substantial consultative and promotional activity is carried on within this Division in addition to its administration of the allotment of Federal funds, it believes that the working interrelationships which have been developed in this area are effective and should not be subject to major change. Therefore, it recommends that the entire present Division of Vocational Education be established as a constituent unit of this Bureau and that its cooperative relationships with the States continue as at present.

A Division of Secondary and Elementary School Assistance: The Division of Secondary and Elementary School Assistance would administer the programs of assistance for the strengthening of science, mathematics and modern foreign language instruction and for the improvement of guidance, counseling, and testing in secondary schools authorized under the National Defense Education Act. The present Aid to State and Local Schools Branch of the Division of State and Local School Systems would form the nucleus for this Division.

This Division could, in addition, be responsible for the administration of a program of general financial assistance to secondary and (p. 20) elementary education if such a program is enacted. Without being able to anticipate the precise nature of such a program, however, the Committee is unwilling to foreclose the possibility that a fourth division, for this purpose, might have to be created.

The Bureau of International Education

For reasons suggested in the introduction to this report, the Committee recommends that a Bureau of International Education be established. While the present Division of International Education would form the nucleus of this Bureau, the Committee envisions the tasks of this new organization to be substantially greater than those of the present one. This Bureau would differ from others, in the sense that it would embrace a variety of functions in the service of one dimension of education, but involving all levels. It should be, as nearly as possible, a self-sufficient unit of organization.

The Bureau Chief would have the following staff assistance:

1. An administrative services staff that would be responsible for budget, personnel and management activities.

2. An assistant for program operations who, with a small staff, would be responsible for assisting the Associate Commissioner in program planning, coordination analysis, and evaluation of operations.

3. An Office of Relations with International Organizations would continue to be responsible for maintaining Agency relationships with international organizations dealing with educational problems. This Office would provide educational services and information to these bodies, prepare position papers, nominate delegates to conferences, and serve as a focal point for information about these organizations to people and institutions in the United States. These relationships would include the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the Organization of American States, the International Bureau of Education, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and others. Also included would be certain relationships with foreign ministries of education.

The Committee recommends the establishment of three operating divisions directly under the Chief of the International Education Bureau (p. 21).

A Division of Technical Assistance Programs: The prime function of the Division of Technical Assistance Programs would be to supply technical education assistance to those agencies directly responsible for the conduct of the foreign operations of the Federal Government. This Division would include the present functions of the Education Missions Branch. It should also play a major role in the formulation of educational policy and programs to be implemented by our U.S. operations missions abroad. It would continue to conduct training programs in the United States for large numbers of participants in the technical assistance program coming here from other countries.

A Division of Educational Exchange: The Division of Educational Exchange would be responsible for the present operations relating to the teacher exchange and international teacher development programs, and the existing educational materials laboratory. It also would assist the large and increasing number of nonprogram foreign visitors. Further, it would serve as a clearinghouse on information on all types of scholarships, work, travel, and study grants available. It is the Committee's hope and expectation that this Division would, in time, become involved in the development and execution of exchanges for students and professors as well as for teachers and school administrators.

A Division of International Studies: The Division of International Studies would continue to make studies of foreign educational systems and to evaluate or to assist institutions to evaluate foreign student credentials and those of (p. 22) American students who have studied overseas. It would maintain the documentation center as an aid to the staff and comparative education specialists engaged in research. New functions would include developing international understanding in American schools, promoting American studies, such as English language and literature and American civilization courses abroad, and assisting and keeping abreast of area studies programs.

Bureau of Educational Research and Development

The Committee on Mission and Organization recommends the establishment of a Bureau of Educational Research and Development which would have responsibility

for virtually all of the research, developmental, and consultative service functions of the U.S. Education Agency. The Committee believes that those programs concerned primarily with research, development, and promotion of improved practice in American education should be separate from those programs concerned with the effective disbursement of relatively large amounts of funds designated by the Congress for specific purposes. It believes that the combination of these programs in the present organization has impaired the ability of the Office to render full service to education as it is organized, and has resulted in the inadequate support of the activities not closely associated with financial programs. Without frank differentiation of these functions, individual members of the professional staff of the Office have been asked to perform them all. Given competing demands for time, program administration and the rendering of staff services have inevitably taken precedence over research and the reflective study of educational problems, and over the rendering of consultant service to educational agencies and institutions.

The Committee believes that the separation of these activities will lead to a more meaningful program of research, development and services and one that will attract needed support. It believes that in establishing this Bureau to the fullest extent possible as a self-contained unit, a continuity of operations will be possible that has been difficult to achieve in the present organizational framework.

It is believed, too, that far more effective means can be developed for the identification of truly important educational problems, and for the programing of activities designed to cope with these problems. This is as difficult as it is important. It is important to insure that (p. 23) requests or demands for educational service be met on a basis more systematic and sensible than the "squeaky-wheel" system. The distinction that must be made is that between demands and needs.

Further, the combination of related functions in a Bureau of Research and Development will, it is believed, minimize those situations in which a major problem of education falls between the pillars of organization structure. The teaching of English, or of modern foreign languages, for example, and the problems of counseling and guidance and of teacher education, are not the sole concern of our public school systems, or of our institutions of higher education. They can be solved only by joint action. As a practical matter, the Committee is recommending that this Bureau acknowledge in its structure several organizational "clienteles" it serves; but it does so in the belief that common Bureau direction will facilitate and insure (p. 24) greater cooperative treatment of problems in which the units have a shared concern, than is now possible.

The Committee recommends that this Bureau be composed of three large centers:

1. The Center for Higher Education.

2. The Center for Secondary and Elementary Education.

3. The Center for Continuing Education and Cultural Affairs.

Much could be said of the nature of these Centers. It will perhaps suffice, however, that the Committee hopes they would come to be regarded as the greatest Centers of professional knowledge and competent professional assistance in the Nation, in their respective areas. They should be constituted as the organizations to which American educators would turn for information, assistance and advice on educational problems beyond the reach of their own resources or ability to solve.

The Centers would, therefore, be knowledge-based. Their claim upon the attentions of educators—their very reasons for being—would be their superior understanding of educational affairs, including a perspective denied to many local institutions and organizations. But the Centers would not be ivory towers in the Committee's view, preoccupied with study for study's sake. They would be service-and-action oriented. They would exist to help others in the active improvement of American education, and their tools would be the tools of research and study, coupled with the rendering of services in the field.

Any given Center, for example, would be engaged in a continuum of activity, ranging from statistical and other research, objective analysis, publication, discussion, and field service. Field service (including consultant and survey work) would provide the Centers with invaluable, realistic feedback from their other efforts, thus assuring fullest effectiveness.

Field service would also provide the professional staff of this Bureau with an invaluable perspective on major problems confronting American education. Inherent in the provision of a major bureau for the study of educational concerns is the need for identifying those problems most in need of national attention. No responsibility of this Bureau, or indeed of the Agency, warrants greater emphasis than the responsibility to identify priority needs in American education and to marshal resources for concentrated attention to them.

To be as effective as the Committee believes they must be, these Centers would have to be complemented by certain central resources (p. 25) unequalled elsewhere in the Nation. Principal among these would be: a program of recurring statistical studies of the highest level of excellence to serve (among other things) as a base for special studies within the Centers, a substantial extramural research program, and an organized collection of educational information and materials. In addition, the Bureau would have to be in a position to render prompt, efficient and technically expert central services in statistics, publications and a variety of administrative management activities. Finally, the Bureau would have to provide a modern mechanism for the demonstration of new findings of research and experimentation. This should consist at least of a demonstration center, and might appropriately extend to field demonstrations as appropriate and feasible.

To help accomplish these purposes, the Committee recommends that the organization of the Bureau be completed with a number of central operations and staff services that would be placed in a staff relationship to the Bureau Chief. These central operations and staff services are essentially of three types:

1. Staff services to the Bureau Chief:

(a) A program planning and coordination staff that would continuously analyze and evaluate Bureau operations and assist in planning future operations. This is a key function in view of the obvious need for concentration of resources on priority problems in American education. The Bureau Chief will have the weighty responsibility of identifying problems most in need of research and service attention, and of weighing competing claims for such service. This staff would give him the support without which a planned program of Bureau activities would be jeopardized.

(b) An administrative services staff that would supply the financial, personnel and management services that the Bureau Chief requires.

2. Central services which are essentially resources for the Centers and for the other parts of the Bureau:

(a) A publications staff that would furnish editorial services and provide those services necessary for the publications of the Bureau. These will be primarily professional publications directed toward organized education. In addition, this staff would serve as an adviser to the Bureau Chief on the publications policy of the Bureau (p. 26).

(b) A field operations staff that would be responsible for coordination of the activities of personnel from the various units of the Bureau who may be stationed from time to time in the various regions of the Department.

3. Units that, in addition to rendering services to the Bureau Chiefs and to the Centers, have operating programs of their own:

(a) An Office of Educational Demonstrations and Communications that would serve the Centers by facilitating the demonstration of research findings, and would conduct its own program, the nucleus of which would be the activities authorized by title VII of the National Defense Education Act. The effective operation of this Office will require an adaptable, well-equipped physical installation for demonstration purposes.

(b) An Office of Statistics and Records and Reports Systems that would be established around the activities performed by the present Educational Statistics Branch and the activities associated with section 1009 of title X of the National Defense Education Act. This Office would have several major functions:

1. It would conduct the basic and recurring statistical studies that both provide a base for the research and consultation of those in the Centers and furnish the educational community and the public with basic serial information about the current condition of education.

2. It would promote the development of uniform educational reporting systems and administer funds designed to further the utilization of modern data processing systems in State and local systems and in higher education institutions.

3. It would also have the responsibility for the production activities associated with the conduct of statistical studies. As a logical extension of this responsibility, it would control any automated equipment that the Agency acquired to facilitate this production job.

4. It would furnish professional statistical assistance to the staff of the Centers, and to other Bureaus.

5. It would exercise the clearance function and serve as a quality control unit for all statistical activities of the Agency (p. 27).

(c) An Office of Educational Research that would administer a separate program of extramural contracts and grants for basic and experimental research in discipline bearing upon the educational situation, and would serve the other parts of the Bureau with advice on research problems.

The Committee believes it important to establish clearly the character of the educational research program it has in mind. We believe that extramural research has the twofold responsibility of augmenting the intramural research activities of the Centers, and an equally compelling responsibility to strengthen research capacity throughout the Nation by approaching the problems of education in a manner different from that of the Centers. Since it is presumed that the Centers, oriented to education as it is organized and administered, will deal with educational problems directly confronting schools and colleges, it is believed desirable that extramural research be significantly attentive to basic problems of human development, training and teaching, regardless of whether or not they are acknowledged as immediately pressing problems by educators. In short, some research should be conducted precisely because it challenges the assumptions upon which practicing educators are proceeding.

(d) A National Library of Education that would serve essentially as a research resource both for the other units within the Bureau and for educational researchers generally.

The library would be based on a nucleus of the educational documents now contained in the departmental library. It would utilize modern library methods, such as extensive indexing of resource material available elsewhere. It would also serve as a clearinghouse for educational research.

The three Centers would be the major operating units within the Bureau. Their organization would reflect the organization of their respective clienteles.

The Center for Higher Education: The Center for Higher Education would be composed of two major branches, one concerned with the area of administration, including facilities, finances, organization and administration, and auxiliary services; and the other concerned with academic affairs, including curriculum, staff, and students. The present branches of the Division of Higher Education (excluding the Financial Aid Branch) would lend themselves readily to forming the nucleus of such a Center (p. 28).

The Center for Elementary and Secondary Education: The Center for Elementary and Secondary Education would include three major branches, one for administrative organization, one for curriculum and instruction, and one for pupils and personnel. The nucleus for this Center would be furnished primarily by the present Instruction and Organization Services Branch and the School Administration Branch of the Division of State and Local School Systems, though unnecessary distinctions between elementary and secondary education would be eliminated. The Pupils and Personnel Branch would include all present and prospective activities in which a group of students are regarded as sufficiently distinctive as to warrant separate attention, such as the present program for exceptional children and youth.

The Center for Continuing Education and Cultural Affairs:

The Center for Continuing Education and Cultural Affairs would be composed of four major branches:

1. A Library Services Branch that would continue to administer the funds authorized under the Library Services Act as well as conduct studies and render services in this area.

2. An Adult Education Branch that would include the activities of the present Adult Education Section of the Division of State and Local School Systems, and would conduct an expanded program of studies, services, and promotion of educational opportunities for persons beyond school and college age.

3. A Cultural Affairs Branch that would have responsibility for emerging public programs in the arts and promoting public awareness of and educational use of those activities and resources generally regarded as cultural—such as museums, galleries, theaters, and music programs.

4. A Special Educational Services Branch that would have responsibility for studying educational problems which arise from broader social and community concerns, such as juvenile delinquency. This Branch would place substantial reliance in its staffing pattern on persons whose competence was in the various social sciences.

The Potential of this Bureau: The Committee regards the creation of this Bureau as one of its most significant recommendations. It does so in part because of the (p. 29) vast potential it sees in such a Bureau for the modernizing of the Office's oldest and best established functions. Freed of the competing claims of staff service and major program administration, assured of extensive educational resources and supporting services, and manned with well-informed and broadly concerned professional persons, this Bureau could render to American education a degree and kind of service surpassing what we have thus far known. Solidly founded in knowledge and dedicated to unencumbered service, it could become a monument to the established role of the Federal Government in American education. The Committee believes that this Bureau could become a mainstay for all those who, in the conduct of educational affairs here and abroad, seek to apply the fruits of research, study and objective analysis (p. 30).

SUMMARY

In summary the Committee on Mission and Organization recommends a new and significant role for the Federal education agency in the 1960's. This agency must, over the next decade, not only perform its traditional functions of data gathering, analysis, and dissemination; research; and services to organized education. It must also prepare itself to assume larger responsibilities in carrying out Federal policy through the administration of operating programs. It must assume a new role, speaking within the Federal Government for the long-term interests of education. And it must render assistance in the development of public educational policy.

To accomplish this mission, the Committee has recommended an organizational structure that includes four major operating bureaus in addition to a strengthened Office of the Commissioner.

Generally, two of the bureaus, those of higher education assistance programs and State assistance programs, would be concerned with the administration of educational support programs that have been specifically authorized by law. One of the bureaus, that of international education, would be concerned with the administration of operating programs, the conduct of studies, and consultative services to Federal and private agencies. The final bureau, that of research and development, would be concerned with both the traditional activities of data gathering, dissemination, and consultation; and new and growing activities such as the support of experimental research, the support and conduct of educational demonstrations, and the development of technical resources for educational research.

The Office of the Commissioner would be augmented to assist in the policy decisions of the Federal Government. It would be strengthened internally through additional resources for the identification and analysis of major educational problems and for program planning. It would be strengthened externally through the establishment of a board of educational advisors to the Commissioner reflecting lay as well as professional opinion. The organizational structure of the general Office of the Commissioner would consist of a Division of (p. 31) Policy and Program Development, a Division of Administration, a Center of Information Services, and a Field Services Staff.

Finally, the Committee recommends that the Office of Education should be renamed the U.S. Education Agency to reflect its new role.

The Committee on Mission and Organization believes that within the described organizational structure the Federal education agency will be able to accomplish its present responsibilities, to respond quickly to the educational problems of the future and to administer effectively those Federal programs which may result (p. 32).

APPENDIX A

A FLEXIBLE STAFFING CONCEPT

Closely associated with the question of mission and of organization structure is the question of adequate staffing. The Committee recognizes a need for strengthening staff resources in keeping with the expanding role of the Agency.

However, after reviewing the reorganization proposals of Commissioner Studebaker in the years 1944 through 1947, and the progress made toward implementation of these proposals, the Committee acknowledges the futility of trying, in a single agency of the Federal Government, to recruit and direct effectively a staff that reflects all of the myriad specialities that characterize American education. The Committee finds the following difficulties in this staffing concept:

1. The potential proliferation of specialities is almost infinite.

2. The pattern of organizational growth tends to be inconsistent, reflecting such factors as the external pressure of special interest groups and availability of specialists, rather than considerations that would be dictated by a rational growth program.

3. The coordination of the efforts of specialists in compartmentalized areas is difficult.

4. Fixed, specialized staffing inhibits ready response to changing areas of educational concern, without continual augmentation of the staff.

The Committee, therefore, recommends that in the Bureau of Educational Research and Development a new approach to staffing be employed that might be termed the flexible staffing concept. At the core of a Branch of any of the three Centers would be a permanent staff of senior specialists in general areas of educational concern—areas that represent perennial sources of educational problems. In the Curriculum and Instruction Branch of the Center for Elementary and Secondary Education, for example, these senior specialists might be in the areas of curriculum content, instructional methods, and staffing. In the Administration Branch of the Center for Higher Education, on the other hand, these senior specialists might be in the areas of facilities, finance, administration and organization, and (p. 35) auxiliary services. In support of these senior specialists other permanent specialists might be employed in less generalized areas. For example, the Curriculum and Instruction Branch might have a specialist in each basic subject matter area—English, mathematics, history, social sciences, foreign languages, fine arts, sciences, industrial arts, and physical education.

This staff would, with the support of research assistants and clerical staff, provide the permanent cadre of the agency in each Branch of the Centers. This permanent cadre would be distinguished by breadth of educational concern, despite special competence in basic areas of education. The specialist in science, therefore, would be fully informed of science education developments in the United States, but would regard himself as concerned with the total development of sound curriculum and instruction. He would derive his program of action from a general branch orientation to a perennial educational concern, rather than from the interests of his own professional group. In such a team of specialists, each would be a partner in a common effort toward sound and balanced educational improvement, and not as an advocate of one element or segment of education.

There will always be educational problems in the area of science teaching, in higher education finance, and a variety of other areas. The Committee believes, therefore, that the Centers should have a permanent interest in all such areas.

But within these major areas of perennial need, there will, inevitably, be problems of narrower scope and shorter duration which require more highly specialized competence. These are, in a modern phrase, "burning" rather than "basic" issues and problems. The question of modern foreign language instruction affords an example. Certain factors combine to urge the necessity of special attention to this area—attention beyond the capacity of a single specialist, to be sure. One way—the traditional way—of coping with such a need is to employ additional specialists in modern foreign lan-

guages. The problem with this is that the staff becomes permanently skewed in favor of one curriculum aspect, even after the crisis period of intensive study and development activity is passed, leaving a legacy of permanent and disproportionate representation. The specialists would be unlikely to be able to turn their attention to new, emerging problems in the teaching of history, for example, even if they wished to do so.

Recognizing the need for both mobility and sometime special emphasis on pressing problems, the Committee believes that a solution can be worked out. Essentially, it calls for permanent staffing in basic and recurring educational problem areas, and the provision, in (p. 36) addition, of several "expansion joints" in the Branch structure. Among the latter are:

1. The use of so-called schedule A authority to appoint professional persons for periods up to 2 years, to augment permanent staff in areas of pressing concern.

2. Authority to accommodate selected researchers whose temporary presence in the Center would enrich the program of the Center.

3. Authority to utilize personnel from State education agencies and from colleges and universities.

4. Significantly greater reliance on—and where necessary, expansion of—research assistants, to insure that specialists use their advanced skills and understanding efficiently.

5. Increased use of short-term consultants, ad hoc advisory groups, and conference mechanisms.

6. Increased use of the personal services contract to provide the Center with highly specialized supplements to its ongoing programs of study.

The Committee believes that this type of organization would provide the flexibility needed to respond to changing areas of major educational concern, without sacrificing needed special staff competencies. It also believes that such an organization will diminish the fragmenting effect of overspecialization of permanent staff, and will permit the evolution of planned programs of activity (p. 37).

APPENDIX B

THE MISSION OF THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION IN THE 1960'S

OVERVIEW OF OFFICE OF EDUCATION MISSION

Education in the 1960's

The decade into which we as a nation are entering will pose a series of unprecedented challenges to American education.

These challenges are a consequence of the dynamic state of national and world affairs. The product of rapidly advancing technology, and of restless, growing populations, they are reflected in social and economic ferment and in the rising expectations and rising demands of the peoples of the world, operating in a context of deep and threatening ideological conflict. Broadened economic, social, and educational expectations, themselves a harvest of educational seeding, point toward a continuing acceleration of human endeavor in the coming decade.

Educational challenge of quantity and quality

The impact of these forces on education in the United States is already great. In quantitative terms our secondary and elementary schools are faced with the need to accommodate an increase of some 9 million pupils, some 25 percent of the existing enrollment. Similarly, our colleges and universities must absorb a spectacular enrollment rise of 2,700,000 students during the 1960's, an increase of approximately 70 percent. This problem of sheer numbers itself represents an extraordinary demand upon our educational system, with obvious implications for educational finance, utilization, and organization.

Our schools, colleges, libraries, and other educational institutions must be prepared, furthermore, to meet the qualitative challenges that the coming era will present—challenges affecting the substance, process, and spirit of education. The schools of tomorrow must prepare their students for living in a world of continuous and rapid change, presenting them with unprecedented social, economic, and political problems. We must, in fact, give to education a character (p. 39) that will initiate and support a process of lifelong learning if Americans are to keep abreast of the accelerating advent of new knowledge and of the increasing complexity of modern life. These prospective conditions are already suggested in part by the rapidly increasing demand for highly specialized and professional skills.

During the coming decade, new means must be developed for identifying and releasing student potential; curriculums will have to undergo continual reshaping and upgrading; and new techniques and tools of instruction will have to be developed.

The educational challenge of the world community

No aspect of the educational task of the 1960's surpasses in significance the fact that education is basic to the effort to bring about an enduringly peaceful world.

The developing nations of the world are seeking desperately to raise their standards of living and improve their economic and social conditions. They recognize that education is the key to this advancement, and they will continue to look increasingly to the United States for aid.

The next decade will bring closer and multiple relationships with ministries of education abroad and international organizations, such as UNESCO, the Organization of American States, International Bureau of Education, and others working in the field of education, as problems in education are attacked bilaterally and multilaterally on a worldwide basis.

At home, greater attention to the study of comparative education, history, languages, geography, economics, and comparative Government must be given in order to prepare students to understand the world of tomorrow. Likewise, teacher preparation, textbooks and the curriculum in these subject fields must be improved in the decade ahead.

The challenges of the 1960's, however, do not arise from the new pressures and the new potential of that decade alone; they stem in part from the imperative of educational deficiencies that now exist in the Nation. Variations among States and school districts in standards of instruction, facilities, staff, and services expose serious inadequacies. Our progress toward the ideal of equality of educational opportunity is tragically uneven. These deficits clearly spell out the task that must be accomplished at home. Their correction is imperative in the light of our stake in the progress of education throughout the world (p. 40).

The role of the Federal Government

The Federal Government carries a heavy responsibility in connection with these challenges. Its trusteeship of the general welfare places upon it an obligation to assist in the development of equality of educational opportunity, to promote the fullest development of the abilities and aspirations of its citizens, and to preserve a system of education that will enhance democratic values. The Federal Government can and should reflect a growing sense of educational nationhood—an awareness that the implications of education are indisputably national, however local may be the control of education.

Practically speaking, this obligation is reinforced by a realistic consideration of public finance—the substantial revenue resources available to the Federal Government as opposed to those available to the States and localities.

The Federal Government must be prepared in the coming decade not only to continue and, where appropriate, expand existing programs of aid to education; it must also develop new avenues of assistance and patterns of educational leadership. It must do all that is necessary to support the pluralistic educational system of the Nation. In the area of international educational cooperation, in particular, it must play the major role, since only the Federal Government can enter into agreements with other governments.

The mission of the Office of Education

Despite the dynamic character of educational and governmental developments, the basic legislation authorizing the establishment of the Office of Education, now some 93 years old, still furnishes a unifying objective. An act written in the middle of the 19th century naturally could not anticipate the specific demands of the mid-20th century. Nonetheless, the authors of the act of 1867 wisely made provisions for the newly created agency to carry out its then unforeseen responsibilities within a general objective: to "promote the cause of education in the United States." The changes of 97 years and the promise of vastly greater change in the next 10 notwithstanding, this still describes the central mission of the Office of Education.

Pursuant to this general charter, as further developed by subsequent legislation, the Office has evolved a pattern of assistance to the cause of education characterized by encouragement of the pluralistic structure of responsibility and initiative, and the corresponding lack of central domination (p. 41).

In keeping with this aim, the Office's research and information activities have been sensitive to those areas of educational inquiry in which needs have been felt by the States, the local districts, and the profession.

At the same time, the mission of the Office has always implied a certain leadership function. As the task of promoting the cause of education has grown, the leadership aspect of the mission of the Office of Education has taken on new significance. The treatment of the several functions of the Office will reflect this aspect of its mission.

Education being thus crucial to the entire national being, the Federal agency having principal concern for education as a whole must provide dimensions of leadership far exceeding the kinds of tasks outlined in the preceding section. In its research and information activities it must be concerned, more than ever before, with identifying and even anticipating needs and problems of national concern in every educational field. Indicators must be sought not only within our educational system, but in the social, economic, political, and moral aspects of our national and international life. Thus the Office of Education must not only assemble, assimilate, and analyze significant elements of the universe of educational data and information, but also be able to discern and analyze those elements of other universes of information which may reveal needs and implication for change in education.

Having identified an area of need, moreover, the Office must have the strategic mobility to bring to bear upon education problems of high priority the resources required. The dissemination of educational

information, although an important function in itself, must be capable of meshing with the more substantive measures which may from time to time be needed. In other words, the Office must be a striking force ready to move along the educational problem front at home and abroad. The action program may range in scope from the rendering of professional counsel to the administering of major financial grant programs.

Concurrently and continuously, the Office must have the willingness and the posture to exert its leadership in the stimulation, encouragement, development, and strengthening of professional leadership in education throughout this Nation and in other nations with like goals and aspirations. It must help to provide to educational leaders the informational resources essential to the exercise of professional leadership in the identification and solution of their educational problems, in the constant improvement of educational programs, and in securing understanding, cooperation, and support of their respective publics (p. 42).

In the fulfillment of its educational leadership responsibilities at the Federal level, the Office must establish such rapport and mutual understandings as to merit and achieve confidence in its representation of the eduactional profession in national policymaking, thus rendering more effective its assistance to the policymaker through reports, recommendations, and proposals to the administration.

Along with these responsibilities should be included that of stimulating and participating activity in the process of formulation, examination, and reformulation of the goals of our national society in terms of educational objectives.

The Office of Education, as the primary Federal agency in the field of education, must look forward to a greater role in planning the Nation's relationships with educational programs, educational institutions, students and faculty members in other countries, in implementing international educational projects in the United States, and in bringing maximum effectiveness to the total international educational effort.

The five functional areas

For the purposes of this statement, five basic functions have been identified as composing the principal substance of the mission of the Office of Education. Although they are not presented as the sole functions of the Office, or as separate and unrelated, they offer a helpful framework for our analysis.

These functions are presented in an essentially historical fashion, rather than in any suggested order of importance. The area described as "Statistics, Research, and the Dissemination of Information," for example, is treated at the outset because it was the first clearly defined and stated function of the Office. "The Promotion of Coherence in Federal Educational Activity" and "Assistance in the Development of Public Policy" are reserved to last because their full significance in the mission of the Office is only now emerging.

Some of these functions are growing rapidly in importance, not at the expense of others, but rather in such a way as to add further dimensions to the total responsibility of the Office. Qualitative changes, moreover, are taking place within each. These changes and the whole context in which they occur are highly relevant to the manner in which the Office organizes for its mission.

The following discussion is designed to reaffirm the essential importance of certain traditional functions, while recognizing that other relatively new ones also are assuming a major place (p. 43).

FUNCTIONAL COMPONENTS OF MISSION

STATISTICS, RESEARCH, AND THE DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

The earliest mandate of the Office of Education was the collection and dissemination of information about the condition and progress of education. While the Office has performed this function with varying degrees of effectiveness for 93 years, the coming decade will place upon it new and expanded demands in this area.

Improvement in the effectiveness of our educational enterprise depends upon the adequacy of the information on which programs are formulated and the rate of development of new and significant knowledge about the educational process and its organization.

Data gathering and analysis

The Office of Education, because of its nationwide perspective and its advantage of disinterestedness, is in a unique position to provide accurate, reliable, and complete data on education at home and abroad. During the coming decade, it will need to collect data which will permit the analysis and interpretation of important trends and emerging problems.

In view of the magnitude of this task and the flexibility needed, the Office must use new concepts and methods of data collection and processing. The program of basic educational data collection must:

Develop reporting practices in the field of education to the point where consistent, understandable data about education can be gathered.

Maintain professional statistical standards and reflect the latest developments in the survey theory and technique.

Employ the most effective patterns of data analysis and statistical interpretation available in the social science field (p. 44).

Take full advantage of modern technological developments in automatic data processing.

The development of uniform, consistent, and compatible statistical data in all States and in all institutions of higher education will call for both technical and financial assistance to these sources from the Office of Education.

Research and development

Continuing progress in improving and extending educational opportunities of American citizens is ultimately dependent upon the development of new knowledge about education. Improvement through action programs which merely take full advantage of our present knowledge has predetermined limits. No responsibility of a Federal Office of Education is more urgent or important than to push forward continuously the frontiers of educational research and development.

This responsibility of the Office can be discharged in two general ways, (1) by its own analysis and evaluation of statistical studies, by special surveys and studies, and by the synthesis and evaluation of ongoing research in the field, and (2) by the support of basic and applied research studies and programs in colleges and universities, State education agencies, and other appropriate organizations.

Dissemination and demonstration

All of the efforts of the Office to improve its statistical data gathering and to conduct and stimulate research will be of little import if the dissemination of the resulting information is not effective. The Office has a responsibility, therefore, to give systematic and sustained attention to the reaching of its various publics. This approach implies making imaginative use of modern communications media.

Parallel with extensive dissemination measures, there must be a creatively conceived program of intensive communication, carrying to the appropriate public unique presentations of educational knowledge. A program of State, regional, and local educational demonstrations, based on the most up-to-date knowledge, should be designed to have the same kind of impact on the improvement of educational opportunities that the agricultural experiment stations have had on the improvement of agriculture.

Central to this multiphase dissemination function would be the Office's role as a clearinghouse for all educational research, including (p. 45) that done in other nations, and as a repository and resource for published educational information.

Finally, the Office of Education must continually evaluate and adjust its informational program in the light of both its effectiveness and its responsiveness to broad social needs.

Services to organized education

The rendering of technical assistance and various other services to the profession has constituted from the beginning a major part of the Office's efforts on behalf of "the cause of education." These services, rendered through State and local authorities, through direct contacts with higher institutions, and through voluntary professional associations, have been the basis for the development of highly fruitful partnerships between the Federal Government and its several educational constituencies.

At the same time, new needs for Office services have been developing in the international area. The rendering of technical assistance in education to many countries and the further training of many of their educational personnel have accounted for a steady growth in service load of the Office over the past 10 years. The Office is now planning training programs for 1,400 educators from 75 countries, and is sending out over 400 teachers and approximately 100 educational experts each year to some 45 countries. Requests for these or other services will increase greatly in the next decade, and will require a close relationship with the educational institutions and organizations in the United States in the planning and implementing of projects in the field of international educational cooperation.

It is evident that the increasing scale and complexity of the task of promoting the cause of education compel more systematic consideration of how the existing pattern of consultative, research, and survey service should be extended. For many decades the climate of national attitude, both in the profession and in the laity, has encouraged the Office to regard itself as the supplier of services, the nature of which is determined by others. The mounting pressures of opportunities for service henceforth warrant a more calculated and less adventitious basis for the deployment of its necessarily limited resources.

As the Office makes this transition, it should take pains to follow certain important guidelines (p. 46):

It should conscientiously respect the principle of pluralism in American education.

It should support the growing spirit and practice of voluntary cooperation among educational agencies at local, State, and National levels.

It should pay particular attention in the next few years to the involvement of the various segments of the educational community in the processes of national planning for education.

The more effective assumption of these principles of action will require reorientation in the roles of many members of the

Office staff and in their relationships to professional organizations in the fields of their interests. Although staff members should surely continue to cultivate their close and cooperative relationships with professional groups outside the Office, these relationships should have increasingly direct connection with the larger context of Office policies and associated priorities.

Correspondingly, the development of the professional staff for this more comprehensive aspect of the Office's mission must include a broadening of the areas of competence represented. Economists, sociologists, and other social scientists will be needed on the staff to assist in dealing with educational problems in their total context. The relationships of the Office in these larger concerns may well extend beyond the boundaries of organized education, particularly as they affect such multiphase areas as adult education.

Finally, all of these considerations of focus and priority call for organizational steps to insure adequate advanced program planning, responsible teamwork, and—to borrow an industrial concept—"quality control" of services rendered.

Some specific possibilities for new activities and emphases within the construct just described may be suggested:

Increased services to aid the profession in evaluation of educational performance.

Major increase in service and program activity in social problem areas related to education, e.g., juvenile delinquency.

Conduct of Federally sponsored professional development institutes for educational administrators.

Greatly extended use of conferences at national and regional levels to assist in consensus development.

Conduct of State and regional surveys in any educational area, on request (p. 47).

Marked increase in Federal-State consultative relationships in general as a result of enactment of basic support programs for elementary and secondary schools.

Increasing consultative relationships with schools and colleges as a result of further categorical Federal aid programs.

OPERATING PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Historical development

One of the earliest functions of the Office of Education, and one which has grown in an accelerating fashion recently, has been the administration of financial assistance and other operating programs. In the years since the establishment of the Office, these programs have varied in scope and complexity, ranging from the simple and direct financial assistance of the land-grant colleges under the Second Morrill Act of 1890 to the involved provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The increasing interest of the Federal Government over the past decade in financial assistance to education can be seen in the funds appropriated to the Office for expenditure under these programs. In 1950 these amounted to roughly $32 million, and by 1960 they amounted to approximately $464 million, exclusive of programs administered by means of transferred funds, such as those of the International Cooperation Administration.

For analysis of the mission of the Office of Education, it is important to distinguish between the meaning of these grant programs (1) as forms of general Federal assistance for education, and (2) as selective channels for educational development reflecting the leadership of the Federal Government through the Office. While both general and categorical Federal aids should have an important place in the coming decade, the administration of the latter type of assistance, which has characterized most of the larger Federal programs in this century, places far more comprehensive educational leadership responsibilities upon the Office. As long as there exist serious educational deficiencies and imbalances of national consequence, beyond the general inadequacy of financial support, there will be a continued need for the selective type of remedy typified by the Smith-Hughes, Library Services, and National Defense Education Acts (p. 48).

Future programs

The experience of Federal assistance programs to date and the urgency of many educational problems of the era together indicate that the Office may expect to administer operating programs of significantly increased scope and impact. Programs may be anticipated in such areas as the following:

1. Grants to States for elementary and secondary education.
2. Grants for higher education physical facilities.
3. Grants to States for vocational education.
4. Increased aid to graduation education.
5. Expanded educational research in all areas, including graduate education.
6. Strengthening of educational statistics programs.
7. Increased financial assistance to students for higher education.
8. Increased financial assistance for teacher education.
9. Broadening of Federal interest in curriculum and improvement of instruction.
10. Marked increase in international educational assistance.
11. Broadening of Federal interest to include educational activities and services outside the structure of organized education.

The Office should not only prepare itself for the assumption of these assignments, but it should also make a concerted effort to see that the statutory responsibility for the administration of Federal programs with major educational implications is properly lodged within the Federal structure. While the criteria for assigning to the Office the responsibility for administering new programs must necessarily be subject to the influence of practical considerations present at the time of enactment, generally there are two substantive considerations pertinent to the decision: (1) the magnitude of the impact of the program on the Nation's educational system; and (2) the extent to which the basic purpose of the activity is to advance education, as distinct from using education as a relatively short-range instrument to advance some other purpose. When either of these factors is significant, the Office should be seriously considered for the administration of the program; when both of these factors are significant, the Office should be assigned the responsibility with little question (p. 49).

PROMOTION OF COHERENCE IN FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITY

The need for coordination of Federal educational activities has grown faster than the means for this coordination.

First, there has been a burgeoning of Federal activity in general. Every Department of the Federal Government has some concern with education, and a number of Federal programs have a direct and very significant impact upon it. These include, for example, the international educational exchange operations of the Department of State, the fellowship and institute activities of the National Science Foundation, and the sponsored research programs of the Department of Defense. Second, the amount of Federal activity directly concerned with education has continually increased. This activity was first evidenced in the land ordinances of 1785 and 1787 and has since grown to multi-billion-dollar proportions, depending upon the criteria used in the definition of educational activity. Finally, during recent decades there has been an increasing directness of relationship between education and national security, the general economy, and other areas in which the Federal Government has a major concern.

Historically, there has been only limited consideration of the implications of these activities for education itself. Consequently, while the educational community has been instrumental in the achievement of the diverse ends of a large number of governmental programs, these programs have not had in all cases a fortunate effect on the ends of education. For example, there is a striking imbalance, in favor of the natural sciences, in the relative amounts of Federal funds flowing into the support of advanced study in university graduate schools, with respect to both the number of students supported and the size of the average stipend. The volume and specificity of Federal programs constitute a potential force for distortion of the educational structure of the Nation.

As the Federal agency having primary concern for education per se, the Office must be the nerve center of educational information and perform the communication aspect of coordination. Specifically, it should serve in the following roles:

1. A monitor of all Federal educational activity.
2. A source of authoritative educational information essential to the making of educational decisions in the Federal Government.
3. A source of educational expertness which may be drawn on by other agencies and other friendly governments (p. 50).

ASSISTANCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC POLICY

Basis of the Office's policy role

In the final analysis, public policy is determined by the people, through their governmental representatives, and with participation by the various associations and groups through which the people make their interests known.

The Office of Education is the one Federal educational agency which represents not a segment but the totality of national interest in education. Its contribution to the development of sound, educational policies for the Nation, however, is possible only to the degree that the Office holds the respect and confidence of all segments of the public.

Policy role in the Federal structure

The most direct participation of the Office in the determination of public policy occurs through its advisory role in the Federal structure. Throughout its history, the Office of Education has been expected to advise the National Government with respect to educational policies and programs. The original enabling act of 1867 required that the Commissioner include in his annual report to Congress "a statement of such facts and recommendations as will, in his judgment, subserve the purpose for which this Department is established."

As national concern and activities in the field of education have grown rapidly in recent years, the role of the Office as an adviser on educational policies and programs has likewise expanded. The Office is regularly called upon to review and evaluate legislative proposals affecting education, as referred through the Bureau of the Budget

and the Department. In this climate of expanding Federal educational interest, greatly increased demands for service to the Congress on behalf of the executive branch seem virtually certain.

Specific policy areas in which the Office should have an increasingly important role in the next decade include the educational aspects of national manpower problems, and the educational aspects of our foreign policy and programs to implement that policy. Active cooperation by the Office in programs affecting education carried on by other Federal agencies is also an essential requirement of balanced national and international policy in education. This aspect of the Office role needs to be further developed and strengthened (p. 51).

Policy role in the national community

In addition to the Federal level of public policy determination, the Office has much concern with policy matters at the State and local levels, and in higher education institutions. Active leadership by the Office to encourage constructive concensus on particular problems or issues in American education helps to crystallize public policy at all levels. This development of consensus is encouraged in a number of ways. The Office calls national conferences focused on identified problems and issues; it participates in cooperative programs to develop voluntary nationwide standards; and it exerts a continuous stimulating effect through its daily operational contacts in categorical assistance programs.

Direct communication to the general public of basic and objective factual information on the condition and progress of education is another dimension of the Office contribution to national policy development.

The Office of Education, as the primary education agency in the Federal Government, recognizes the fundamental importance of its policy advisory function. It needs now to provide adequate internal procedures and staff resources for full and complete performance of this function (p. 52).

IMPLICATIONS FOR EXTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS

Inevitably the discussion of functions must lead to some consideration of the relationships that ensue from them. These relationships may be viewed in the following four major dimensions:

1. Relationships with other agencies of the Federal Government.
2. Relationships with institutions and systems of education, as organized throughout the United States.
3. Relationships with the public, whose needs and aspirations are the ultimate object of the Office's mission.
4. Relationships with ministries of education and with international organizations dealing with educational problems.

Each of these relationships must be considered before the adequacy of the present structural organization of the Office of Education can be evaluated, since significant changes of substance and emphasis will take place in and among them during the coming decade.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

The Office of Education has yet to achieve, within the total structure of the Federal Government, a position that reflects complete recognition of its ultimate mission. It is essential that the Office be related closely to all agencies and branches of the Federal Government having an interest in American education. Particularly, the Office of Education should place itself in a position to render far greater service than it has historically rendered to the Congress, on behalf of the executive branch, and to all agencies of the executive branch whose activities impinge upon the interest of American education. The Office of Education, speaking within the Government for the long-term interests of American education, has also a responsibility to assert its role as monitor of the Federal impact upon education. It must speak to all agencies of the Federal Government with the voice of the Nation's educational conscience (p. 53).

RELATIONSHIPS WITH ORGANIZED EDUCATION

Within the mission of the Office of Education, the rendering of service and the provision of leadership to organized education are basic and important functions. As these are performed with that increasing effectiveness required by the needs of American education, relationships between the Office of Education and educational colleagues in the field are certain to shift in emphasis.

The Office may well have to be more selective in allocating its services in order to insure optimum effectiveness of effort and to avoid the dissipation of its talents and resources. Increasingly, too, the Office must make certain that the nature of services rendered and the areas in which leadership is exercised, are areas in which a Federal agency is qualified to contribute to the cause of education in the United States.

Finally, the assumption of greater responsibility in the performance of these functions requires the most careful attention to the delicate balance between close professional cooperation on the one hand, and the essential independence and integrity of the cooperating parties on the other. Professional and public respect for the Office of Education will be in direct relationship to its ability to demonstrate its professional integrity and independence of interest groups within the world of education.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE PUBLIC

Of all the relationships of the Office, those with the American public are likely to undergo the greatest degree of change in the coming decade. As decisions regarding education involve more people, more money and a greater share of the public energies, it is vitally important that the Office of Education attend more assiduously to the role of the people in the evolution of American education.

Whether it be in an effort to inform the public of educational needs, or in an effort to reflect the public will in identifying educational objectives, the Office of Education can be effective in the future only if it is constantly aware of this relationship. It must increasingly think of itself as closely allied with the American public itself (p. 54).

RELATIONSHIPS WITH MINISTRIES OF EDUCATION AND WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS DEALING WITH EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS

As the number and scope of international educational projects increase, the Office will be working more closely with ministries of education abroad. It is anticipated that ministries of education will come directly to the Office of Education for assistance—for example, to arrange for a team of experts to assist in setting up a vocational education program.

Also, as additional international projects in education develop, the Office, acting for the United States, will be expected to nominate delegates and to prepare the position papers for meetings of international organizations such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

CONCLUSION

The initial mission of the Office of Education, first eloquently stated in the enabling legislation of 1867, to "promote the cause of education in the United States," may be reaffirmed as the continuing mission of the Office.

This statement has attempted to indicate that the basic functions through which this mission can be effected are in a state of change. Additional functions are emerging, and functions of long standing are undergoing reorientation. Changes within and among these functions will lead inevitably to altered relationships between the Office of Education and the principal elements of society. Only out of an understanding of the changing functions and relationships can there flow reasonable recommendations with regard to future organization and structure of the Office of Education (p. 55).

[House of Representatives, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Rept. 674, pt. 2]

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 7904]

We, the undersigned members of the committee, believe that the respective States have done and are doing an outstanding job to meet the challenge of the sixties in the field of education.

We hold that the record of accomplishment by the States and local communities in the last 10 years has been remarkable. The advocates of Federal aid to education have failed to prove the case of need. The figures speak for themselves.

Public school expenditures alone have risen 1½ times as fast as national income in the last 10 years. These expenditures have also risen much faster than spending for personal consumption.

Public school enrollment had its greatest growth of all time during the past 10 years with a rise of 43 percent, but over the same period public school revenues increased 152 percent in actual amount and 98 percent in dollars of constant value.

In the matter of construction of classrooms, the classroom needs are being met without Federal aid. Since the 1954–55 school year, the classroom inventory across the Nation has increased by 30 percent while enrollment was increased by 20 percent.

In the matter of availability of teachers, teaching staffs grew to such an extent that the number of pupils per teacher dropped from 28.4 in 1953–54 to 26 in 1960–61. The record seems clear that outstanding progress is being made by the States and local communities in the field of education, and it is our opinion that a Federal aid program would only serve to stifle this healthy initiative already being shown at local level.

We reject, furthermore, the philosophy that there can exist Federal aid to any degree without Federal control. We further hold that there should not be Federal aid without Federal control. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to so supervise and control its allocations that waste and misuse is kept at a minimum.

Since we do not desire such Federal control in the field of public education, we do not desire Federal aid to education.

We should never permit the American educational system to become the vehicle for experimentation by educational ideologies. A careful analysis of the writings and statements of vocal and influential spokesmen in the governmental and educational fields indicates a desire on the part of some of these individuals to utilize the educational system as a means of transforming the economic and social outlook of the United States.

We point to a statement by Dr. Harold Rugg, for many years professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, who declared in "Frontiers of Democracy" on May 15, 1943 (pp. 247 to 254), concerning the teachers colleges, "let them become pow-

erful national centers for the graduate study of ideas and they will thereby become forces of creative imagination standing at the very vortex of the ideational revolution. Let us make our teacher education institutions into great direction finders for our new society, pointers of the way, dynamic trailblazers of the new frontiers."

We could supply pages of documentation analyzing the type of new frontier planned. It is indeed a Socialist frontier. It had been hoped that the philosophy of education expressed by Dr. Rugg and his cohorts back in the early forties, had long since been repudiated. However, in April of 1961, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare published a booklet entitled, "A Federal Education Agency for the Future." Anyone who doubts that the Federal aid to education bills now before Congress would mean eventual Federal control of education, should carefully read and analyze for himself what the Office of Education is planning for tomorrow's schools. They openly predict their "need" for new powers on the passage of the multimillion-dollar aid legislation now before us. They recommend that their Office of Education be elevated to the status of "U.S. Education Agency," "to reflect the more active role of this unit of Government." They envision the new Agency's mission as one of "leadership" (p. 42), "national policymaking" (p. 43), "national planning" (p. 47), a broadening of "Federal interest in curriculum and improvement of instruction" (p. 49), "to prepare students to understand the world of tomorrow" (p. 40).

The Office of Education writers further say "along with these responsibilities should be included that of stimulating and participating activity in the process of formulation, examination, and reformulation of the goals of our society in the terms of educational objectives" (p. 43).

In our opinion, this quietly circulated publication of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "A Federal Education Agency for the Future" shows that there has been no basic change in the plans of the professional political educationists who, like Dr. Rugg, see the educational system as a means of remaking our society to fit their ideas of what is right and proper.

H.R. 7904, as proposed, is more than an expansion and ballooning of a department of the Federal Government. In our opinion, it is a clear attempt to take command and control of the American educational system. Under the cry of "emergency," the Department already has its toe in the door with the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which does not expire until June 30, 1962. H.R. 7940 is disguised as an extension of the NDEA. The original NDEA bill was born of the sputnik panic as an emergency measure to provide temporary programs. It was designed to step up opportunities for needy students of engineering, science, and languages, and it provided for liquidation after 1966 (Public Law 85–864).

H.R. 7904, however, would redefine the purposes of the act. It would put the Federal Government into the permanent business of teacher training at all levels of education, both public and private (sec. 205(b)(3)). That inevitably must result in specifications, standardized courses, and controls. This places State certification of teachers subject to Federal control, the key measure of all. We regard this as very dangerous. For example, the need for increasing from 1,500 fellowships for teachers to 5,000 per year, 2,000 of which the Commissioner would personally appoint (title IV, secs. 402–403), has not been shown. It would again put the Federal Government permanently in the education business. With 15,000 fellowships at all times, specifications and control would be essential.

A tremendous increase of power of the Commissioner is written into many parts of the bill. Authority to manage by regulation without financial limitation is general. Title X extends the Commissioner's power over provisions of "any other law" (secs. 1003 and 1010) such as vocational acts, land-grant college acts, library acts, and others, and all future programs, and authorization is without limit (sec. 1007).

It would extend his power to appoint, assign, and delegate to a virtually unlimited network of employees and officers all over the country power to administer, including employees and officers of States (sec. 1011(b), sec. 1011(f)). This proposed interchange of personnel creates real control.

He could bypass civil service regulations (sec. 1011(f)) and disregard job descriptions, even to the extent of salary payments and "sick leaves" and insurance benefits (sec. 1011).

This is "Federal control" with a vengeance.

The close tieup of this bill with the "Federal Education Agency" report is revealed by the proposal to create a "U.S. Education Agency" of three new Bureaus, that of Higher Education Assistance, State Assistance Programs, and International Education, with the original functions of the Office of Education being made a subordinate part of a fourth Bureau of Educational Research and Development (report, p. 11).

"The Office of Education," according to the report of the Committee on Mission of the Federal Agency, "as the primary Federal agency in the field, must look forward to a greater role in planning the Nation's relationships with educational programs, institutions, students, and faculty in other countries, in implementing international projects in the United States" (p. 43).

"The next decade will bring closer and multiple relationships with ministries of education abroad and international organizations such as UNESCO, the OAS, the International Bureau of Education, and others—as problems in education are attacked bilaterally and multilaterally on a worldwide basis" (p. 43). Do we want international controls and conventions directing, by agreement, American education methods and curriculums?

For example, UNESCO's proposed new treaty participated in by 10 Communist countries, known as the Convention Against Discrimination in Education, is now before the State Department. It would deliver the entire American educational system into UNESCO international control. It could close every private and parochial school in the United States. It would automatically remove education from under "domestic" law and control. It encompasses every phase and facet of American education.

Thus it is that a vast new Federal-State bureaucracy would be created with immense power to administer existing programs, including all the many new programs being proposed, and ever to be proposed, to Congress. It would, in our opinion, thus authorize continuous centralized direction over the future of American education at all levels, especially through the controlling of the teaching profession in the preparation and certification of future teachers.

This vast planned expansion is offered in the face of the fact that no overall evaluation of the achievements of the act are available. Important authorities, notably the American Association of School Administrators, oppose it (National Schools, February 1961, p. 61), characterizing it as "expensive" and exerting "Federal control and direction."

The National School Boards Association delegates, representing 150,000 board members, a dedicated group, the legal trustees of our public school system, "went on record as opposed to further extension of Federal aid until the need of such aid is expressed" (Philadelphia, May 4–6, 1961).

The director of counseling for the Peabody College for Teachers stated before the Senate subcommittee that "the Federal Government dictated curriculum and administration of the institute as well as financial arrangements" (Senate report on S. 1021).

These are men who actually have handled the NDEA at the grassroots, and have knowledge of the great number of courses being taken, such as folk dancing, art, music appreciation, and other worthy humanities, under the guise of "defense education."

Borrowing for education has jumped from $13 million in 1956 to $230 million in 1960, of which $150 million have been initiated through the States and private agencies (Reader's Digest, April 1961). Eight States are now guaranteeing loans to students and 22 others are formulating loans or loan guarantee programs. Why thwart the natural interest of States and private individuals and agencies? Why force Federal Government expansion into this field with necessary controls and bureaucracies?

And, why force up the cost of buildings and facilities by the new insertion of the Davis-Bacon union-backed wage scales (sec. 305(d))?

And, why the rush to force through an unneeded renewal and vast expansion? Isn't it quite apparent that the educationist lobby is using this defense education bill as a vehicle this year to force through a Federal Education Agency before the public clamor, now rising in opposition, can block it?

We believe this is an unneeded and very dangerous measure, and urge its defeat.

WILLIAM H. AYRES.
EDGAR W. HIESTAND.
DONALD C. BRUCE.
JOHN M. ASHBROOK.
DAVE MARTIN.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. Certainly I would like to compliment the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and incorporating in the RECORD this material which will be available to so many citizens across the country.

In answer to the question propounded by the gentleman from Ohio as to whether or not there would be some Federal control of education I would call the gentleman's attention to the dilemma in which the House Committee on Agriculture finds itself in regard to these agricultural programs as to whether there would be any Federal control of agriculture. The answer is that what we have seen happen in regard to agriculture will certainly happen with regard to the control of education.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for his answer, and I am glad for his reference to agriculture, for it stands to reason that just as surely as there have been Federal attempts to control agriculture in various segments, so also will control be extended to education. Back in 1939 the farmer was

told he would be "aided" but not "controlled" just like the Government is telling the educators today. We all know what has happened.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield.

Mr. BEERMANN. As a freshman Member of Congress, a member of the committee, and a practical farmer, I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] for his remarks, also the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK]. In discussing this matter of Federal aid to education and the problems some of our folks are having in other matters, and considering a possible takeover of the food supply of the United States, these are things that people all over the country are quite worried about; and I must again state that the people of our Nation are probably far ahead of we who are trying to write this legislation. Very shortly we will be considering amendments to the AAA and we will get a good idea of just what control means.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman has propounded an interesting proposition here. Does the gentleman think that the Federal Government should provide funds without exercising supervision over the expenditure of those funds?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that I believe to the extent that the Federal Government participates in the program it should be made completely sure from a functional and auditing basis that the money is properly spent. This is different from setting out to control policy and procedure. This points to the fact that education being local in character should remain that way. We can assist local schools by a system of tax remission with no controls. We must remember, however, that the Federal bureaucrats control the expenditure of Federal funds. I think what we are faced with here is the complete domination of our State and local school systems by educators in Washington. I think anyone who reads "Federal Education Agency for the Future" will certainly conclude that it represents a blueprint for Federal control and can readily lead to indoctrination of our students according to the political, social and international beliefs of our Washington bureaucrats.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman and to say to the Members that the gentleman does not often address the House, but when he does he has something to say and I think Members should pay attention. He has demonstrated during his first 6 months' service in the Congress of the United States that he is a true American patriot with conservative views. That is demonstrated by the votes he has cast during his brief service here in the Congress.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank my colleague from Ohio for his remarks.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLAN DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1958

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter, charts, and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is probable that early consideration will be given to legislation designed to strengthen the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act of 1958. Therefore, I feel my colleagues will be interested in a letter I have recently received from Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg. The factual material accompanying the letter has been included in order that my colleagues may have reference to it.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1961.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: Since I testified before your subcommittee urging passage of amendments to strengthen the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958, I have received the enclosed special report indicating the very extensive financial operations of these funds. The tabulations are based upon financial reports for 1959, as reported to the Department under the present law.

Plan officials reporting to this Department in 1959 showed assets of nearly $48 billion. More than $10 billion in contributions were made to these plans during the year, and benefits in excess of $5.5 billion were paid.

However, despite the tremendous equity of Americans workers in these plans, there is virtually no protection of these monies under the present weak law. As you know, under the provisions of this act, the Department is unable to ascertain whether reports are filed as required, nor are we able to determine whether the reports filed are in fact accurate. This system obviously gives no protection to the workers whose present and future welfare is to a great extent tied to these funds.

The amendments which we have proposed would give this Department investigative and enforcement powers; enable plan administrators to get authoritative and binding interpretations of the act; and insure that reports are complete, meaningful and filed on time. The absence of these features in the present law constitutes a serious weakness.

If these proposals are enacted into law, they will provide needed protection of the welfare and pension rights of millions of workers and their families.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary.

FINANCIAL DATA OF WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS FOR 1959

(From U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Standards, Division of Welfare and Pension Reports, Washington, D.C.)

Plans reported to the U.S. Department of Labor, under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, had assets of nearly $48 billion in 1959. More than $10 billion in contributions were made to these plans, and benefits in excess of $5.5 billion were paid. These and other financial data are based on information reported by plan administrators and relate to the 118,660 plans for which first-year annual reports were filed with the Department under the act which became effective January 1, 1959.

ASSETS

Total assets amounted to $47.7 billion. The reports filed with the Department showed assets of $30.2 billion. Not accounted for in the reports, but included in the total, are pension reserves of $17.5 billion held by insurance carriers.

Assets of $28.3 billion were shown for the 24,130 pension plans which provide retirement benefits. Assets of nearly $2 billion were shown for the 94,530 welfare plans which provide benefits such as life insurance, accident and sickness insurance, hospitalization, surgical, medical and dental benefits, and paid sick leave.

More than half of the reported total, $17.7 billion, represented the assets of plans covering workers engaged in manufacturing. Plans covering workers engaged in communications and utilities were second, with assets of $3.7 billion, followed by wholesale and retail trade ($2.6 billion), and finance, insurance and real estate ($2.5 billion).

CONTRIBUTIONS

Contributions in excess of $4.7 billion were made to 94,530 welfare plans. Although only about one-fourth as many plans were involved, contributions of nearly $5.5 billion were made to 24,130 pension plans.

Of the total $10.2 billion, employer contributions amounted to $7.9 billion, or 77 percent, with employees contributing the remaining $2.3 billion. For welfare plans, employer contributions accounted for 70 percent, as contrasted to employer contributions of more than 83 percent for pension plans.

Nearly half of all plans covered workers in manufacturing. The second largest proportion of plans (16 percent) covered workers in wholesale and retail trade; followed by finance, insurance and real estate (9 percent), and services (8 percent).

BENEFITS

Benefits of more than $3.8 billion were paid by the 94,530 welfare plans. Benefits paid from the 24,130 pension plans amounted to nearly $1.7 billion.

For the welfare plans, benefits of almost $2.9 billion, or 75 percent of the total, were provided by an insurance carrier, or service, or other organization. Unfunded plans provided benefits of $397 million. The remaining $552 million in benefits were provided through a combination of methods.

By contrast, slightly less than $1 billion of 59 percent of the total benefits from pension plans, were provided by self-insured plans; i.e., all benefits were paid from trust funds or other separately maintained funds. The second largest amount of pension benefits, $294 million, was provided by an insurance carrier.

Nearly 59 percent ($2.25 billion) of the welfare benefits, and 51 percent ($850 million) of the pension benefits were paid to workers in manufacturing. The second largest amount of total benefits ($512 million) was paid to workers in wholesale and retail trades; followed by transportation ($443 million), and communication and utilitier ($395 million).

Additional information is included in a set of tables which may be obtained upon request from the Division of Welfare and Pension Reports, Bureau of Labor Standards, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington 25, D.C.

TABLE 1.—*Selected financial data for 118,660 welfare and pension benefit plans, by type of plan, and by method of providing benefits, 1959* [1]

[Preliminary, subject to revision]

Method of providing benefits	Number of plans	Total assets of plans [2]	Contributions [2]			Total benefits paid [2]
			Total	By employers	By employees	
Total, all plans	118,660	30,237	10,257	7,932	2,325	5,513
	Welfare benefit plans					
Total, all plans	94,530	1,935	4,766	3,356	1,410	3,841
Insured	85,850	185	3,649	2,420	1,229	2,892
Self-insured	2,070	1,353	404	266	138	275
Insured and self-insured	660	370	169	159	10	141
Unfunded	5,460	0	397	397	0	397
Combination of above	490	27	147	114	33	136
	Pension benefit plans					
Total, all plans	24,130	28,302	5,491	4,576	915	1,672
Insured	7,130	165	1,232	998	234	294
Self-insured	13,090	22,303	3,049	2,530	519	995
Insured and self-insured	2,260	3,557	794	657	137	216
Unfunded	1,470	0	92	92	0	92
Combination of above	180	2,277	324	299	25	75

[1] Data included are for plans having fiscal, policy or contract years ending between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1959.

[2] Millions of dollars.

TABLE 2.—*Selected financial data for 118,660 welfare and pension benefit plans, by type of plan, and by industry divisions, 1959* [1]

[Preliminary, subject to revision]

Industry divisions	Number of plans	Total assets of plans [2]	Contributions [2]			Total benefits paid [2]
			Total	By employers	By employees	
Total, all plans	118,660	30,237	10,257	7,932	2,325	5,513
	Welfare benefit plans					
Total, all plans	94,530	1,935	4,766	3,356	1,410	3,841
Manufacturing	45,720	1,346	2,891	2,015	876	2,254
Mining	1,340	12	92	64	28	85
Construction	3,400	218	201	183	18	171
Transportation	3,480	110	363	276	87	344
Communication and utilities	2,550	5	293	185	108	238
Wholesale and retail trade	15,990	140	371	254	117	316
Finance, insurance, real estate	7,890	12	247	159	88	191
Services	8,300	75	208	147	61	162
Other and unclassified	5,860	17	100	73	27	80
	Pension benefit plans					
Total, all plans	24,130	28,302	5,491	4,576	915	1,672
Manufacturing	11,880	16,389	3,147	2,572	575	850
Mining	360	451	105	83	22	39
Construction	730	400	112	108	4	23
Transportation	880	1,125	328	262	66	99
Communication and utilities	930	3,709	530	485	45	157
Wholesale and retail trade	3,350	2,484	341	275	66	196
Finance, insurance, real estate	2,910	2,512	548	481	67	190
Services	1,490	904	186	164	22	51
Other and unclassified	1,600	328	194	146	48	67

[1] Data included are for plans having fiscal, policy or contract years ending between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1959.

[2] Millions of dollars.

SELECTED FINANCIAL DATA FOR 118,660 WELFARE AND PENSION BENEFIT PLANS, 1959

The Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act which became effective January 1, 1959, provides that the administrator of each welfare and pension plan, coming under the provisions of the act, shall file an annual report on the plan with the Secretary of Labor within 120 days after the end of the fiscal or policy year of the plan. These annual reports must contain, among other data, the amount of contributions made to the plan by employers and by employees, the amount of benefits paid under the plan, the assets of the plan, the amount paid in insurance premiums, and the number of employees covered by the plan. Information presented in the following tables relate to the 118,660 plans for which first-year (1959) annual reports were filed with the Department of Labor under the act.

The act authorized the Secretary of Labor to prepare forms that could be used by administrators in submitting annual reports. The form developed was designated Form D-2 and, although its use was not mandatory, it was used by administrators in filing approximately 99 percent of the annual reports.

Before the data were summarized, plans were classified as welfare benefit or pension benefit based on the definitions contained in the act.

1. Welfare benefit plan: A plan that provides for its participants or their beneficiaries, medical, surgical, or hospital care or benefits, or benefits in the event of sickness, accident, disability, death, or unemployment.

2. Pension benefit plan: A plan that provides for its participants or their beneficiaries, retirement benefits, and includes any profit-sharing plan which provides benefits at or after retirement.

Included with the pension benefit plans are 610 plans which are primarily pension benefit plans but which also provide some welfare type benefits.

Plans were also classified on the basis of the method by which benefits were provided as follows:

1. Insured: All benefits provided through an insurance carrier or service or other organization. Also includes plans involving a trust or other separately maintained fund out of which premiums and/or subscription charges were paid to an insurance

carrier or service or other organization which provided all of the plan benefits.

2. Self-insured: All benefits provided from a trust fund or other separately maintained fund.

3. Insured and self-insured: Some benefits provided through an insurance carrier or service or other organization and some benefits provided from a trust fund or other separately maintained fund.

4. Unfunded: Benefits paid from general assets of employer or from general funds of employee organizations; no benefits underwritten by an insurance carrier or service or other organization and no benefits paid from trust or other separately maintained fund to which contributions were made.

5. Combination of above: Benefits provided through any combination of the above four methods.

Plans were further classified into eight major industry divisions. For most plans, this classification was made by the administrator of the plan when he submitted the plan description filing. In instances where the administrators did not make such classifications, plans were classified on the basis of the best information available from an examination of the plan description filings and other sources.

TABLE 1.—*Contributions made to 118,660 welfare and pension benefit plans during 1959,[1] by method of providing benefits and by industry divisions*

[Preliminary, subject to revision]

Method of providing benefits and industry divisions	Total, all plans				Welfare benefit plans				Pension benefit plans [2]			
	Number of plans	Contributions [3]			Number of plans	Contributions [3]			Number of plans	Contributions [3]		
		Total	By employers	By employees		Total	By employers	By employees		Total	By employers	By employees
Total, all plans	118,660	10,257.6	7,932.1	2,325.5	94,530	4,765.8	3,355.9	1,409.9	24,130	5,491.8	4,576.2	915.6
By method of providing benefits												
Insured	92,980	4,881.1	3,417.5	1,463.6	85,850	3,648.8	2,419.5	1,229.3	7,130	1,232.3	998.0	234.3
Self-insured	15,160	3,453.3	2,795.9	657.4	2,070	403.5	265.5	138.0	13,090	3,049.8	2,530.4	519.4
Insured and self-insured	2,920	963.0	816.2	146.8	660	169.0	159.3	9.7	2,260	794.0	656.9	137.1
Unfunded	6,930	488.7	488.7	0	5,460	397.1	397.1	0	1,470	91.6	91.6	0
Combination of above	670	471.5	413.8	57.7	490	147.4	114.5	32.9	180	324.1	299.3	24.8
By industry divisions												
Manufacturing	57,600	6,038.4	4,587.2	1,451.2	45,720	2,891.6	2,015.3	876.3	11,880	3,146.8	2,571.9	574.9
Mining	1,700	197.2	147.3	49.9	1,340	92.2	64.3	27.9	360	105.0	83.0	22.0
Construction	4,130	312.9	291.1	21.8	3,400	200.8	182.8	18.0	730	112.1	108.3	3.8
Transportation	4,360	690.3	537.9	152.4	3,480	362.5	275.8	86.7	880	327.8	262.1	65.7
Communication and utilities	3,480	822.6	669.2	153.4	2,550	292.7	184.5	108.2	930	529.9	484.7	45.2
Wholesale and retail trade	19,340	712.1	528.6	183.5	15,990	371.2	253.9	117.3	3,350	340.9	274.7	66.2
Finance, insurance, real estate	10,800	794.8	639.6	155.2	7,890	246.9	158.7	88.2	2,910	547.9	480.9	67.0
Services	9,790	393.2	311.0	82.2	8,300	207.8	147.3	60.5	1,490	185.4	163.7	21.7
Other and unclassified	7,460	296.1	220.2	75.9	5,860	100.1	73.3	26.8	1,600	196.0	146.9	49.1

[1] Data included are for plans having fiscal, policy, or contract years ending between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1959.

[2] Includes 610 plans which are primarily pension benefit plans but which also provide some welfare type benefits.

[3] Millions of dollars.

TABLE 2.—*Total benefits paid under 118,660 welfare and pension benefit plans during 1959,[1] by method of providing benefits and by industry divisions*

[Preliminary, subject to revision]

Method of providing benefits and industry divisions	Number of plans			Total benefits paid [2]		
	Total all plans	Welfare benefit plans	Pension benefit plans [3]	Total all plans	Welfare benefit plans	Pension benefit plans [3]
Total, all plans	118,660	94,530	24,130	5,512.7	3,840.9	1,671.8
By method of providing benefits						
Insured	92,980	85,850	7,130	3,185.4	2,891.5	293.9
Self-insured	15,160	2,070	13,090	1,269.4	274.7	994.7
Insured and self-insured	2,920	660	2,260	357.2	140.9	216.3
Unfunded	6,930	5,460	1,470	488.7	397.1	91.6
Combination of above	670	490	180	212.0	136.7	75.3
By industry divisions						
Manufacturing	57,600	45,720	11,880	3,104.5	2,254.1	850.4
Mining	1,700	1,340	360	124.2	85.0	39.2
Construction	4,130	3,400	730	193.9	171.2	22.7
Transportation	4,360	3,480	880	443.2	343.9	99.3
Communication and utilities	3,480	2,550	930	394.6	237.7	156.9
Wholesale and retail trade	19,340	15,990	3,350	511.5	315.8	195.7
Finance, insurance, real estate	10,800	7,890	2,910	381.4	191.3	190.1
Services	9,790	8,300	1,490	213.3	161.9	51.4
Other and unclassified	7,460	5,860	1,600	146.1	80.0	66.1

[1] Data included are for plans having fiscal, policy, or contract years ending between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1959.

[2] Millions of dollars. Partially estimated; includes benefits paid by insurance carriers as well as benefits paid directly from funds of plans, and benefits paid under unfunded plans.

[3] Includes 610 plans which are primarily pension benefit plans but which also provide some welfare-type benefits.

TABLE 3.—*Total assets of 118,660 welfare and pension benefit plans during 1959,*[1] *by method of providing benefits and by industry divisions*

[Preliminary, subject to revision]

Method of providing benefits and industry divisions	Number of plans			Total assets [2]		
	Total, all plans	Welfare benefit plans	Pension benefit plans [3]	Total, all plans	Welfare benefit plans	Pension benefit plans [3]
Total, all plans	118,660	94,530	24,130	30,236.5	1,934.5	28,302.0
	By method of providing benefits					
Insured	92,980	85,850	7,130	349.6	184.7	164.9
Self-insured	15,160	2,070	13,090	23,655.9	1,353.2	22,302.7
Insured and self-insured	2,920	660	2,260	3,927.2	370.0	3,557.2
Unfunded	6,930	5,460	1,470	0	0	0
Combination of above	670	490	180	2,303.8	26.6	2,277.2
	By industry divisions					
Manufacturing	57,600	45,720	11,880	17,735.3	1,345.9	16,389.4
Mining	1,700	1,340	360	462.6	11.6	451.0
Construction	4,130	3,400	730	617.9	218.1	399.8
Transportation	4,360	3,480	880	1,235.6	110.3	1,125.3
Communication and utilities	3,480	2,550	930	3,713.6	4.6	3,709.0
Wholesale and retail trade	19,340	15,990	3,350	2,623.9	140.1	2,483.8
Finance, insurance, real estate	10,800	7,890	2,910	2,524.2	12.1	2,512.1
Services	9,790	8,300	1,490	978.5	74.9	903.6
Other and unclassified	7,460	5,860	1,600	344.9	16.9	328.0

[1] Data included are for plans having fiscal, policy, or contract years ending between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1959.
[2] Millions of dollars.
[3] Includes 610 plans which are primarily pension benefit plans but which also provide some welfare type benefits.

TABLE 4.—*Total insurance premiums paid during 1959* [1] *in connection with 118,660 welfare and pension benefit plans, by method of providing benefits and by industry divisions*

[Preliminary, subject to revision]

Method of providing benefits and industry divisions	Number of plans			Insurance premiums paid [2]		
	Total all plans	Welfare benefit plans	Pension benefit plans [3]	Total all plans	Welfare benefit plans	Pension benefit plans [3]
Total, all plans	118,660	94,530	24,130	5,350.4	3,857.6	1,492.8
	By method of providing benefits					
Insured	92,980	85,850	7,130	4,792.2	3,612.4	1,179.8
Self-insured	15,160	2,070	13,090	0	0	0
Insured and self-insured	2,920	660	2,260	352.7	120.1	232.6
Unfunded	6,930	5,460	1,470	0	0	0
Combination of above	670	490	180	205.5	125.1	80.4
	By industry divisions					
Manufacturing	57,600	45,720	11,880	2,977.7	2,289.8	687.9
Mining	1,700	1,340	360	110.8	85.1	25.7
Construction	4,130	3,400	730	176.9	160.7	16.2
Transportation	4,360	3,480	880	389.3	283.1	106.2
Communication and utilities	3,480	2,550	930	329.2	203.9	125.3
Wholesale and retail trade	19,340	15,990	3,350	432.4	345.0	87.4
Finance, insurance, real estate	10,800	7,890	2,910	516.4	231.6	284.8
Services	9,790	8,300	1,490	244.1	179.9	64.2
Other and unclassified	7,460	5,860	1,600	173.6	78.5	95.1

[1] Data included are for plans having fiscal, policy, or contract years ending between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1959.
[2] Millions of dollars.
[3] Includes 610 plans which are primarily pension benefit plans but which also provide some welfare type benefits.

TABLE 5.—*Distribution of 118,660 welfare and pension benefit plans by number of employees covered, 1959* [1]

[Preliminary, subject to revision]

Number of employees covered	Number of plans			Percentage distribution					
				Simple			Cumulative		
	Total all plans	Welfare benefit plans	Pension benefit plans [2]	Total all plans	Welfare benefit plans	Pension benefit plans [2]	Total all plans	Welfare benefit plans	Pension benefit plans [2]
Total, all plans	118,660	94,530	24,130	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under 30	9,920	7,660	2,260	8.4	8.1	9.4	8.4	8.1	9.4
30 to 39	12,920	10,470	2,450	10.9	11.1	10.2	19.3	19.2	19.6
40 to 49	9,390	7,480	1,910	7.9	7.9	7.9	27.2	27.1	27.5
50 to 59	7,340	5,880	1,460	6.2	6.2	6.1	33.4	33.3	33.6
60 to 69	6,160	4,770	1,390	5.2	5.0	5.8	38.6	38.3	39.4

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 5.—*Distribution of 118,660 welfare and pension benefit plans by number of employees covered, 1959* [1]—Continued

[Preliminary, subject to revision]

Number of employees covered	Number of plans			Percentage distribution					
				Simple			Cumulative		
	Total all plans	Welfare benefit plans	Pension benefit plans [2]	Total all plans	Welfare benefit plans	Pension benefit plans [2]	Total all plans	Welfare benefit plans	Pension benefit plans [2]
70 to 79	4,860	3,960	900	4.1	4.2	3.7	42.7	42.5	43.1
80 to 89	3,930	3,210	720	3.3	3.4	3.0	46.0	45.9	46.1
90 to 99	3,440	2,790	650	2.9	3.0	2.7	48.9	48.9	48.8
100 to 199	20,050	16,300	3,750	16.9	17.2	15.5	65.8	66.1	64.3
200 to 299	9,000	7,170	1,830	7.6	7.6	7.6	73.4	73.7	71.9
300 to 399	5,230	4,170	1,060	4.4	4.4	4.4	77.8	78.1	76.3
400 to 499	3,280	2,590	690	2.8	2.7	2.9	80.6	80.8	79.2
500 to 599	2,790	2,240	550	2.4	2.4	2.3	83.0	83.2	81.5
600 to 699	1,870	1,450	420	1.6	1.5	1.7	84.6	84.7	83.2
700 to 799	1,500	1,180	320	1.3	1.2	1.3	85.9	85.9	84.5
800 to 899	1,230	970	260	1.0	1.0	1.1	86.9	86.9	85.6
900 to 999	990	790	200	.8	.8	.8	87.7	87.7	86.4
1,000 to 1,999	5,380	4,180	1,200	4.5	4.4	5.0	92.2	92.1	91.4
2,000 to 2,999	1,970	1,540	430	1.7	1.6	1.8	93.9	93.7	93.2
3,000 to 3,999	1,170	950	220	1.0	1.0	.9	94.9	94.7	94.1
4,000 to 4,999	690	540	150	.6	.6	.6	95.5	95.3	94.7
5,000 and over	3,620	2,800	820	3.1	3.0	3.4	98.6	98.3	98.1
Unknown	1,930	1,440	490	1.4	1.7	1.9	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1] Data included are for plans having fiscal, policy, or contract years ending between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1959.

[2] Includes 610 plans which are primarily pension benefit plans but which also provide some welfare type benefits.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. STRATTON (at the request of Mr. MORRIS), for 1 hour on Wednesday, July 19, 1961.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. MORRIS), for 1 hour on Monday, July 24, 1961.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DENTON and to include a statement he made before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs last week.

Mr. MASON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

Mr. ANFUSO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEVINE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

Mr. SCHADEBERG.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. HOSMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORRIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. ASPINALL.

Mr. ROUSH.

Mr. DANIELS.

Mr. DULSKI.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 320. An act to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 333. An act for the relief of Godofredo M. Herzog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 763. An act to authorize annual appropriation to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained during any fiscal year in lieu of annual appropriations to restore capital impairment based on annual Treasury appraisals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1054. An act for the relief of Huan-pin Tso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1070. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for an additional unit of life insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1088. An act for the relief of Ivan Balog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1205. An act for the relief of Roger Chong Yeun Dunne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Kazuo Ito and Satomi Ito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1459. An act to amend the provisions of law relating to longevity step increases for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1492. An act to amend the act of March 24, 1948, which establishes special requirements governing the selection of superintendents of national cemeteries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1527. An act for the relief of James D. Jalili; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1716. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Corpacius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1775. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to expend appropriated funds to acquire approximately 12 acres of land for the Richmond National Battlefield Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution relating to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1462. An act to amend the act of September 2, 1960 (74 Stat. 734), in order to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum standards of quality for any variety of grapes and plums covered by such act, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1962.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 19, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1142. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1143. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorized grants, contracts, and jointly financed cooperative arrangements for research relating to maternal and child health services and crippled children's services, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1144. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected operations of

the Federal-aid highway program of the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 2429. A bill to prohibit damage to, or destruction of, any shipment of freight or express moving in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 727). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8102. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 729. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 8206. A bill to approve the revised June 1957 reclassification of land of the Fort Shaw division of the Sun River project, Montana, and to authorize the modification of the repayment contract with Fort Shaw Irrigation District; to the Committee on Inerior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 8207. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instruction materials for the blind, and to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and to otherwise improve such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 8208. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of surplus agricultural commodities to such nations at prices less than those prices available to American consumers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 8209. A bill to amend section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, relating to contracts by the departments of the Government for the services of experts and consultants; to the Commitee on Governmen Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 8210. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 8211. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 8212. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instruction materials for the blind, and to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and to otherwise improve such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 8213. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 8214. A bill to permit the use of certain construction tools actuated by explosive charges in construction activity on the U.S. Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 8215. A bill to establish an advisory committee on king and silver salmon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 8216. A bill to amend section 105 of title 28, United States Code, so as to transfer certain counties from the Western Division of the Western District of Missouri to the St. Joseph Division of such district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 8217. A bill to amend section 35 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to permit restaurants to sell alcoholic beverages on credit; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 8218. A bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 8219. A bill to withdraw Federal support and approval from apprenticeship programs which deny individuals an equal opportunity to participate therein on account of their race, color, or creed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 8220. A bill to provide authority for the States to conduct a recount in contested elections to a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 8221. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of any agricultural commodities to such nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.J. Res. 487. Joint resolution to provide protection for the golden eagle; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.J. Res. 488. Joint resolution establishing a temporary loan guarantee program under the direction of the Secretary of State in connection with the 1962 world sport parachuting championship to be held at Orange, Mass.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Res. 373. Resolution supporting the President's reply to the Soviet aide memoire on Germany and Berlin; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 374. Resolution providing for a committee to consider removal of the U.S. Capital or providing a supplemental Capital; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 8222. A bill for the relief of Dick Kwong Eng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 8223. A bill for the relief of Lew Ik Chew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 8224. A bill for the relief of Gabriel G. Kajeckas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 8225. A bill for the relief of Amos Meiri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 8226. A bill for the relief of Herbert F. Wascher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 18, 1961

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

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

O God, our strength and our Redeemer, in the glory and wonder of the new day, whatever we may face, support us with the faith that there is a heavenly power to lift us up which is stronger than all the earthly gravitation that pulls us down.

Deliver us from the folly of thinking or acting in moods of black despair as if we must carry the weight of the world upon our frail shoulders.

As we open up our lives to Thee in prayer we know that Thy completeness waits to flow around our incompleteness, and that not in our fallible weakness, but in Thy ageless power, are the issues of life and destiny.

Feeling ourselves part of the universal family of Thy children, make us quick to welcome every adventure in cooperation between the peoples of the world, so that within these historic walls of national decision may be woven the fabric of the common good, too strong to be torn by the evil hand of ruthless might.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 17, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, and he announced that

the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 11, 1961:

S. 1748. An act to provide for the increased distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the Federal Judiciary; and

S. 2083. An act to correct a technical inaccuracy in the act of May 19, 1961 (Public Law 87-36).

On July 14, 1961:

S. 1073. An act for the relief of Henry Eugene Godderis.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1956—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Ninth Semiannual Report of operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 18, 1961.*

REPORT ON WEATHER MODIFICATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 213)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress the Second Annual Report on Weather Modification (for fiscal year 1960) as submitted by the Director of the National Science Foundation.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 18, 1961.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 507) to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinaielt Tribe, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 650. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit certain new organizations to sponsor works of improvement thereunder; and

S. 1644. An act to provide for the indexing and microfilming of certain records of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in Alaska in the collections of the Library of Congress.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 17 and 23 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7577) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President, the Department of Commerce, and sundry agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GARY, Mr. CANNON, Mr. FENTON, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 176. An act to amend section 331 of title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for representation on the Judicial Conference of the United States;

H.R. 566. An act authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Fort Davis, Jeff Davis County, Tex.;

H.R. 1452. An act to authorize the sale of a portion of the former light station property in Scituate, Mass.;

H.R. 6007. An act to amend section 505(d) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to certain positions in the General Accounting Office;

H.R. 6597. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the crediting of certain minority service for the purpose of determining eligibility for retirement, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6902. An act to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have;

H.R. 7038. An act to eliminate the right of appeal from the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico to the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit;

H.R. 7043. An act to extend to employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949 the benefits of salary increases in connection with the protection of basic compensation rates from the effects of downgrading actions, to provide salary protection for postal field service employees in certain cases of reduction in salary standing, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7454. An act consenting to the amendment of the compact between the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio relating to Pymatuning Lake;

H.R. 7864. An act to dissolve Federal Facilities Corporation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7935. An act to restore authority in the Armed Forces to prepare the remains, on a reimbursable basis, of certain deceased dependents of military personnel and to transport the remains at Government expense to their homes or other appropriate place of interment; and

H.J. Res. 435. Joint resolution to provide for recognition of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1462. An act to amend the act of September 2, 1960 (74 Stat. 734), in order to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum standards of quality for any variety of grapes and plums covered by such act, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1962.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 176. An act to amend section 331 of title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for representation on the Judicial Conference of the United States;

H.R. 6902. An act to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have;

H.R. 7038. An act to eliminate the right of appeal from the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico to the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit; and

H.J. Res. 435. Joint resolution to provide for recognition of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 566. An act authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Fort Davis, Jeff Davis County, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1452. An act to authorize the sale of a portion of the former light station property in Scituate, Mass.; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 6007. An act to amend section 505(d) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to certain positions in the General Accounting Office; and

H.R. 7043. An act to extend to employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949 the benefits of salary increases in connection with the protection of basic compensation rates from the effects of downgrading actions, to provide salary protection for postal field service employees in certain cases of reduction in salary standing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6597. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the crediting of certain minority service for the purpose of determining eligibility for retirement, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7935. An act to restore authority in the Armed Forces to prepare the remains, on a reimbursable basis, of certain deceased dependents of military personnel and to transport the remains at Government expense to their homes or other appropriate places of interment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7454. An act consenting to the amendment of the compact between the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio relating to Pymatuning Lake; placed on the calendar.

H.R. 7864. An act to dissolve Federal Facilities Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

John B. Duncan, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

George L-P Weaver, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

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

David M. Satz, Jr., of New Jersey, to be U.S. Attorney for the district of New Jersey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

U.S. MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. marshals.

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

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

RESEARCH RELATING TO MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES AND CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize grants, contracts, and jointly financed cooperative arrangements for research relating to maternal and child health services and crippled children's services, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ESTABLISHMENT OF INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

A letter from the Chairman and Members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN STATES OF NORTH DAKOTA AND SOUTH DAKOTA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected activities of the Federal-aid highway program in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated July 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS

A report of the American War Mothers, covering the period September 1, 1957, to September 1, 1959; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 201

"Resolution relating to farm program

"Whereas the proposed Agricultural Act of 1961, H.R. 6400 by Mr. COOLEY, of North Carolina, and S. 143 by Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, is essentially based upon the same sound principle of farmer self-help that has been so successful in California's own widespread program of marketing agreements; and

"Whereas the act recognizes that our abundance should be used to improve the diets and the health of children and needy persons in the United States and to strengthen the cause of democracy throughout the world; and

"Whereas the act seeks to improve our stewardship of the land through strengthening the system of democratically administered, independent soil conservation districts which has changed the face of the farming areas of the Nation over the past 30 years; and

"Whereas the act intends also to conserve human resources on the land by strengthening the family farm and the cooperative organizations of family farmers and by offering an opportunity to marginal farmers and young farm people to upgrade their skills and their properties in the great tradition of the Farmers Home Administration; and

"Whereas the act, through its provisions for the use of a variety of economic devices, suitable to differing situations which may arise in various crops, rather than by set and rigid formulas, affords farmers the opportunity to improve their position with little, if any, retail price increases and at no net cost to the Public Treasury; and

"Whereas it appears that programs under the act will be developed, administered, and advised upon by democratically elected committees of working farmers, subject to the sound principle of legislative review: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That Representative COOLEY and Senator ELLENDER are congratulated upon their drawing of an act which should long stand as a landmark in national farm policy, and the California delegation to Congress is urged to give their strong support to the act in committee, and the Congress of the United States is urged to pass it with the sound agricultural and public policy principles embodied in it left unimpaired; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of Congress from California, and to the chairmen and members of the House and Senate Agricultural Committees, and the Secretary of Agriculture."

A resolution adopted by the Philippine Association of War Widows, Parents & Orphans, Inc., of Ermita, Manila, Republic of the Philippines, favoring the enactment of House bill 261, to provide pensions for Filipino veterans during World War II; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the board of governors of the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce, Tampa, Fla., favoring an investigation of the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the West Hollywood, Fla., Chamber of Commerce, favoring an investigation of the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Henry Stoner, of Avon Park, Fla., relating to the designation of a Statehood Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Henry Stoner, of Avon Park, Fla., praying for the relocation of the Nation's Capital in the neighborhood of St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KERR:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the expenditures and the income of the Government of the United States

"Whereas the U.S. Government is presently indebted in an approximate sum of $290 billion and the debt increases each year; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government now pays approximately $9 billion in interest on the present indebtedness each fiscal year; and

"Whereas the value of a dollar continues to decrease, particularly since World War II, largely due to the inflationary fiscal policy of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the people of the United States are already bearing a practically confiscatory and excessive burden of taxes, particularly from the Federal Government; and

"Whereas, 'the power to tax is the power to destroy,' and the present level of taxation on the people has reached the point of diminishing returns: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 28th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma hereby urges and memorializes the Congress of the United States to propose to the States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as provided by article V of the Constitution, to read as follows, to wit:

" 'ARTICLE

" 'SECTION 1. On or before the 15th day after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the President shall transmit to the Congress a budget which shall set forth his estimates of the receipts of the Government, other than trust funds, during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws then existing and his recommendations with respect to expenditures (including so much for reduction of the public debt as he deems feasible) to be made from funds other than trust funds during such ensuing fiscal year, which shall not exceed such estimates of receipts. The President in transmitting such budget may recommend measures for raising additional revenue and his recommendations for the expenditure of such additional revenue. The Congress shall not authorize expenditures to be made during such ensuing fiscal year in excess of the estimated receipts. In case of war or other grave national emergency, if the President shall so recommend, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the Members of each House may suspend the foregoing provisions for balancing the budget for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding 1 year each.

" 'SEC. 2. This article shall take effect on the first day of the calendar year next following the ratification of this article.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.'

"Be it further resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate the 20th day of April 1961.

"BOYD COWDEN,
"Acting President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 7th day of July 1961.

"J. D. MCCARTY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 463. Joint resolution to extend through June 30, 1962, the life of the U.S. Citizens Commission on North Atlantic Treaty Organization (Rept. No. 567).

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

S. 2032. A bill consenting to the amendment of the compact between the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio relating to Pymatuning Lake (Rept. No. 568).

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual Youth Appreciation Week (Rept. No. 569).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 7208. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 570).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 513. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Acadia*, owned by Robert J. Davis, of Port Clyde, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges (Rept. No. 572); and

H.R. 1182. An act to create the Wyandotte National Wildlife Refuge (Rept. No. 573).

OPPOSING REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 OF 1961—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 571)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I report unfavorably the resolution (S. Res. 158) opposing Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators CURTIS, MUNDT, and ERVIN, members of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if this resolution is the one that pertains to Reorganization Plan No. 5, relating to the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is correct. I understood from the majority leader that the resolution would probably come up Thursday. In order to get the report printed in time, I think it should be filed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be placed on the Calendar, and the report will be printed, as requested.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of May 1961. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, MAY 1961

INTRODUCTION

This is the 18th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories under the Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is for the month of May 1961.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the agencies involved.

The four agencies reported that as of May 1, 1961, the cost value of materials in their stockpile inventories total $15,981,939,000 and as of May 31, 1961, they totaled $15,929,061,000, a net decrease of $52,878,000 reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc., during the month.

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

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories

[In thousands]

Agency and program	Beginning of month, May 1, 1961	End of month, May 31, 1961	Net change, reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc.
Department of Agriculture: Price support program:			
Agricultural commodities	$7,163,803	$7,093,394	−$70,409
Exchange commodities—strategic and critical materials	80,510	53,832	−26,678
Total, Department of Agriculture	7,244,313	7,147,226	−97,087
General Services Administration: Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile	6,118,031	6,114,414	−3,617
Federal Facilities Corporation: Tin inventory	9,519	9,511	−8
Defense Production Act program	1,471,614	1,474,518	+2,904
Supplemental stockpile	883,822	883,611	−211
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit	67,416	111,105	+43,689
Total, General Services Administration	8,550,402	8,593,159	+42,757
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization: Civil defense stockpile	19,718	20,165	+447
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Civil defense medical stockpile	167,506	168,511	+1,005
Grand total	15,981,939	15,929,061	−52,878

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

Detailed tables in this report show opening inventories at the beginning of the month in quantity and cost, transactions during the month, and the closing inventories at the end of the month. Each inventory is shown by commodity except the national stockpile, for which commodity detail is classified.

Pertinent information and explanation are set forth in notes accompanying the respective tables. Statutory authority and program descriptions are shown in the appendix to the report.

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

Table 1: Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, May 1961: Including agricultural commodities and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter.

Table 2: Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, May 1961: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

Table 3: Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, May 1961.

Table 4: Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, May 1961.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, May 1961: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Agriculture defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Lists each commodity in the form in which it exists when extended support, and in some instances in a form to which the supported commodity is processed or converted to increase marketability. The commodities are grouped under the appropriate statutory subclassifications as "Basic," "Designated nonbasic," "Other nonbasic," and "Exchange."

Unit of measure: The applicable unit used in the accounting records and reports of the Corporation.

Inventory, beginning of month: Quantity: In number of units. Cost value: All inventories are recorded in the accounts at cost. "Cost value" is comprised of the initial cost of the commodity plus storage, handling, transportation, and accessorial expenses paid or accrued up to the date of reporting. The initial cost of inventories acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans is the unpaid balance of the notes plus storage and other charges advanced, any equities due or paid to producers on warehouse-stored collateral (by Public Law 85-835, and beginning with 1959 crop production, the Corporation will not make equity payments to borrowers on unredeemed price support loan collateral, title to which it acquires on or after maturity of the loans), and the net value of any quantity or quality differences determined upon delivery of farm-stored collateral. Amounts paid to lending agencies participating in the loan program for crop years prior to 1958 were recorded as a part of inventory cost.

Adjustments: Warehouse settlements, exchanges and transfers (net): Warehouse settlements include the net differences in quantity and/or value represented by the net of overdeliveries, premiums, underdeliveries, and discounts arising from movement of commodities. Exchanges represent the net change in quantity and/or value for inventories exchanged or in process of exchange. On completed exchanges, the change in value represents differentials due to location, quality, and quantity. Unprocessed commodities removed from inventory for conversion or processing (on a contractual or fee basis and excluding conditional sales) are included as a reduction of inventory. Processed commodities acquired as a result of this conversion or processing are included as an addition to inventory.

Acquisitions: As reflected in accounting records and reports; and includes commodities acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans, commodities purchased under terms of purchase agreements, commodities purchased directly from producers or processors as a part of the support operation but not under purchase agreements, and processed commodities acquired by purchases which offset conditional sales of unprocessed commodities from inventory. The cost value of acquisitions is described under the explanation of the cost value of inventory.

Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition: Total costs of storage, handling, transportation, and other accessorial expenses incurred during the month.

Disposals: As reflected in accounting records and reports. Inventory transactions generally are recorded on the basis of transfer of title. Disposition commitments are not reflected in the accounts. Cost value: Represents acquisition value plus applicable amount of carrying charges. The amount of cost allocated to commodities removed from inventory is determined with the view of retaining in the inventory accounts the cost of commodities remaining on hand. The cost allocated to commodities removed from price support inventory is generally computed on the basis of average unit cost of the commodity reflected in the inventory accounts for the applicable crop year and general storage location. In the case of commodities generally stored commingled (e.g., bulk grains and bulk oils) the crop year is determined on the first-in, first-out basis. In the case of commodities stored in identified lots, the crop year is determined by lot identification.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, May 1, 1961		Transactions during the month								Inventory, end of month, Mar. 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Carrying charges added to investment after acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Storage and handling	Transportation and other	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Agricultural commodities:													
Basic commodities:													
Corn	Bushel	1,393,701	$2,317,641	−90	−$172	2,260	$1,956	$11,160	$3,617	47,141	$101,100	1,348,730	$2,233,102
Cornmeal	Pound					50,366	1,901		−1	50,366	1,900		
Cotton, extra long staple	Bale	53	15,023					23	−4	7	1,942	46	13,100
Cotton, upland	do	2,323	409,988	(1)	(1)	1	248	919	−150	115	20,224	2,209	390,781
Peanut butter	Pound			+3,418	+928					3,418	928		
Peanuts, farmers' stock	do	39,113	3,984	−18,292	−2,779	5,262	506	72	243	18,095	1,199	7,988	827
Peanuts, shelled	do	96,313	15,723	+14,874	+1,851	2,127	285	94	373	18,755	2,687	94,559	15,639
Rice, milled	Hundredweight	354	3,100	(1)	(1)	110	1,016	16	56	273	2,446	191	1,742
Rice, rough	do	3,307	15,563	−1	−6	1,597	8,069	300	(1)	69	371	4,834	23,555
Tobacco	Pound					1,377	835			1,377	835		
Wheat	Bushel	1,275,697	3,180,393	−394	−451	20,734	38,839	17,989	8,389	19,207	66,353	1,276,830	3,178,806
Wheat flour	Pound					245,973	12,818		2	245,973	12,820		
Total, basic commodities			5,961,415		−629		66,473	30,573	12,525		212,805		5,857,552
Designated nonbasic commodities:													
Barley	Bushel	49,564	61,595	−5	−22	6,809	5,518	939	126	2,674	4,254	53,694	63,902
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	396,964	1,020,839	+111	+98	3,760	7,105	8,473	751	1,962	6,575	398,873	1,030,691
Milk and butterfat:													
Butter	Pound	88,808	54,115			41,222	24,877	326	289	13,111	8,191	116,919	71,416
Cheese	do	197	75			2,104	801	6	1	3	2	2,298	881
Milk, dried	do	257,856	37,353			91,211	15,218	156	704	69,154	11,905	279,913	41,526
Milk, fluid	do					17,817	731			17,817	731		
Oats	Bushel	10,364	8,874	−188	−458	499	309	120	239	623	382	10,052	8,702
Oats, rolled	Pound			+5,178	+445					5,178	445		
Rye	Bushel	3,608	5,482	−10	−8	−958	853	126	162	497	796	4,059	5,819
Tung oil	Pound	8,500	1,823					3	(1)	1,335	287	7,165	1,539
Total, designated nonbasic commodities.			1,190,156		+55		55,412	10,149	2,272		33,568		1,224,476
Other nonbasic commodities:													
Beans, dry, edible	Hundredweight	1,810	12,211	(1)	−26	2	11	185	136	154	1,157	1,658	11,360
Flaxseed	Bushel	5	12			(1)	−1	1	(1)	3	7	2	5
Soybeans	do	5	9	−3	−32	(1)	1	2	(1)	2	−21	(1)	1
Total, other nonbasic commodities.			12,232		−58		11	188	136		1,143		11,366
Total, agricultural commodities			7,163,803		−632		121,896	40,910	14,933		247,516		7,093,394

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, May 1961: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, May 1, 1961		Transactions during the month								Inventory, end of month, Mar. 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Carrying charges added to investment after acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Storage and handling	Transportation and other	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Exchange commodities: [2]													
Strategic and critical materials:													
Aluminum oxide, abrasive, crude	Pound	10,642	$690					$1	−$26	9,943	$620	699	$45
Antimony, metal	do	3,030	783			309	$97	2	2	2,034	511	1,305	373
Asbestos, amosite	do	5,230	652			(1)		4	3	1,349	180	3,881	479
Asbestos, chrysotile	do	1,000	237			520	148	1	5	500	145	1,020	246
Asbestos, crocidolite	do	3,446	532					5	(1)	2,546	384	900	153
Bauxite	do	2,500,256	15,929			576,282	3,370	27	54	695,935	4,841	2,380,603	14,539
Beryl ore	do	1,901	404					−1		1,901	403		
Beryllium copper master alloy	do	679	1,363			144	291	1	(1)	644	1,293	179	362
Bismuth	do							(1)			(1)		
Boart	Carat	500	1,379							500	1,379		
Chrome ore, chemical grade	Pound	53,270	494			72,156	599	8	12	53,270	487	72,156	626
Chrome ore, refractory grade	do	16,689	217					1	1	10,984	144	5,705	75
Chromium metal	do					60	57	(1)	(1)		(1)	60	57
Colemanite, Turkish boron minerals.	do							(1)	(1)				(1)
Columbite	do	351	278			−47	−37	(1)	(1)	304	241		
Diamonds	Carat	590	7,834			396	5,232			140	2,235	846	10,831
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Pound	27,104	4,358			3,539	547	7	−12	25,931	4,148	4,712	752
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do	4,320	940					2	3	4,320	945		
Ferromanganese	do	91,855	8,773			30,635	2,770	29	137	97,474	9,305	25,016	2,404
Fluorspar, acid grade	do	93,217	1,723			19,379	347	6	−1	83,164	1,530	29,432	545
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Iodine	do					30	31	1	(1)			30	32
Lead	do							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Manganese ore, chemical grade	do	79,663	2,581			18,052	525	2	13			97,715	3,121
Manganese ore, metallurgical grade	do	776,614	16,464			51,518	1,303	28	327	490,441	10,621	337,691	7,501
Manganese ore, natural, battery grade.	do	72,308	3,785			7,497	400	(1)	14			79,805	4,199
Mica	do	698	1,730			119	304	4	1	195	197	622	1,842
Platinum	Troy ounce					6	505					6	505
Quartz crystals	Pound	150	2,116					−17	(1)			150	2,099
Rutile	do	13,986	1,418			21	−1,249	6	3	11,204	44	2,803	134
Silicon carbonite	do	32,471	3,191			1,474	140	14	25	24,860	2,469	9,085	901
Thorium nitrate	do							(1)			(1)		
Tin	do								(1)		(1)		
Titanium sponge	do	1,970	2,639			370	444	1	3	780	1,076	1,560	2,011
Zinc	do							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Total, strategic and critical materials.			80,510				15,824	132	564		43,198		53,832
Total, Department of Agriculture			7,244,313		−$632		137,720	41,042	15,497		290,714		7,147,226

[1] Less than 500.

[2] See appendix, p. 17, for notes relating to reporting o. strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, May 1961: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The General Services Administration defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Identifies the program and the minerals, metals, fiber, and oils acquired under the program.

Unit of measure: The standard weight or measure of minerals, metals, fibers, and oils determined to be the stockpile unit of measure.

Inventory, beginning of month: Opening inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the beginning of the accounting period.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of material in inventory other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Decreases occur from theft, loss incurred while in transit to stockpile location, repacking from one type of container to another, beneficiation of a low-grade material to a higher grade, and the removal of material for sampling and testing purposes. Increases occur from return of material previously removed for sampling and testing purposes and from quantities received at storage locations in excess of quantities billed by the contractor. A new chemical analysis of the materials may cause an increase or decrease where the weights are based on chemical and moisture content. Increases or decreases are also made from findings of audits of inventory and accounting records.

Acquisitions: For the National Stockpile and Defense Production Act acquisitions include open market purchases at contract prices; intradepartmental transfers at market or appraised value at time of transfer; transportation to first permanent storage location; and, beneficiating and processing cost in upgrading materials. For the supplemental stockpile acquisitions include the market value or CCC's acquisition cost whichever is the lower at time of transfer from CCC.

Disposals: Cost of disposals are calculated at the average unit price of inventory at time of removal from inventory. For the national stockpile inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that by their nature would deteriorate if held in storage for lengths of time; and, sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government. For the Defense Production Act inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the end of the accounting period.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, May 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
National stockpile: Total (classified detail omitted)			$6,118,031		−$9		$1,088		$4,697		$6,114,414
Federal Facilities Corporation: Total, tin	Long ton	4	9,519	(1)	−8					4	9,511
Defense Production Act:											
Aluminum	Short ton	772	391,593			5	2,707			777	394,300
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton	2	2,103							2	2,103
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	1,370	18,168							1,370	18,168

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, May 1961: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, May 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Defense Production Act—Continued											
Beryl	Short ton	2	$1,155			(1)	$26			2	$1,181
Bismuth	Pound	23	52							23	52
Chromite, metallurgical grade	Short dry ton	931	33,834			$13	496			944	34,329
Cobalt	Pound	25,187	52,063			26	48			25,213	52,110
Columbite	do	10,624	51,736	(1)						10,624	51,736
Copper	Short ton	132	73,129					1	$589	131	72,540
Cryolite	do	38	10,475					(1)	14	38	10,460
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	20	1,394							20	1,394
Graphite, lubricating	Short ton	(1)	73					(1)	49	(1)	24
Lead	do	8	3,036							8	3,036
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide	Short dry ton	4	2,524							4	2,524
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	3,097	178,487			12	804			3,109	179,291
Mica, muscovite block and film	Pound	6,219	35,944			45	727			6,264	36,670
Nickel	do	118,454	101,036					1,775	1,260	116,679	99,776
Palladium	Troy ounce	8	177							8	177
Rare earth residue	Pound	6,086	658							6,086	658
Rutile	Short dry ton	9	1,725							9	1,725
Tantalite	Pound	1,531	9,734							1,531	9,734
Thorium	do	849	42							849	42
Titanium	Short ton	22	173,002	(1)						22	173,002
Tungsten	Pound	79,810	325,460	+35						79,845	325,460
Subtotal, DPA commodities			1,467,599				4,806		1,912		1,470,494
Machine tools inventory:											
In storage	Tool	(1)	20							(1)	20
On lease	do	(1)	3,966							(1)	3,966
On loan	do	(1)	29				10			(1)	39
Subtotal, DPA machine tools			4,015				10				4,024
Total, Defense Production Act			1,471,614				4,816		1,912		1,474,518
Supplemental stockpile:[2]											
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	Short ton	143	18,485		+$84					143	18,569
Antimony, metal	do	9	5,108		+6					9	5,113
Asbestos, amosite	do	5	1,154		−8					5	1,146
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton	5	3,499							5	3,499
Asbestos, crocidolite	Short ton	3	978		−30					3	948
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	2,340	35,966		+445					2,340	36,410
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type	do	1,033	16,592		−514					1,033	16,078
Beryl	Short ton	9	19,370		−13					9	19,357
Bismuth	Pound	1,497	3,316		+32					1,497	3,348
Cadmium	do	6,609	10,938		+29					6,609	10,967
Chromite, chemical grade	Short dry ton	137	11,744		−95					137	11,649
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do	1,312	206,974		+174					1,312	207,147
Chromite, refractory grade	do	169	4,750		(1)					169	4,751
Cobalt	Pound	1,077	2,169							1,077	2,169
Colemanite	Long dry ton	63	2,799		−325					63	2,474
Columbite	Pound	213	501		+3					213	503
Copper	Short ton	10	6,828		(1)					10	6,828
Diamond, industrial, bort	Carat	561	1,505		+20					561	1,525
Diamond, industrial, stones	do	10,524	134,632		−202					10,524	134,430
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	503	26,941		−6					503	26,936
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do	43	1,358	(1)	+148					43	1,505
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump	do	1	341							1	341
Iodine	Pound	242	231							242	231
Lead	Short ton	222	58,681	(1)	(1)					222	58,681
Manganese, battery grade, natural	Short dry ton	35	3,334							35	3,334
Manganese, chemical grade, type A	do	12	1,016		−114					12	902
Manganese, chemical grade, type B	Short ton	28	2,387		−112					28	2,275
Manganese, metallurgical grade	Short dry ton	1,264	114,407	(1)	+100					1,264	114,507
Mercury	Flask	16	3,446							16	3,446
Mica, muscovite block, strained and better	Pound	263	698							263	698
Mica, muscovite film	do	27	212							27	212
Mica, muscovite splittings	do	4,826	6,226							4,826	6,226
Mica, phlogopite splittings	do	252	234		(1)					252	235
Palladium	Troy ounce	548	9,872							548	9,872
Quartz crystals	Pound	82	1,099							82	1,099
Rare earths	Short dry ton	2	$2,427							2	$2,427
Ruthenium	Troy ounce	15	560							15	560
Selenium	Pound	157	1,071							157	1,071
Silicon carbide, crude	Short ton	87	17,090		+$164					87	17,254
Tantalite	Pound	8	21							8	21
Thorium	do	4,030	9,839		(1)					4,030	9,839
Tin	Long ton	8	16,401		+3					8	16,404
Titanium	Short ton	6	23,401							6	23,401
Tungsten	Pound	4,493	15,627							4,493	15,627
Zinc	Short ton	324	79,599	(1)	+1					324	79,600
Total supplemental stockpile			883,822		−210						883,611
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit:[2]											
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	Short ton	30	3,369			5	$620			34	3,988
Antimony, metal	do	2	942			2	511			3	1,453
Asbestos, amosite	do	1	350			1	180			2	530
Asbestos, chrysotile	do					(1)	145			(1)	145
Asbestos, crocidolite	do	3	849			1	385			4	1,234
Bauxite	Long ton	895	12,516			311	4,841			1,206	17,358
Beryl	Short ton					1	403			1	403

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, May 1961: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, May 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit:[2]—Con.											
Beryllium copper, master alloy	Pound	690	$1,407			644	$1,293			1,334	$2,700
Chromite, chemical grade	Short ton	81	1,526			27	487			108	2,013
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do	(1)	31							(1)	31
Chromite, refractory grade	do	3	70			5	144			8	214
Colemanite	Long ton	4	251							4	251
Columbite	Pound					304	241			304	241
Diamond, industrial, bort	Carat	2,449	6,464			500	1,379			2,949	7,842
Diamond, industrial, stones	do					140	2,235			140	2,235
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Short ton	8	2,839			13	4,147			21	6,986
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do	1	519			2	945			3	1,464
Ferromanganese	do	42	8,208			49	9,305			90	17,513
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	18	687			42	1,530			60	2,216
Manganese, battery grade, natural	do	10	1,014							10	1,014
Manganese, chemical grade	do	16	1,074							16	1,074
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	433	20,086			245	10,621			678	30,707
Mica	Pound					195	197			195	197
Rutile	Short ton	5	918			6	540			10	1,458
Silicon carbide, crude	do	11	2,112			12	2,466			23	4,578
Thorium nitrate	Pound	50	115							50	115
Titanium sponge	Short ton	1	2,070			(1)	1,076			1	3,145
Total, supplemental stockpile inventory in transit.			67,416				43,689				111,105
Total, General Services Administration			8,550,402		−$227		49,593		$6,609		8,593,159

[1] Less than 500.
[2] See appendix, for notes relating to the reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultura commodities.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, May 1961*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization defines the content of the colmuns as follows:

Commodity.—Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure.—Shown only for engineering supply units; not feasible for other composite groups.

Inventory-quantity.—Shown only for one item, namely, engineering supply units. It is not feasible to furnish quantity figures on the other commodity groups because they are composite groups of many different items. To report quantities, it would be necessary to list numerous different items.

Inventory-cost value.—Dollar value figures on commodities in the stockpile inventory essentially reflect their actual cost. The stockpile inventory is generally augmented by acquisition of Government excess property without reimbursement to the several holding agencies. The value assigned to these materials is (1) original acquisition cost if known, (2) estimated current market value of items in similar condition, or (3) average unit cost of identical or similar items purchased in the open market for stockpiling. Government excess property acquired by reimbursement is assigned a value equal to the amount of the fair-value reimbursement required.

Adjustments.—Represent inventory pricing adjustments resulting from recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions.—Materials placed in inventory during the month, including return to inventory of items previously released from inventory for reworking, etc. Value stated in terms of actual costs of the commodities.

Disposals.—Materials removed from inventory during the month, including items released from inventory for reworking, etc. Values shown are based on average unit costs.

Inventory at end of month. Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, May 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, May 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Engineering stockpile (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe and fittings).	10-mile units	(1)	$10,194		[2] −$13		$14		[3] $1	(1)	$10,193
Chemical and biological equipment			942		[2] −5		346		[4] 12		1,271
Radiological equipment			8,582		[2] −60		235		[5] 57		8,701
Total, civil defense stockpile, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.			19,718		−78		595		70		20,165

[1] Less than 500.
[2] Accounting adjustments.
[3] Inventory writeoff.
[4] Consists of grants to other Federal agencies and the States of $10,290, and inventory writeoff of $1,565.
[5] Consists of grants in other Federal agencies and to States of $46,420, and inventory writeoff of $10,395.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 4.—*Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, May 1961*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare defines content of the columns as follows:

Commodity: Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure: Shown only for hospital functional units; not feasible for other composite groups.

Inventory cost value: The dollar value figures in the civil defense medical stockpile inventory reflect essentially the average acquisition costs per unit of the commodities. No transportation, delivery, or storage costs are included.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of materials in commodity groups other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Normally these transactions result from inventory pricing adjustments due to recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, removal of material for sampling during testing or reworking, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions: Materials placed in inventory during month, including new procurement and acquisition of Government excess property.

Disposals: Materials removed from inventory during the month. Costs of disposals are calculated on a basis of the average unit price of items in inventory at the time of removal. Disposals consist principally of items no longer suitable for stockpiling due to deterioration and of samples consumed through testing.

Inventory at end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, May 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, May 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Medical bulk stocks and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses.			$108,024		+$6		[1] $1,101		[2] $154		$108,976
Medical bulk stocks at manufacturer locations			3,985								3,985
Civil defense emergency hospitals	Each	2	38,227		−1				[2] 1	2	38,225
Replenishment units (functional assemblies other than hospitals).			17,270		+54				([3])		17,324
Total, civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.			167,506		+58		1,101		155		168,511

[1] Includes $1,061,326 serum albumin returned from manufacturers resulting from reworking blood plasma.

[2] Inventory writeoff, certificate of destruction.

[3] Less than 500.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

APPENDIX

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the Corporation's charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714), in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1962. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

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

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

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

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Strategic and critical materials stockpiling and related programs

1. National Stockpile

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

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

2. Tin Received From Federal Facilities Corporation

Public Law 608, 84th Congress (50 U.S.C. 98 note), provided, among other things, for the continuation of operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., from June 30, 1956, until January 31, 1957. It provided also that all tin acquired by the Federal Facilities Corporation by reason of such extension should be transferred to GSA.

3. Defense Production Act

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

4. Supplemental Stockpile

As a result of a delegation of authority from OCDM (32A C.F.R., ch. 1, DMO V–4), GSA is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile

established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195, which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Civil defense stockpile program

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

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Civil defense medical stockpile program

As authorized under Public Law 920, 81st Congress, and following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1958, the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has delegated responsibility to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to plan and direct operation of the medical supply portion of the OCDM stockpile. The warehousing of the medical stockpile is principally within the OCDM warehouse system; in addition, the medical stockpile includes a program designed to preposition emergency hospitals and other treatment units in communities throughout the Nation.

EXPLANATORY NOTES RELATING TO THE REPORTING OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS ACQUIRED BY EXCHANGE OR BARTER OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Surplus agricultural commodities in the Commodity Credit Corporation's price-support inventory may be exchanged or bartered for strategic and critical materials under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), and other basic legislation including the CCC Charter Act, as amended, the Agricultural Act of 1954, and the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Except for small amounts which may go to the national stockpile, the strategic and critical materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation under the barter program are transferred to the supplemental stockpile.

Direct appropriations reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for materials so transferred from the price-support inventory.

The General Services Administration is charged with the custody and management of strategic and critical materials, and becomes the responsible reporting agency when title to these bartered materials is placed in the supplemental stockpile.

For purposes of this report, strategic and critical materials acquired by barter may appear in three inventories, reflecting the stages of the transfer of title.

1. The Department of Agriculture reports those to which the Commodity Credit Corporation still has title, prior to transfer to the supplemental stockpile.

2. The General Services Administration reports those which have been transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation exchange inventory in two parts:

A. Materials for which title is "in transit" from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

B. Materials for which title has passed to the supplemental stockpile.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of materials in nine Federal stockpile inventories as reported by the Agriculture Department, General Services Administration, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on May 31, 1961, totaled $15,929,061,000. May activity in these stockpiles resulted in a net decrease of $52,878,000.

Net change in these stockpile inventories reflects acquisitions, disposals, and adjustments. May activity and end-of-month totals are summarized:

[In thousands]

Inventories by agency and program	Cost value, May 1961	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Department of Agriculture:		
Price support program:		
1. Agricultural commodities	−$70,409	$7,093,394
2. Exchange, strategic and critical materials	−26,678	53,832
Total, Department of Agriculture	−97,087	7,147,226
General Services Administration:		
Strategic and critical materials:		
3. National stockpile	−3,617	6,114,414
4. Federal Facilities Corporation, tin inventory	−ε	9,511
5. Defense Production Act program	+2,904	1,474,518
6. Supplemental stockpile	−211	883,611
7. Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit	+43,689	111,105
Total, General Services Administration	+42,757	8,593,159
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:		
8. Civil defense stockpile	+447	20,165
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:		
9. Civil defense medical stockpile	+1,005	168,511
Grand total	−52,878	15,929,061

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

STORAGE AND HANDLING

The report shows storage and handling costs for Commodity Credit's price support inventory totaled $41,042,000 for the month of May. It should be noted these storage costs are for only two of the nine stockpiles covered by the report.

INCREASES AND DECREASES

The major net decreases in cost value during May were $85 million in corn, and $21 million in cotton. This was partially offset by net increases of $22 million in milk and butterfat and $10 million in grain sorghum.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Of 19 agricultural commodities in Commodity Credit's $7.1 billion price support inventory on May 31, 1961, those leading in cost value include:

Wheat, with 1.3 billion bushels at a cost of $3.2 billion;

Corn, with 1.3 billion bushels at a cost of $2.2 billion; and

Grain sorghum, with 399 million hundredweight at a cost of $1 billion.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Strategic and critical materials are shown in six inventories totaling $8.6 billion, including the $6.1 billion national stockpile for which itemized detail is classified. Combined figures from the other five inventories show materials (in all grades and forms) leading in cost value as follows:

Aluminum, bauxite, etc., with 8.1 million tons at a cost of $519 million;

Manganese (and ores), with 5.5 million tons at a cost of $370 million; and

Tungsten, with 84 million pounds at a cost of $341 million.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Supplies and equipment in two civil defense stockpile inventories total $189 million. Nearly 90 percent is in the medical stockpile valued at $169 million.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. LONG of Hawaii):

S. 2267. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain property to the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 2268. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the application of Federal criminal law to certain events occurring on board aircraft in air commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 2269. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

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

S. 2270. A bill to amend section 105 of title 28, United States Code, so as to transfer certain counties from the western division of the western district of Missouri to the St. Joseph division of such district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2271. A bill for the relief of Christos Ganniotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2272. A bill to disclaim interest in certain rights in certain lands in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 2273. A bill to authorize grants, contracts, and jointly financed cooperative ar-

rangements for research relating to maternal and child health services and crippled children's services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2274. A bill for the relief of Roland Guenther; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2275. A bill for the relief of Anthanasia F. Fragou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2276. A bill for the relief of James Takeo Nigo; and

S. 2277. A bill for the relief of Thomas Shuichi Nakagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 2278. A bill for the relief of Dr. Charles C. Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPLICATION OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAW TO CERTAIN EVENTS OCCURRING ON BOARD AIRCRAFT IN AIR COMMERCE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the application of Federal criminal law to certain events occurring on board aircraft in air commerce.

As our laws now stand, a person could commit an assault or even murder on a flight crossing the United States and the matter might be tied up in litigation for years while authorities tried to determine the local jurisdiction under which the offense occurred.

Recently an incident occurred that points up the urgent need for filling this gap in our Federal laws. On July 8 a passenger on a jetliner going west drew a knife on members of the crew when they attempted to take a bottle of liquor from him. When the incident occurred the plane was presumably flying over the State of Nevada. When the plane landed in Los Angeles, Federal and local authorities were unable to find a criminal statute under which to arrest the offender. He was first booked on suspicion of assault with a deadly weapon but the district attorney's office decided it had no jurisdiction over an incident taking place while the plane was over Nevada. No Federal law seemed to cover the case.

This is just one example but it is representative of the difficulties that have been encountered in applying State laws to crimes committed aboard aircraft. The problem is aggravated because only certain crimes are extraditable under State laws and the apprehending officials are usually not the officials of the State or jurisdiction where the alleged crime was committed. By making such a crime a Federal offense, the offender may be apprehended by Federal officials and returned to the appropriate district for trial by Federal law.

There is in title 18 of the United States Code a category of crimes identified as being within the special maritime or territorial jurisdiction of the United States. This jurisdiction is aimed primarily at crimes committed on vessels and aircraft over the high seas. The crimes embraced under these provisions include assault, maiming, murder, manslaughter, robbery, and attempts at committing murder or manslaughter. The bill I have today introduced would extend the criminal jurisdiction of the United States under title 18 to these same crimes when committed on board an aircraft in flight in air commerce.

As we move along in the jet and space age, we are finding that many of our laws need revision to keep pace with the extraordinary changes in our way of life. Let us remember that in this day of jets a man may pull a knife out of its sheath in the airspace over Nevada and by the time he completes his nefarious intentions he is flying in the airspace over California.

I ask that my bill be appropriately referred and urge that it receive quick and favorable action.

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

The bill (S. 2268) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the application of Federal criminal law to certain events occurring on board aircraft in air commerce, introduced by Mr. ENGLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, relating to the bill.

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

The bill (S. 2269) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. KERR), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, July 12, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing for your consideration a draft bill to authorize the Surgeon General to establish within the Public Health Service a National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and a National Institute of General Medical Sciences. The proposed Institutes would be similar in organizational character and function to the seven Institutes which are presently contained within the National Institutes of Health.

The establishment of these two new Institutes would provide a sharper focus for research and training activities in two vital areas—first, the broad fields of research relating to child health and human development and, secondly, research in the general and basic medical sciences which underlie all fields of medical research. However, only the first area will require the establishment of a new program. At the present time the National Institutes of Health, through its Division of General Medical Sciences, is carrying out an extensive program of grants for research and research training in the general and basic medical sciences, and the draft bill would merely elevate an important ongoing program to institute status.

The legislative proposal for the establishment of a National Institute of Child Health and Human Development will implement the recommendation, in your health message to the Congress on February 9, "* * * that there be established in the National Institutes of Health a new National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, which will include a Center for Research in Child Health as well as other broad-ranging health research activities not now covered by the specialized work of the existing Institutes."

This new Institute will provide a central focus and coordinating point in the fields of research relating to child health and human development similar to the focus which the existing Institutes provide for their respective disease areas. In spite of the extensive research already supported by the National Institutes of Health which relates to the problems of children and youth and the process of human maturation, we believe that the importance of these problems deserves the emphasis of a special organizational unit and the attention of special research and training programs. This Institute could provide the basis for a stepped-up program of research into such specific problems as congenital malformations, infant mortality, mental retardation, and maternal factors which relate to the health and development of the child. There is an equally great need for more research into the developmental and adaptive processes (both normal and abnormal), beginning with the reproductive system and then continuing logically through the perinatal period, infancy, and childhood and including the processes of maturation (physiological, physical, intellectual, social, and psychological development) through adolescence and into adulthood. This type of fundamental research is needed to provide the basis for specific advances in the health and well-being of our children, youth, and other age groups in the years to come The research program of this Institute will also form a particularly suitable setting for an effective research effort in the aging process. The study of aging is a logical extension of a program which is concerned with the processes of human development.

We do not propose that this new Institute take over from other institutes the study of those childhood diseases which can best be undertaken in the context of a total disease category. For example, the study of leukemia in children would remain in the National Cancer Institute, and the National Institute of Mental Health would continue to be responsible for research into schizophrenia in children. We believe that there are great research opportunities in the areas described above which will occupy the total attentions of the proposed Institute and which can be undertaken without any harmful disruption of the current research programs of other institutes.

Nor would this legislation impinge upon the authority of other agencies which have responsibilities in the sphere of child health and human development. The draft bill contains a specific provision which recognizes the existing authority of the Secretary to conduct related studies and investigations through the Children's Bureau, and

we are submitting for your approval companion legislation to clarify and expand this authority of the Secretary. It is our intention to have a representative of the Children's Bureau serve as an ex officio member of the advisory council which would be established to advise the Surgeon General on the activities of this new Institute.

In carrying out its functions the proposed Institute of Child Health and Human Development could utilize all of the mechanisms provided in section 301 of the Public Health Service Act, including grants for research projects and direct conduct of research. In addition, the Institute could support training activities related to child health and human development, including training grants, fellowships, and traineeships. Provision is also made in the draft bill for an advisory council, similar to the national advisory councils associated with the present Institutes.

As indicated above, the proposal for the conversion of the Division of General Medical Sciences into a National Institute of General Medical Sciences is made in recognition of the importance of the general and basic medical sciences to the progress of medical research. The conversion of this division into an institute was recommended by the group of expert consultants appointed by the Senate Appropriations Committee for the purpose of considering all aspects of the Federal support of research. The program of research and research training supported by the Division of General Medical Sciences has increased both in size and importance. The elevation of the division to institute status is a logical step in the evolution of this vital program.

The functions of the Institute of General Medical Sciences would be similar to those of the other Institutes at the National Institutes of Health and to the authorities of the Institute of Child Health and Human Development described above. The Surgeon General would also be authorized to establish an advisory council to advise on this program.

An amendment to section 301(d) of the Public Health Service Act is proposed in this draft bill in order to clarify the general authority of the Surgeon General to make grants for research training projects. Additional provisions included in the draft bill would authorize the Surgeon General to appoint advisory committees to provide advice and consultation concerning any programs of the Public Health Service.

Also included is an amendment exempting members of councils and other advisory groups, existing or prospective, from certain conflict-of-interest laws, except for the prohibition against participation in the prosecution of any claim against the United States on any matter with respect to which he was directly connected as a member and except for a prohibition against receipt of salary from other than the member's employer at the time of his appointment.

We believe that the enactment of this legislation will provide the Public Health Service with new tools to be used in the expanding fight against human disease and disability. These proposed new Institutes would constitute a needed complement to the present significant efforts in this fight.

Faithfully yours,

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Secretary.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BURDICK (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. DOUGLAS) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1643) to improve and protect farm prices and farm income, to increase farmer participation in the development of farm programs, to adjust supplies of agricultural commodities in line with the requirements therefor, to improve distribution and expand exports of agricultural commodities, to liberalize and extend farm credit services, to protect the interest of consumers, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PASTORE submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 7208) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Page 9, line 2:

"The second proviso in the paragraph relating to the authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their respective offices, which appears in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U.S.C. 60f) is amended to read as follows: '*Provided further*, That no salary shall be fixed in a Senator's office under this section at a basic rate of more than $5,100 per annum, except that (1) the salary of one employee may be fixed at a basic rate of not more than $6,540 per annum, (2) the salary of one employee may be fixed at a basic rate of not more than $8,040 per annum, (3) the salary of one employee may be fixed at a basic rate of not more than $8,460 per annum, and (4) the salary of one employee may be fixed at a basic rate of not more than $8,880 per annum.'"

Mr. PASTORE also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill (H.R. 7208) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. PASTORE submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 7208) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Page 9, line 16:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds available for the payment of travel and subsistence expenses of members of committees of the Senate may hereafter be used for payment, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of such expenses incurred by such Members for official travel on committee business performed at any time subsequent to July 12, 1960, regardless of place of departure or destination."

Mr. PASTORE also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill H.R. 7208, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. PASTORE submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 7208) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely, page 10, line 1:

"The contingent fund of the Senate is hereafter made available for the payment of mileage, to be computed at 10 cents per mile by the nearest usual route, between Washington, District of Columbia, and a point in the home State of the Senator involved, for not to exceed four round trips originating and terminating in Washington, District of Columbia, made by employees in each Senator's office in any fiscal year, such payment to be made only upon vouchers approved by the Senator containing a certification, by such Senator, that such travel was performed in line of official duty, but the mileage allowed for any such trip shall not exceed the round trip mileage by the nearest usual route between Washington, District of Columbia, and the residence city of the Senator involved."

Mr. PASTORE also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill H.R. 7208, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. KEATING, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2189) to establish an Office of Federal Administrative Practice and to provide for the appointment and administration of a corps of hearing commissioners and for other purposes, and it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO STIMULATION OF ACTIVITY IN THE METAL MINING AND COAL MINING INDUSTRIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 14, 1961, the names of Senators BYRD of West Virginia, CASE of South Dakota, MORTON, BIBLE, RANDOLPH, MOSS, and GOLDWATER were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2249) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of stimulating growth, activity, and employment in the metal mining and coal mining industries, introduced by Mr. BENNETT on July 14, 1961.

NOTICE OF JOINT HEARING BY INTERIOR AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEES ON S. 1629 AND S. 2246, RELATING TO WATER RESOURCES AND RIVER BASIN PLANNING

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce for the information of the Senate that on July 26 at 10 a.m., in room 3110, New Senate Office Building, there will be a joint hearing by the Interior and Public Works Committees on S. 1629 and S. 2246, measures involving water resources and river basin planning.

This hearing will be in lieu of the previous one scheduled for July 14 which was canceled after President Kennedy submitted his communication on water resources planning. Government witnesses only will be heard at this time.

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

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

By Mr. HICKEY:

Article entitled "N-Bomb: Ideal Weapon for Defense," written by Senator DODD, and published in U.S. News & World Report for July 17, 1961.

By Mr. HARTKE:

Article entitled "N-Bomb: Ideal Weapon For Defense," written by Senator DODD and published in U.S. News & World Report of July 17, 1961; also an article entitled "The Case for Atomic Testing By United States," written by Representative HOLIFIELD and published in U.S. News & World Report, July 17, 1961.

BERLIN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, Armageddon looms before the world. Evil—the evil of communism—is arrayed against man's freedom. Peril continues to mount.

The people of the United States are united, without equivocation, behind the President of the United States. Khrushchev's demands on Berlin may, indeed, as the President of the United States has said, lead to highly dangerous developments which could endanger and engulf millions of people.

Mr. President, there is no despair in America. There is courage; there is resolve—the same resolve which has ever motivated the American people in times of crisis. America holds high the banner of freedom, and by her side are the governments and the peoples of free nations in every clime. The President's message to the Kremlin is vigorously echoed in London and Paris.

Let the rulers of the Kremlin clearly understand our firm resolve, as enunciated by President Kennedy. Let them make no miscalculation; let them make no mistake. We shall continue to stand by our honorable commitments to the free peoples of Berlin.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of the unfinished business, Senate bill 2043.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2043) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum has been suggested; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEATH OF HERBERT CLAIBORNE PELL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, death has come suddenly, unexpectedly, to a distinguished American—the beloved father of my colleague, Senator PELL.

Herbert Claiborne Pell passed away yesterday at Munich, Germany. He had been guiding his grandson and namesake on a tour of the lands made familiar to Mr. Pell through his years of service as Minister for his country.

A Member of Congress in his own name in the 66th Congress, the father of my colleague was a public servant whose labors were national and international in scope and neighborly in beneficence.

In his 77 years of unselfish activity, he earned rich recognition from his party, his country, and from grateful nations in appreciation of his statesmanlike, scholarly, and humane efforts.

Born February 16, 1884, Mr. Pell was educated at Pomfret School, then Harvard University, and Columbia University, to both of which he has returned as occasional lecturer. From 1937 to 1941 he was U.S. Minister to Portugal; then Minister to Hungary until November 30, 1942, after he had received the Hungarian declaration of war. He then served as U.S. representative on the War Crimes Commission from 1943 to 1945. In this capacity the crimes against the Jews especially appalled his sense of justice and humanity.

For his work on the War Crimes Commission there were conferred on him the honors of the White Lion of Czechoslovakia and the grade of Officer of the Legion of Honor of France. Portugal had bestowed upon him the Grand Cross of the Order of Christ.

The most recent of his honors was to be appointed Honorary Consultant in French Bibliography to the Library of Congress. In his days on the Hill, Mr. Pell had served on the Joint Committee on the Library. For his educational work the French Government had decorated him Officier d'Instruction Publique. In 1948, Mr. Pell presented the Library with a selection of fine books from his personal library. This was in the pattern of his lifelong devotion to education, literature, and good neighborliness. By personal gift, the Pell home at Newport is now a Catholic school.

The cause of world peace continued to command the efforts of Mr. Pell through the years, and he was an earnest advocate of solidarity and negotiations for disarmament to avert world conflict.

Herbert Claiborne Pell has been no stranger to the Hill since the advent of his son as junior Senator from Rhode Island. It has been the good fortune of many of the Senators to meet him and to enjoy at firsthand the character of the gentleman, scholar, and diplomat, whom we in Rhode Island have known as the good neighbor and gentle friend.

He had pardonable pride in the continuity of the family spirit of public service. The life and labors of Herbert Claiborne Pell could well be an example and inspiration to all Americans who see their country as part and partner in a world where human dignity and human decency are the goals of honest men.

To my esteemed colleague, Senator PELL, to Mrs. Pell and family, and to all near and dear to the departed, I extend my sincerest sympathy in their great loss and deep sorrow.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join in the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island relative to the passing, late yesterday, of the father of our beloved and outstanding colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]. I know what a loss this will mean to the junior Senaator from Rhode Island, because in this instance it is really a case of "like father, like son." There was much in the way of parallelism in the lives of the two that was outstanding, and both have contributed mightily to the welfare of their State of Rhode Island, and the United States as a whole.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] may be officially excused from attendance in the Senate because of the obligations imposed on him by the passing of his father.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I extend to the family of Mr. Pell, Sr., and to our distinguished colleague and his family our

extreme sympathy and condolences, and pray that his soul will rest in peace.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to identify myself with the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island and Montana in extending condolences and sympathy to the Pell family. I am very fond of our colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]. I join in the expressions of sympathy in the sense of deep personal loss in the death of his father.

TEXTILE MEETING AT GENEVA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a very important matter which is taking place today in Geneva, where representatives of the leaders in the textile industry from many countries, including our own, together with State Department representatives and observers from many countries, are meeting under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, for the purpose of seeking to rationalize the question of concentrated imports of textiles.

The question of textile imports is a major problem in our country, and I have strongly urged upon the Congress that we adopt measures of adjustment and assistance which will deal with the problem of concentrated imports, rather than the imposition of quotas.

It is because I stand here with those who are in the forefront of the idea of expanding trade for the world that I think I have the right to speak today. I urge upon the nations who are meeting at Geneva, especially those nations who are responsible for the concentrated imports in textiles, to agree to voluntary quotas, because, whatever I may think or whatever others like me may think, the situation is one of real seriousness. It would be a big blow to the trade of the world, and to our own export trade, if we were driven to impose quotas or use other restrictive devices. Yet that is a real danger, and the problem can be dealt with in a constructive, statesmanlike way if there will be an effort to come to an accommodation at the conference at Geneva.

I express the hope that the counsel will prevail, not as a counsel of reason, but as one of self-interest, because, if it does not prevail, a dangerous situation will confront world trade.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I wish to commend the Senator from New York. I know how he feels about the whole panorama of imports and exports. I know of his deep interest in the international affairs of our country, and what this question of trade means to our foreign policy and what it means on the domestic level also.

It is the fervent hope of those who are concerned with the decline of the domestic textile industry, which has taken place over the past 10 years, as a result of the release of a tremendous influx of imports from friendly nations, that those nations will appreciate the predicament of the American textile industry and go along with the idea of voluntary quotas, so we will not be forced to impose more restrictive measures.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. Although there may be arguments about the facts and figures, in which I myself have engaged, these are the facts of life, and it would be much better to try to meet the problem on the basis of self-interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, an article on the textile meeting at Geneva which appeared in today's New York Times.

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

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1961]

TEXTILE MEETING OPENS AT GENEVA: INTERNATIONAL TRADE TALKS BY LEADERS OF INDUSTRY ARE UNDERWAY; GATT ACTS AS SPONSOR; CONFERENCE URGED BY UNITED STATES SEEKS AGREEMENTS ON LEVELS OF EXPORTS

GENEVA, July 17.—Leaders in the textile industry from many countries gathered here today for the opening of the International Textile Conference, a major meeting of representatives of nations gravely concerned over the flow of manufactured textiles between nations.

The meeting, which is sponsored by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), is one of statesmen more than of industry spokesmen. The U.S. delegation includes representatives of the Department of State, as well as of the textile industry, and there are many observers from countries not taking a direct part in the proceedings.

The opening sessions were held behind closed doors, and there was no communique of the type usually issued when international conferences take up big problems. A conference spokesman said that the only opening statements were short and of a preliminary nature, and that was all that came out of the gathering.

UNITED STATES SEEKING ACCORD

The United States is hoping for an accord that would make selling easier for its American producers in their own country. There is pressure on U.S. manufacturers in their own domestic markets because producers in Hong Kong and Japan, among others, can ship low-cost manufactured goods to the United States for sale at lower prices than goods made in America.

At the same time, the United States wants to assure these low-cost countries of expanding markets to further their economic development. The dilemma is that this objective is sought without causing disruptive effects on other producers that would bring about retaliatory restrictions on trade.

A preliminary document issued before today's meeting said that the conference would aim through international action to accomplish these objectives:

To increase significantly, for the low-cost producers, access to markets now subject to import restrictions.

To maintain orderly access to markets where restrictions are not now maintained.

To obtain from exporting countries a measure of restraint in their export policy in order to avoid disruptive effects in import markets.

CHAIRMAN ELECTED

At the opening session, Eric Windham White, executive secretary of GATT, was elected chairman of the meeting, whose stated purpose is to take up problems of trade in cotton textiles. His election had been proposed by the United States.

The United States had asked that the meeting be held with the twin purposes of persuading other industrially advanced countries to accept more finished cotton goods from underdeveloped countries and from Japan, while persuading such countries not to flood the markets accepting their output to the harm of local producers.

Attending the talks, in addition to the United States, are representatives of Australia, Austria, Britain, Canada, Spain, India, Japan, Pakistan, Portugal, Sweden, and five of the six member countries of the European Common Market. These are France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands, with Luxembourg not present. The Common Market Commission also is represented.

In addition, requests to be represented by observers were accepted from Brazil, Denmark, Greece, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United Arab Republic.

George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, heads the U.S. group. Mr. Ball in recent days has traveled to the Far East and to a number of European capitals to help prepare for the session, which is scheduled to last until Friday.

SOVIET PROPAGANDA ON AFRICAN ENVOYS IN UNITED STATES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a newspaper article from the New York Times of July 14, 1961, headed "Soviet Mocks United States on African Envoys."

The article shows the way in which Soviet propagandists exploit the slightest scintilla of publicized racial tension in the United States, enabling the Soviets to blow it up and give it some colorability of truth and undermine us in the decisive and neutralist areas of the world.

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

SOVIET MOCKS UNITED STATES ON AFRICAN ENVOYS—EXPLOITS RACIAL INCIDENTS IN PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN

(By Seymour Topping)

Moscow, July 13.—A Maryland restaurant unwittingly supplied the Soviet Union today with another propaganda missile in the Communist campaign to win over the peoples of Africa and Asia.

The story of how a roadside restaurant refused service to Adam Malick Sow, Ambassador from Chad, because he is a Negro, was broadcast by the Moscow radio to the uncommitted countries of the world.

The broadcast did not mention that the State Department and the State of Maryland had apologized to the African diplomat for the incident, which occurred on June 26.

This was typical of the way Soviet propagandists exploit almost every publicized instance of racial discrimination in the United States.

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

In the opinion of African, Asian, and Latin American diplomats here, reports of this kind often have a significant impact on opinion in their countries. It was pointed out that there was enough truth in Soviet reporting of racial discrimination in the United States to make credible frequent cases of propaganda distortions.

Izvestia, the Government newspaper, chose the occasion of the current visit to Moscow of President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana for an illustrated article on discrimination against African and Asian diplomats and students in the United States.

On the front page of Izvestia were two photos showing the beaming President of Ghana being warmly greeted and feted by Premier Khrushchev, and Leonid I. Brezhnev, Soviet President.

On an inside page were two other photos. One purported to show some U.S. youngsters beating the 9-year-old-son of the Third Secretary of the Ghanaian Embassy in Washington. The U.S. children were said by Izvestia to have "received appropriate education from racist families."

The other photo was represented as having been taken of an African student from Kenya who is attending a university in the United States. He is shown defiantly standing under a tree bearing a sign that says "this is a white area."

U.S. HYPOCRISY CHARGED

The Izvestia article charged that U.S. authorities did not want to fight racial discrimination. "Moreover, they themselves in fact stir up passions although they hypocritically swear friendship for the peoples of Africa," Izvestia said. "That is why demands are becoming louder about the necessity for transferring the capital of the United Nations from New York to the capital of one of the neutral countries."

Jeeringly referring to the United States as "the most democratic country of the world," Izvestia said it was curious that the State Department had found it necessary to organize a special section to deal with instances of racial discrimination against African and Asian diplomats.

The Soviet Government limits the possibility of incidents in Moscow involving foreign diplomats by segregating them in special housing. Diplomats, including Africans and Asians, live in blocs of flats or embassies provided by the Government. Militiamen who are posted at entrances screen all Russians entering the premises.

African and Asian diplomats generally are given preferential treatment in Government-run restaurants and hotels here. There have been no reported incidents recently.

ATTEND SPECIAL SCHOOL

Until a year ago, when Friendship University was founded, African and Asian students were enrolled in regular Soviet universities. They now attend Friendship University in Moscow with students from other countries and a number of selected Soviet students.

In past years there have been isolated instances in which African students complained, after having left the country, of discrimination in Soviet universities. One such case involved a Nigerian student, Theophilis Chukuemeko Okonkwo, who wrote several newspaper articles last year charging racial bias in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Okonkwo subsequently was denounced by the Soviet press. He was charged with having carried on subversive work for the United States. It was stated that he had been expelled after failing to pass a single examination in 2 years.

THE AMERICAN INDIAN CONFERENCE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, some days ago I inserted in the RECORD seven articles regarding the American Indian Chicago Conference. Those articles reflected some of the needs and wishes of the Indians attending the Chicago conference.

I have now received a copy of the printed declaration of Indian purpose which was formulated at the Chicago conference. I wish to commend this declaration to my colleagues in the Senate, and it is my hope that they will study the document with great care.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two sections from the declaration of Indian purpose: the creed and the concluding statement. I believe these sections express the attitude the American Indians ask of the American people and the Federal Government in considering their problems.

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

CONCLUDING STATEMENT

To complete our declaration, we point out that in the beginning the people of the New World, called Indians by accident of geography, were possessed of a continent and a way of life. In the course of many lifetimes, our people had adjusted to every climate and condition from the Arctic to the torrid zones. In their livelihood and family relationships, their ceremonial observances, they reflected the diversity of the physical world they occupied.

The conditions in which Indians live today reflect a world in which every basic aspect of life has been transformed. Even the physical world is no longer the controlling factor in determining where and under what conditions men may live. In region after region, Indian groups found their means of existence either totally destroyed or materially modified. Newly introduced diseases swept away or reduced regional populations. These changes were followed by major shifts in the internal life of tribe and family.

The time came when the Indian people were no longer the masters of their situation. Their life ways survived subject to the will of a dominant sovereign power. This is said, not in a spirit of complaint; we understand that in the lives of all nations of people, there are times of plenty and times of famine. But we do speak out in a plea for understanding.

When we go before the American people, as we do in this declaration, and ask for material assistance in developing our resources and developing our opportunities, we pose a moral problem which cannot be left unanswered. For the problem we raise affects the standing which our Nation sustains before world opinion.

Our situation cannot be relieved by appropriated funds alone, though it is equally obvious that without capital investment and funded services, solutions will be delayed. Nor will the passage of time lessen the complexities which beset a people moving toward new meaning and purpose.

The answers we seek are not commodities to be purchased, neither are they evolved automatically through the passing of time.

The effort to place social adjustment on a money-time interval scale which has characterized Indian administration, has resulted in unwanted pressure and frustration.

When Indians speak of the continent they yielded, they are not referring only to the loss of some millions of acres in real estate. They have in mind that the land supported a universe of things they knew, valued, and loved.

With that continent gone, except for the few poor parcels they still retain, the basis of life is precariously held, but they mean to hold the scraps and parcels as earnestly as any small nation or ethnic group was ever determined to hold to identity and survival.

What we ask of America is not charity, not paternalism, even when benevolent. We ask only that the nature of our situation be recognized and made the basis of policy and action.

In short, the Indians ask for assistance, technical and financial, for the time needed, however long that may be, to regain in the America of the space age some measure of the adjustment they enjoyed as the original possessors of their native land.

CREED

We believe in the inherent right of all people to retain spiritual and cultural values, and that the free exercise of these values is necessary to the normal development of any people. Indians exercised this inherent right to live their own lives for thousands of years before the white man came and took their lands. It is a more complex world in which Indians live today, but the Indian people who first settled the New World and built the great civilizations which only now are being dug out of the past, long ago demonstrated that they could master complexity.

We believe that the history and development of America show that the Indian has been subjected to duress, undue influence, unwarranted pressures, and policies which have produced uncertainty, frustration, and despair. Only when the public understands these conditions and is moved to take action toward the formulation and adoption of sound and consistent policies and programs will these destroying factors be removed and the Indian resume his normal growth and make his maximum contribution to modern society.

We believe in the future of a greater America, an America which we were first to love, where life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness will be a reality. In such a future, with Indians and all other Americans cooperating, a cultural climate will be created in which the Indian people will grow and develop as members of a free society.

REPEAL OF TAX EXEMPT STATUS OF MUNICIPAL BONDS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, last month I introduced in the Senate a bill to repeal the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds issued for the purpose of industrial development.

That bill, S. 2042, would strike sharply at an insidious form of modern-day piracy, the luring of industry from one area to another with community-built, tax-free plants, financed by municipal bonds.

Since I introduced the bill I have been interested to note a growing feeling in many responsible circles that this practice not only is unethical, but it also holds many dangers.

The Investment Bankers Association, for example, has sharply attacked this industrial piracy, declaring that "it is poor policy to use public credit for private industrial facilities."

In reporting the action of the IBA the June 19 issue of Barron's Weekly summed up the dangers of what it calls trespassing, and concluded by saying that the IBA has "taken a firm stand on behalf of the national interest."

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Barron's Weekly article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in addition to the growing body of opinion against the use of municipal bonds for industrial piracy, there has been an even more significant development.

In my earlier remarks to the Senate I pointed out that the real tragedy fell upon the hundreds and thousands of workers who are left behind, jobless, when their companies succumb to the bait and move out.

In many cases, these workers have put in 20 to 30 years with their company, yet they are casually tossed on the job market at an age when new opportunities are few and far between.

Naturally, the company and the locality which has bought its presence have no desire for the workers to move with the plant.

One Michigan company, for example, very bluntly told its employees they would not be welcome in the new location.

In a letter to the abandoned employees the company frankly stated it had "agreed to give first opportunity for jobs in the new plant to the people of the community in exchange for certain tax concessions."

Such an attitude clearly ignores the moral responsibilities of a company toward long-term employees who have made substantial contributions toward the firm's success.

The least the company can do to meet its moral responsibilities, even if it becomes a willing party to industrial piracy, is to give the employees an opportunity to move with the plant.

A recent decision handed down in Federal District Court in Detroit may well have a far-reaching effect on this point.

The opinion, delivered by Federal Judge Fred W. Kaess, was on a case brought by several employees of the Gemmer Manufacturing Co.

This company, one of the examples to which I referred when I introduced S. 2042, plans to move to Lebanon, Tenn., to a plant built under a $2.4 million municipal bond issue.

To be left behind in Michigan were 750 employees whose average age is 48 and who have spent an average of 20 years with the company.

However, Judge Kaess ruled in his decision that the company "has an obligation and duty to rehire on the basis of seniority those employees laid off in Detroit when that plant's operations are removed to Lebanon, Tenn."

The key words in that opinion are "obligation and duty," and Judge Kaess is to be commended for reminding the company that it has these responsibilities.

Judge Kaess dismisses the argument that the physical move of the company diminishes this responsibility by stating:

> The Gemmer division plant is the same plant wherever it is moved, in spite of the fact that it might be known by a different name. This is the same plant, same machinery and equipment, same operation, same officers and supervisors, but in a new climate.

Judge Kaess stated further:

> The mere fact that there is a termination date in a collective bargaining agreement does not terminate all the rights and benefits of the employees under that agreement, but merely designates a certain time agreed upon by the parties when there would be further negotiations concerning those rights and benefits.

I am hopeful that the opinion issued by Judge Kaess will have a sobering effect on those companies which believe they can flee their social and human responsibilities in return for a tax concession.

Judge Kaess attacks one very important injury caused by industrial piracy.

I believe it is up to Congress to destroy the root of the trouble by eliminating the tax-free privileges of such bonds—when used for this purpose.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to study the opinion of Judge Kaess in detail, I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the RECORD.

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

JAMES ODDIE, EDWARD CWIERTNIEWICZ, JOHN PENZAK, OSCAR KING, HARRY C. BREMMER, PLAINTIFFS *v.* ROSS GEAR AND TOOL CO., INC., AN INDIANA CORPORATION, DEFENDANT

(In the U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, Civil No. 21350)

OPINION

Plaintiffs are employees who bring this action in behalf of themselves and their fellow seniority employees of the Gemmer Manufacturing Co., a division of Ross Gear & Tool Co., Inc., an Indiana corporation. They bring this action purportedly in behalf of themselves and others similarly situated for a declaration of rights, together with temporary injunctive relief, pending final adjudication, and any money damages that may be earned upon a final hearing.

The defendant is in the business of manufacturing steering gears for automobiles, etc., and is an Indiana corporation. The defendant company has two plants presently in operation, one its original plant in Indiana, and the acquired division, known as the Gemmer Manufacturing Co. of Detroit, Mich.

The Gemmer division has recognized the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America UAW (AFL-CIO) and its Local Union No. 80, as exclusive bargaining agent of its employees at the Detroit plant, and had entered into a collective bargaining agreement with such union.

The defendant company, Ross Gear & Tool Co., Inc., acquired certain property in Lebanon, Tenn., and on January 13, 1961 posted a notice advising the employees of the Gemmer division that it had formed a Tennessee division and that some products then manufactured in Detroit would be transferred to Tennessee. Later, however, it became apparent, and there seems to be no doubt, that the entire Gemmer division, lock stock and barrel, is to be moved to Lebanon, Tenn., and to be called the Tennessee division of the Ross Gear & Tool Co., Inc. On May 22, 1961 the defendant announced its decision to terminate the plant operations conducted by the Gemmer division in Detroit and further advised that the equipment and operations are to be transferred to its new division, beginning July 1, 1961, with production being concluded in the Gemmer division on or about September 2, 1961. Thus the transfer or move will be in two phases—one beginning July 1, 1961 and the concluding phase on September 2, 1961. The first phase, however, will not affect or terminate the employment of the plaintiffs or affect their seniority rights. However the defendant advises that all seniority rights will be terminated on September 2, 1961 and the Detroit plant is to be closed.

The basic facts seem clear in this respect. The defendant company proposes to close its plant at Detroit, Mich., and move it to Lebanon, Tenn.

If this were all, it would thus far be clear that the defendant could do practically whatever it chose to do, at least with respect to its labor and employment relations, but there is and has been a labor contract in existence for over 20 years, its present expiration being October 1, 1961. The defendant company and its predecessor have been a party to the contract, as has been Local No. 80 of the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America UAW (AFL-CIO).

During this time certain valuable rights have been created by contract, to both the employer and the employee. Perhaps those rights gravitate more to one side than the other, but certainly affect both.

In, and by reason of, the past and present contracts, the employees became beneficiaries of certain rights, to quote but one for the moment, certain pension rights or retirement benefits which can and do survive the contract and are so contemplated by the parties.

The issue here is, do seniority rights survive by analogy as an earned right?

In *Zdanok* v. *Glidden Co.*, 288 F. 2d 99 (103) seniority is called a vested right, or one earned, as a type of unemployment insurance earned and acquired by continuous service.

The court goes on to say, however, at page 103, that "the employee owning that right, or his authorized union agent, could bargain away the employee's rights."

In our case here the contract is still in force. Neither the union nor the employees have sought to change it—nor perhaps would they. But the issue at the moment evolves about the proposition as to whether or not the contract can be annulled unilaterally by the mere moving of the defendant's plant to another State.

To be consistent with the Glidden case, supra, if that were the only issue, the answer would obviously be "No." Therefore this court must determine whether or not the contract now in force, by its terms may have bargained away that right.

It becomes essential to determine the provisions of the contract and to determine its intended meaning. First we must look to the contract as a whole and attempt to apply normal meaning to the words themselves, and then, if they be ambiguous, inquire into the history and surrounding circumstances to elicit their meaning and the intention of the parties.

The present contract of 1958 says, following its opening preamble and in its first section, entitled "Recognition":

"1. The company recognizes the union as the exclusive representative of its employees in its plant or plants which are located in that portion of the Greater Detroit area which is located within the city limits of Detroit for the purpose of collective bargaining on matters of wages, hours, and conditions of employment."

Evidence was submitted by the defendant which disclosed that in those contracts duly negotiated by the union prior to the 1951 contract, the following clause was in its place:

"1. The company recognizes the union as the exclusive representative of its employees for the purpose of collective bargaining on matters of wages, hours, and conditions of employment."

In the collective bargaining agreement of 1951 (as well as in those thereafter) the above opening provision of the contract was changed to read as follows:

"1. The company recognizes the union as the exclusive representative of its employees in its plant or plants which are located in that portion of the Greater Detroit area which is located within the city limits of Detroit for the purpose of collective bargaining

on the matter of wages, hours, and conditions of employment."

This last quoted language remained and was used verbatim as a part of the 1955 and 1958 contracts, the latter being the one here involved and expiring some 3 months from now.

During the term of the 1955 to 1958 contract Gemmer Manufacturing Co. was acquired by the defendant Ross Gear & Tool Co., Inc., an Indiana corporation, and Gemmer continued to be operated as a division of Ross Gear & Tool Co., Inc.

Defendant submits that during the negotiation of the 1958 contract (that which is now in force and expiring October 1, 1961) the union submitted the following as a substitute for the above section 1:

"RECOGNITION

"1. The company recognizes the union as the exclusive representative of its employees in its plant or plants which are located in the Greater Detroit area for the purpose of collective bargaining on matters of wages, hours and conditions of employment, excluding those mentioned in paragraph 2.

"(a) In the event the company creates other plants or facilities regardless of location under the administration of the company, the union shall be recognized for the purpose of collective bargaining on matters of wages, hours, conditions of employment, seniority transfers, and all matters embodied in this agreement.

"(b) In the event the company moves its operations to other locations, the union shall be recognized for the purpose of collective bargaining on matters of wages, hours and conditions of employment. Should this condition occur this matter will be subject to negotiations between the company and the union, such as moving costs of employees, severance pay, seniority transfers, and all other matters pertaining to this situation."

Such proposal was declined by the defendant and section 1 of the contract remained as it had been prior thereto and since the 1951 contract.

The normal inference that one would draw from such a proposed substitute section, and then to compare it with the section 1 of the contract then in force (as quoted on p. 5, from 1951 contract) promptly leads one to believe that the parties had negotiated on the problem of moving to Lebanon, Tenn., or at least moving somewhere, and had agreed that all matters involved in the contract would and could have only force and effect within the limitations of the city of Detroit. In effect, it appeared the union had conceded and bargained away all the benefits of the employees in the event the plant moved from within the city limits of Detroit.

However, testimony taken in this respect showed the situation surrounding the negotiations in 1951 to be quite different. Gemmer had another plant in the area at that time, which was located just over the city limits of Detroit, an experimental plant, which the union sought to obtain within its bargaining agreement. The company declined and the rephrasing of section 1 was in contemplation of that situation, and not any proposed move of the plant.

Referring above to the proposed change involving moving or changing of locations as stated and proposed by the union in its negotiations in 1958 agreement (the one presently in force), testimony disclosed that with the acquisition of the Gemmer division by the defendant Ross Gear & Tool Co., Inc., the corporation had two plants, one its original plant in Indiana and the acquired plant, Gemmer Manufacturing Co. in Detroit. Because of various reasons (none important here) there had been many rumors reaching the ears of the union that the defendant would move or, more properly, consolidate its Detroit operation with the Indiana plant, thus operating to jeopardize the interest of the local union. In order to anticipate such a change, the local proposed the section referred to, involving moving or transferring. Further testimony intimated that the union did not press the provision on learning another local of the same International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America UAW (AFL–CIO) was the bargaining agent at the Indiana plant and felt they could probably work out any problems between them covering seniority.

Thus, on closer observation it seems quite clear that the intent of the parties was not that which at first look might have bargained away certain rights and benefits of the employees, since the reasons and purposes for the contract changes were well known to the parties, but were for reasons other than in contemplation of any possible move of the Detroit plant to another distinct location.

Therefore, this court is of the opinion whatever emphasis the defendant now chooses to place on section 1 goes for naught, and we must then return to the contract to determine whether the seniority rights and benefits of the plaintiffs are in jeopardy. This court feels bound by the Glidden case, supra, and its reasoning, and since there is nothing within the contract now in force to the contrary, those seniority rights are to continue.

We next come to the geographical situation, as advanced by the defendant. Defendant further claims that the limitations within section 1 terminate the seniority benefits of the plaintiffs on its moving its plant to Tennessee. We cannot agree. Section 1 applies only with respect to the recognition of the union, and has no geographical limitations as to the benefits of the employees and their rights under the contract.

This court is reluctant to reach any conclusion with respect to the effect the company's move might have on the union itself, particularly since the union itself has instituted similar litigation pending before another judge of this court. However, in order to make our meaning clear, it might be that since the recognition clause goes only to the union as an entity, it could follow that its right to represent the employees in Tennessee has been bargained away by section 1. However, we must leave any such decision in the determination of the other case.

To reach our conclusion this court's reasoning is based on this premise. The Gemmer division plant is the same plant wherever it is moved, in spite of the fact it might be known by a different name. Mere change of form will not change the substance, nor will mere change of location. This is the same plant, same machinery and equipment, same operation, same officers and supervisors, but in a new climate. The benefits created for the employees under that contract should not be said to be unilaterally terminated by mere change of location. Such logic seems the more reasonable and just in the light of the real meaning of section 1 and more specifically when the contract still has until October 1, 1961, to run. The mere fact that there is a termination date in a collective bargaining agreement does not terminate all the rights and benefits of the employees under that agreement, but merely designates a certain time agreed upon by the parties when there would be further negotiations concerning those rights and benefits. Therefore the fact that this agreement in question has a termination date does not automatically remove all of the rights and benefits previously acquired by the employees. Although, as in this case, the agreement itself with the union as a bargaining agent might have been terminated by the move to Lebanon, the rights and benefits that have accrued to the individual employees persist and cannot be unilaterally denied by the employer without the employees' consent. Among these rights and benefits would be included the right of seniority or, as more specifically involved in this case, the right to be rehired by the employer after a layoff, as stated in the contract. Nothing herein, however, should be construed to mean that at the time of the expiration of the contract, new provisions may not be agreed upon, to the extent of an entirely new contract, nor that the employees may not select a new bargaining agent, or that they can bargain away, alter or enlarge any of their rights, even to the extent of having a union.

Our conclusion implies that the union, as an identity, might only be able to represent the plaintiffs and those similarly situated in Detroit, but we are satisfied that does not terminate all the rights of the plaintiffs created by a contract that has been in existence for some 20 years and upwards, and which was made in contemplation of those future rights.

It is the court's conclusion:

1. That the collective bargaining agreement grants the employees certain benefits and rights that become "vested" in the sense that they cannot be unilaterally denied without their consent or other agreed means, such as the right to discharge.

2. That these rights extend beyond the time limitations of the collective bargaining agreement.

3. That these rights apply to a plant regardless of physical location under this contract and previous contracts.

4. That these rights include, among other things, seniority rights for the purpose of rehiring after layoff (which could go beyond an anniversary date) as provided in the agreement.

5. That the limitation as set forth in section 1, the recognition clause of this agreement, applies only to the extent of union representation and does not affect future benefits and rights of employees agreed upon by contract.

Therefore, the contract being not to the contrary, and pursuant to the holding in the Glidden case, supra, defendant has an obligation and duty to rehire on the basis of seniority those employees laid off in Detroit when that plant's operations are removed to Lebanon, Tenn.

Should this decision, as requested by plaintiffs on these undisputed facts, not be despositive under the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act (28 U.S.C.A. 2201), plaintiffs may request the court to take such further action as might be necessary at the time.

FRED W. KAESS,
U.S. District Judge.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Barron's, June 19, 1961]

TAX-EXEMPT FACTORIES—THEY ARE A DANGEROUS ABUSE OF MUNICIPAL CREDIT

As organizations go, the Investment Bankers Association of America is a friendly, hard-working group which seldom plunges into controversy. Throughout the year, its thousands of members ply their exacting and vital trade of channeling capital to American industry. Each November, moreover, the IBA holds a 5-day convention at one of Florida's swank hostelries, during which those in attendance succeed admirably in combining business with pleasure. As readers of Barron's by now must know, the IBA frequently produces valuable reports on the prospects of various industries, as well as scholarly analyses of the markets for stocks and bonds. What it rarely does is step on anyone's toes.

Last week, however, throwing off its customary affability, the IBA loosed a sharp blast at one aspect of the investment scene

which it finds disturbing and even dangerous: the growing popularity of municipal industrial bonds. These are relatively new obligations which enable a city or State, by drawing on its own credit, to finance the building of a plant, for lease to a private concern. Such an arrangement obviously is tempting both to communities which seek to lure industry, and to companies which want to acquire factories on the cheap. Yet, as the IBA sternly warns, the practice is fraught with risk. For one thing, in some cases it may boomerang upon the company. It may bring even greater woe to the sponsoring community. Most ominous of all, it inevitably imposes an unfair burden on the taxpaying public, which must foot the bill for the subsidized plants, as well as on the latter's unsubsidized competition. Such financing, in short, diverts public credit to private ends. Thereby it constitutes an intrusion by government into an area where it has no legitimate business.

According to the IBA, trespassing of this kind dates back to the midthirties, when the State of Mississippi authorized its municipalities and counties to issue industrial bonds. In recent years, the volume of such offerings has grown by leaps and bounds. In 1960, local governments throughout the country floated 74 issues, totaling nearly $47 million, an alltime high. This year, to judge by the outburst of activity, another record is sure to be set. For example, Clovis, N. Mex., is readying a $2 million issue for a meat-processing installation, to be operated by Swift & Co.; Froman, Ark., reportedly plans a $7.5 million offering, to finance a plant for Arkansas Cement; Nashville, Tenn., has announced a $7.5 million project, with Genesco as lessee; and Cherokee, Ala. (population, 6,000), has sold a $25 million issue to build an ammonia plant, for lease to Armour & Co. At latest count, 15 States had entered the lists, and others (notably New York which will propose a $100 million State job development authority on the ballot this fall) are queuing up.

The popularity of such financing stems from the obvious advantages which it offers to both landlord and tenant. By luring new plants, the municipality gains in job opportunities and in industrial stature. The company, for its part, acquires a factory at little or no cost to itself. A closer look at the transaction, however, discloses some major drawbacks for both parties. The company, dazzled by the prospect of getting something for nothing, may discover in time that it has overlooked other important business considerations—labor and power costs, availability of raw materials and markets and the like. Furthermore, especially in smaller towns, it may find itself heavily beholden to the city fathers, and, as in today's racial strife in the South, unhappily involved in their headaches. The long-term commitment which is generally involved—30-year leases are the rule—also one day may prove burdensome.

The community, too, is taking a chance. As more and more areas vie for industry's favor, the bidding inevitably will climb. Furthermore, while some blue-chip concerns, as noted, have begun to show interest, the lure of tax-free credit inevitably is strongest for marginal firms, which may prove a liability rather than an asset. During a recession, such tenants may not be able even to pay the rent, thus forcing the community in extreme cases to default on the bonds. As the IBA observes, U.S. municipalities have plunged into serious financial difficulties on three occasions in history—in the panic of 1837; right after the Civil War; and in the late twenties and early thirties. Each crisis followed a similar abuse of public credit for private advantage.

Municipal speculation, finally, carries risks which go far beyond the city limits or the county line. It poses a threat to the whole enterprise system. Subsidized plants obviously have an unfair advantage over competitors elsewhere which choose to pay their own way. Thus, they can succeed only at the latter's expense. The ominous implications of the process were spelled out a year ago by the Supreme Court of Idaho. In striking down as unconstitutional State legislation authorizing municipal industrial bonds, the tribunal observed that "private enterprise, not so favored, would not compete with industries operating (under such advantages). If the State-favored industries were successfully managed, private enterprise managed, private enterprise would of necessity be forced out, and the State, through the municipalities, would increasingly become involved in promoting, sponsoring, regulating, and controlling private business. Ultimately our free private enterprise economy would be replaced by socialism."

For all these reasons, then, the IBA is deeply concerned, and rightly so, about the burgeoning of this free-and-easy type of financing. Indeed, it discerns another lurking threat: If the abuse of municipal credit eventually provokes Congress to action, the legislators might go so far as to wipe out the tax exemption which long has been enjoyed by all municipal bonds. Be that as it may, the more immediate dangers—for the contracting parties, and for the enterprise system—are beyond dispute. The IBA sums up by saying that "it is poor policy to use public credit for private industrial facilities." In speaking thus forthrightly, the organization may offend a few. However, it thereby also has taken a firm stand on behalf of the national interest.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate recognizes the very serious nature of unemployment. We are at times inclined to forget how very serious unemployment has become. I think it is necessary and desirable that we remind ourselves of the disaster which unemployment represents to every unemployed person and to every unemployed family.

Of course, we also should not forget the great impact of unemployment on national growth. At a time when this Nation is being challenged militarily and economically as never before, it is imperative we do all we can to use all our resources—especially our basic resource, our human resource.

Mr. President, the New York Times yesterday carried a very disturbing article. In the article it was stated:

> A confidential survey made last week for Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg indicated that at least 6 percent of the work force would be jobless at the beginning of next year.

The article said further:

> The number of jobless would exceed 5 million next January if the 6-percent estimate proved correct.

Mr. President, the administration has been very deeply concerned with this problem. I am sure it has tried hard to meet it, but somehow the administration and the Congress must recognize that this is a different kind of unemployment problem than we have had at times in the past, when there has been cyclical unemployment, obviously of a transient nature—something which we knew would pass and which we expected to pass after a period of months. This is long-term unemployment, which may extend not for months but literally for years.

The Wall Street Journal yesterday published a long article discussing unemployment in an extremely competent and very understanding way. It concluded as follows:

> Thus it is essential that people who watch economic statistics get themselves ready for the possibility of relatively higher unemployment than in the past decade.

This conclusion followed a careful and thoughtful analysis by the Wall Street Journal, indicating how serious unemployment is and how very unlikely it is we shall be able to do much about it unless we follow some new course, unless we come up with some new ideas in the next 2, 3, or 4 years, because of the great increase which is predictable and certain in the labor force and because of the massive and swift shift over to automated production in our factories.

Mr. President, there is no question that unless we come up with new ideas we shall be faced with a terribly tragic human problem with respect to many families, who will not have breadwinners making money. Many families will be forced on relief.

Also, our Nation will be using only a part of its potentially great resources to meet its challenges.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times, entitled "United States Doubts Drop in Jobless for 1961," and the article from the Wall Street Journal entitled "Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times]

UNITED STATES DOUBTS DROP IN JOBLESS FOR 1961—SEES LITTLE CHANGE IN ROLLS DESPITE ECONOMIC GAINS

(By A. H. Raskin)

Despite the brisk pace of industrial recovery, the Labor Department foresees little drop in unemployment in the next 6 months.

A confidential survey made last week for Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg indicated that at least 6 percent of the work force would be jobless at the beginning of next year. This compares with a preesnt rate of 6.8 percent, virtually unchanged from the low point of the recession.

The 6-percent forecast was based on an expectation that the gross national product—the yardstick used to measure the annual output of goods and services—would reach a peak of $530 million to $535 million in the final quarter of this year. Such a total would be 6 to 7 percent above the total when the Kennedy administration took office last January.

The President's preoccupation with Berlin and other foreign tension points, coupled with his sensitivity to charges of excessive Federal spending, has caused an easing of White House pressure for special programs to get the unemployed back to work.

However, the Goldberg survey may prompt the administration to assign a higher priority to the bills it has sent to Congress for retraining workers displaced by automation and for assisting jobless youngsters. These bills have been making little headway and have been getting scant push from the President.

The Labor Department analysts informed Mr. Goldberg that the unemployment rate in key industrial centers such as Detroit might stay above 10 percent. They also noted that no dent had been made in hard-core unemployment, with 900,000 workers still listed as idle for more than 6 months.

The number of jobless would exceed 5 million next January if the 6-percent estimate proved correct. The administration has indicated that it believes the unemployment rate should get down to 3 to 4 percent as a reasonable standard of full employment.

MORE JOBLESS IN JUNE

The June unemployment total was 5,600,000. This was an increase of 800,000 over May, principally the result of the influx of student jobseekers into the summer labor market. Employment rose by 1,900,000 to a near-record figure of 68,700,000.

The statistics used by the Government to keep track of the ups and downs in joblessness came under attack from opposite directions last week. The Todd & Draper Corp., management consultants in this city, contended that the Federal figures were too gloomy. Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, asserted that the picture was worse than the figures indicated.

The Todd & Draper analysis maintained that the volume of unemployment was overstated. It said this was so because of the inclusion in the official reports of workers in process of voluntarily switching from one job to another, those seasonally unemployed, those discharged for incompetence, and those, like housewives and teenagers, in search of jobs they did not need.

NEW COUNTING BASIS URGED

The management group urged that the count be restricted to heads of families unable to obtain work 6 months or more, a figure that would bring the idle rate to less than 2 percent. It said the only proper role for the Federal authorities in combating unemployment lay in the coordination of retraining programs.

Senator DOUGLAS, a former economics professor, asserted in a report to the Senate that the volume of unemployment would come to 11 percent or more if proper weight were given to certain factors. He cited as examples the number of workers on part-time schedules, the extent of dual job-holding, and the extent of self-employment.

He contended that persons running their own enterprises or employed in family businesses should be subtracted from the overall employment roster because no accurate record could be kept of their joblessness. He said "moonlighting"—the holding of two or more jobs by one worker—also distorted the record on how many workers had no jobs at all.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By George Shea)

Because unemployment is such a serious matter, there is a wide tendency to draw unwarranted conclusions from it about economic trends. The fact is that unemployment at any specific level has little bearing on the outlook for business.

The whole subject is a sensitive one because it involves the welfare, indeed the very ability to live decently, of an appreciable portion of our population. Unemployment is clearly a problem that should be a prime concern of the American people and of the men they have elected to office. But none of these humanitarian considerations should obscure the need for understanding in precise fashion the purely economic aspects of the matter.

Commentators frequently make remarks that reflect a lack of such understanding. For instance, one hears them say that the business outlook would be good except for the large proportion of unemployment. Another example was reflected in the thinking of many of the persons interviewed in a consumer survey made public last week by the University of Michigan. Researchers said that not less than 70 percent of the people interviewed said there was unemployment in their communities, and that many of them reported that this fact restrained their optimism.

This kind of thinking is, of course, very common. It reflects the human tendency to assume that the conditions of the immediate past are going to continue in the future. It completely overlooks the obvious fact that in business cycles conditions are always worst just before an upturn, and best just before a downturn. Yet it is certainly a pardonable weakness, because at the worst time there is usually no detectable indication as yet of the improvement to come, and at the best moment there is rarely if ever any sign of the impending slowdown. The best cure for this weakness is to keep one's mind always open for a possibility of a change in the tide of business.

More significant is the relationship of unemployment to employment, not only in percentage, but also in trend. The mid-June figures issued in recent days do show that unemployment is still at very nearly the highest percentage of the civilian labor force that was reached during the recession of the past year. But they also show employment at a record high.

The fact of this record high was headlined when the figures were issued but perhaps its full significance was not appreciated everywhere. Here was employment in June exceeding not only that of any previous June, but also that of July of last year. July is seasonally a month of high employment, considerably higher than in June, because of the many summer jobs taken by school and college students. In addition, in July 1960, the effect of the recession on employment had barely begun to be felt. Thus the employment total for June represents, by any standards that may be used, the highest number of jobs that has ever existed in the history of this Nation.

Not only that, but by virtue of the fact that average productivity per person in this country continues to grow year by year with only rare setbacks, it means that we are now producing, or about to produce, as a nation the greatest amount of goods and services we ever produced. The gross national product, which measures this total output, was down 0.6 percent from the 1960 average in the first quarter this year, and possibly it was still down a bit in the second quarter, but with the employment trend up, the third or fourth quarter output will almost surely read a new high.

This distinction between the economic significance of employment and unemployment is one that will have to be kept in mind constantly in the years to come because of the prospect that unemployment will remain relatively high. That's because the labor force is now growing faster than in recent years. In turn that's the result of the high birth rate which followed World War II.

The number of persons less than 20 years of age in 1960 totaled 70 million, or 12 million more than those 20 to 44 years of age inclusive. As the years pass this flood of youngsters will come onto the labor market. In 1965, the number of people 20 to 44 will be 2,200,000 larger than in 1960, whereas in 1960 their number was only 400,000 greater than in 1955. At the same time the number of persons 45 to 64 will grow by the same 3 million in the current 5 years that it grew in the previous 5. Thus in 1965 there will be 5,300,000 more people 20 to 64, the working years.

It will take a rapid rate of economic growth to absorb the consequent increased supply of workers, plus a substantial portion of the number of people now out of jobs. Whether that high a rate of growth can be achieved is very uncertain.

That the Kennedy administration is fully aware of the difficulty of the task is apparent in its frequent statements that it hopes to get the proportion of the labor force out of work down to 4 percent from the present seasonally adjusted ratio of 6.8 percent. The 4-percent figure is higher than the unemployment ratios of 3 of the past 10 years, which are apparently regarded as so low as to be unattainable in the period just ahead.

Thus it is essential that people who watch economic statistics get themselves ready for the possibility of relatively higher unemployment than in the past decade. The important point to remember is that production can be growing, employment can be growing, and the Nation as a whole can be making substantial progress even though unemployment may remain undesirably high. This does not mean the problem should be dismissed as unimportant, for no modern society can afford to do that. But concentration on it should not be allowed to mask the real economic trend.

SENATOR PROXMIRE OPPOSES CHEESE IMPORT QUOTA INCREASES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning I appeared at a Tariff Commission hearing to speak against any enlargement or elimination of the import quotas on Cheddar and blue-mold cheese.

I spoke at this hearing because I firmly believe that increasing the amount of foreign-produced cheese, or other dairy products, would be a serious mistake.

Such an action would contradict the will of Congress, as clearly expressed in section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which states that quotas shall be imposed and maintained when imports, first, "materially interfere" with price support programs, or, second, "reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof," the price of which is supported by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Congress wisely enacted this safeguard to prevent subsidizing foreign milk and dairy products, which otherwise would enter in enormous quantities to take advantage of the higher prices, which reflect America's higher standards of living, prices, and wage levels.

If more foreign cheese enters the United States, the American taxpayer will be paying for each pound twice. He will pay for it once when he buys the cheese, and he will pay for it a second time when he pays the taxes used by the CCC to purchase the American cheese which the foreign product has displaced.

This is the kind of material interference with the taxpayer's pocketbook which section 22 was designed to prevent.

In addition, it is abundantly clear that increased cheese imports would "reduce substantially" the amount of cheese processed domestically. Such imports would cut right into the hard-won markets of cheesemakers in this country,

many of them in my own State of Wisconsin.

The fact is, Mr. President, that we in Wisconsin produce one-half of all the cheddar cheese produced throughout our country, and about three-fourths of all the blue-mold cheese produced in America. If there were a 25-percent increase in quotas, as has been proposed and suggested before the Tariff Commission, this would reduce domestic blue-cheese production in Wisconsin by a punishing 10 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my statement to the Tariff Commission be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE, OF WISCONSIN, AT A HEARING ON POSSIBLE ENLARGEMENT OR ELIMINATION OF EXISTING IMPORT QUOTAS ON BLUE-MOLD CHEESE AND CHEDDAR CHEESE, BEFORE THE TARIFF COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON JULY 18, 1961

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to testify. I am here to oppose absolutely and totally any increase in the import quotas on Cheddar and blue-mold cheeses.

The economic backbone of my State is its famous dairy industry. Wisconsin produces almost half of the Cheddar cheese and three-quarters of the blue-mold cheese produced in the United States, and would be the hardest hit by any increase in the import quotas. A recommendation to eliminate quotas would be catastrophic.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act states that quotas shall be imposed and maintained when imports (1) "materially interfere" with price support programs, or (2) "reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof," the price of which is supported by the Government.

Enlargement or elimination of existing quotas in blue-mold and Cheddar cheese would contradict the will of Congress, as here clearly expressed. A recommendation that these quotas be increased would be a serious misuse of the authority which section 22 contains.

Imports of foreign cheese "materially interfere" with price support programs when they require the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase additional cheese to support the price of milk and dairy products. Without such a restriction, the American taxpayer would be in the position of subsidizing milk and dairy products all over the world. Cheese, butter, dry milk, and other transportable dairy products would enter in enormous quantities, to take advantage of the higher prices which reflect America's higher standard of living, prices, and wage levels.

On April 1, 1961, the Secretary of Agriculture set the support price for manufacturing milk at $3.40 per hundredweight. To establish this price the Commodity Credit Corporation has offered to buy Cheddar cheese at 36.1 cents a pound, butter at 60.5 cents a pound, and spray-dried, nonfat milk at 15.9 cents.

In spite of purchases of Cheddar cheese during June at a weekly rate of 3 million pounds and butter at almost 12 million pounds, the Department recently announced that the average price for manufacturing milk in the United States for June was only $3.25 per hundredweight.

The uncommitted stocks of Cheddar in CCC warehouses as of July 5, 1961, were 23.7 million pounds. A year ago, the figure was zero. Since March 29 of this year, the CCC has bought more than 23 million pounds of cheese. A year ago the amount was less than 100,000 pounds. Purchases of butter and dry milk are also much higher this year than last. Our cheese production this year is running 18 percent higher than last year. Total cheese stocks are a full 33 percent higher than in 1960.

Under these circumstances, it is clear that increased cheese imports would "materially interfere" with Government price support programs.

If more foreign cheese enters the United States, the American taxpayer will be paying for each pound twice. He will pay for it once when he buys the cheese. And he will pay for it a second time when he pays the taxes used by the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase the American cheese which the foreign product has displaced.

This kind of material interference—material interference with the taxpayer's pocketbook—is precisely what section 22 was designed to prevent.

A second purpose of section 22 is to prevent imports which "reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product" produced in the United States, the price of which is supported by the Federal Government. It is abundantly clear that increased cheese imports would have precisely the effect that this clause of section 22 prohibits.

As I have already noted, almost three-fourths of the blue-mold cheese produced in this country is manufactured in Wisconsin. This industry was built up by careful, diligent effort, at considerable expense. Effective advertising and promotion have gradually increased the demand for this specialty cheese.

I have received letter after letter from the makers of blue-mold cheese, and from employees in cheese factories, stating that increased imports would cut right into these hard-won markets, and thus would reduce substantially the amount of blue cheese processed in the United States.

Domestic cheese processors are unable to reduce their prices to meet foreign competition because the price of their raw material—manufacturing milk—is supported by the U.S. Government. The $3.40 per hundredweight which domestic processors must pay is significantly higher than the price of manufacturing milk in other countries. Thus, an increase in cheese import quotas would trap these cheesemakers, and their employees, in a confiscatory cost-price squeeze.

The making of blue-mold cheese differs significantly from the manufacture of Cheddar. Special techniques must be employed. The manufacturer of blue-mold cheese sees his product through from the weighing and testing of the milk to the selling of the cheese. He does his own curing, and such processing requires a larger labor force than a cheddar plant handling the same volume of milk. It is difficult, if not impossible, for a blue-mold cheese maker to shift to another product.

Thus, it is clear that increased cheese imports would "reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States" from milk. And I reemphasize that blue cheese produced in this country is made from milk which otherwise would be used for Cheddar, butter, or dried milk Every pound of milk used in the manufacture of blue-mold cheese is one pound of milk which will not end up in the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In conclusion, I want to stress the fact that any increase in quotas means that the American taxpayer will be paying a subsidy to foreign cheese producers. This is true because: (1) Every pound of cheese imported replaces a pound of American cheese which under law must be bought by our Government. These cheese purchases by the CCC give the foreign cheese its market. (2) The price received by the foreign producer is the direct result of Government purchases paid for by the American taxpayer. Without this Government purchase of dairy products, the price received by the foreign producer would be far lower.

Certainly, Congress never intended to tax Americans to provide this kind of concealed foreign aid to foreign businessmen.

There does not appear to be any change in circumstances which would conceivably justify an increase in the period since last January, when the Department of Agriculture informed me by letter that they had no intention of increasing the quota for blue-mold cheese or any other dairy product. The text of the Department's letter follows:

JANUARY 9, 1961.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Thank you for your letter of December 8, 1960, concerning the import quota on blue-mold cheese.

The Department has maintained a continuing review, since 1953, of all import quotas on dairy products, including blue-mold cheese, to determine their current effectiveness and any need for adjustment. In these reviews, the Department endeavors to give appropriate consideration to all pertinent factors, including the formal and informal representations of the interested parties, before recommending that the President direct a formal Tariff Commission investigation under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

On the basis of its current review, the Department does not contemplate recommending a change in any of the existing import quotas on dairy products.

We appreciate your views on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE L. MILLER,
Acting Secretary.

For all these reasons I strongly hope that the Tariff Commission will recommend against any enlargement or elimination of the import quotas on blue-mold cheese or Cheddar cheese.

RESOLUTIONS OPPOSING HEW RULING ON WORK RELIEF

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion recently of a ruling by Secretary Ribicoff to the effect that Federal funds under the new program of aid to the children of unemployed parents cannot be paid to people to work for their community while they are on relief.

For most purposes, work relief programs do not involve the Federal Government. Federal assistance is given only for limited categories, such as the aged, the disabled, and dependent children. However, the recently enacted legislation expanding the aid for dependent children category to include the children of unemployed parents has for the first time in many years involved the Federal Government in local work relief efforts.

In effect, the Secretary has said that a person cannot receive Federal money for himself or his children if he is on work relief, because of a 1936 ruling by the Social Security Board that no Federal money can be paid for "wages" or "compensation."

A related controversy in my State which is very much in the news, and rightly so, concerns the city of Newburgh which has enacted a number of stringent measures affecting local relief recipients. I want to make it clear that this issue presently involves only the city of Newburgh and the government of the State of New York. It is not and should not be focused at the Federal level, although at some point in the future this entire situation may involve a proceeding between the Department of HEW and the State of New York as to whether the State is complying with the Federal-State agreement on public assistance.

Right now, the only Federal aspect of the Newburgh situation is that Newburgh has a work relief program, and to this extent is involved, as is Onondaga County and many other counties in New York State, in the controversy over Secretary Ribicoff's ruling on work relief.

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate today to the views of several communities in New York State which have submitted resolutions to me opposing the Ribicoff ruling on work relief. I should also like to discuss in brief my views on this controversy and on a recent meeting which I arranged with Secretary Ribicoff on this subject. Although the Secretary's position in some respects differs from mine, I found him most cordial and sympathetic which I fully appreciate.

Certainly, Mr. President, if a person is unemployed and able bodied, he should be permitted to do useful work for his community while he is on relief. This would bring about a net savings to the community and at the same time would enhance the self-respect of the individual involved.

The July 10 meeting with Secretary Ribicoff was successful to an extent in that the Secretary offered to help New York State devise and administer a temporary arrangement whereby those eligible for aid to the dependent children of unemployed parents would be used on work relief for the difference between their Federal ADC payments and the ceiling on the amount of relief money which can be paid to any one family. In many, perhaps most, of the cases, this formula would permit those on work relief to work on public projects as much as they are now doing. Secretary Ribicoff has volunteered to have his technical staff meet with the relevant New York officials. Commissioner Raymond W. Houston of the New York State Department of Social Welfare has accepted this invitation and will be in Washington tomorrow.

While this plan is designed to avoid having the State lose any Federal money under the new temporary program to aid the children of unemployed parents, it does not resolve the basic question as to whether the Federal Government should or should not sanction work relief programs.

The Secretary made it clear that his Department recognizes the merit of work relief as such, but does not feel the Federal Government can be involved in local programs of this nature. Because aid for dependent children of unemployed parents is under temporary legislation, it may be that this problem will not be germane when this 14-month program has expired.

Believing as I do in the home-rule principle, I am hopeful that in the future the responsibility for work relief and for all relief programs will be as fully as possible left to individual communities, rather than being dictated from Washington.

In sum, the Department has devised a mechanical solution for a philosophic problem. Unless the home rule principle prevails in this and similar situations in the future, we may yet have a great Washington legislative battle on the work relief issue.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD resolutions by the boards of supervisors of Madison County and Cortland County, N.Y., opposing the Secretary's ruling on work relief.

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

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
MADISON COUNTY, N.Y.,
July 11, 1961.

I hereby certify that the following is a copy of a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors on the 11th day of July 1961; that I have compared the same with said original on file in my office and find it to be the same and the whole thereof.

"RESOLUTION 99

"Whereas the enactment of recent legislation has practically eliminated the work relief program in Madison County; and

"Whereas the members of this board sincerely believe that in the administration of welfare, there should be more flexibility, more authority and more discretion at the local level and that public assistance for the care of needy persons more logically should be a local decision; and

"Whereas overstandardization, maximum control and the ever present threat of loss of reimbursement are believed to be harmful to the initiative, morals, and well-being of the individual and an unnecessary burden on the taxpayer: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this board of supervisors go on record in urging that the State of New York exert all influence possible to encourage the Federal Government to change, alter and amend those Federal laws, rules, and regulations adversely affecting the reasonable administration of welfare; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the United States; Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York; Hon. Raymond W. Houston, commissioner of social welfare for the State of New York; Senator Jacob Javits; Senator Kenneth Keating; Congressman Alexander Pirnie; and to all boards of supervisors of the counties of New York State."

ROBERT A. CLARK,
Clerk, Board of Supervisors.

Whereas it appears to this board to be desirable that the county welfare commissioner should be empowered to assign able-bodied recipients of public welfare in federally supported categories to work on municipal projects as a condition of welfare being provided to them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board request that such changes be made in existing Federal rules, regulations and laws as may be required to enable county commissioners of public welfare to assign able-bodied welfare recipients to work on municipal projects as a condition of furnishing said welfare to them; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the United States; Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York; Hon. Raymond W. Houston, New York State commissioner of social welfare; Hon. JACOB JAVITS, U.S. Senator from the State of New York; Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING, U.S. Senator from the State of New York; Hon. JOHN B. TABER, Member of House of Representatives from this district; Hon. Janet Hill Gordon, State senator from this district, and Hon. Louis H. Folmer, member of assembly for the county of Cortland.

ALBERT C. KENNEY,
Clerk, Board of Supervisors.

SENATE COMMITTEE WORK

Mr. McCLELLAN rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during the 85th Congress, the Committee on Government Operations, in connection with its duties of studying the organization of the legislative branch of the Government, compiled a report (S. Rept. 96) reflecting the activities of the U.S. Senate. That report clearly documented what every Member of this body already knows; that is, that Senators simply do not have sufficient time available to give thorough attention to committee deliberations and actions.

It was reported during consideration of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 that 90 percent of all work of the Congress on legislative matters is carried out in committee. And it was with this fact in mind that the Committee on Government Operations recently directed its staff to survey the present committee structure of the Congress.

The startling results of this informal survey reveal that the Congress currently maintains a total of 303 committee units. This includes 36 standing committees, 3 special and select committees, 11 joint committees, and 253 subcommittees.

The Senate, with a membership of less than one-fourth of the other body, is responsible for 127 of these units while the House has established 152 legislative units. Added to these figures are 11 joint committees, which have, in turn, generated 13 subcommittees of their own.

Thus, if the joint committees and their subcommittees are piled on top of the number of Senate committee units, we arrive at the somewhat staggering number of 151 legislative satellites swirling about the body of the Senate.

And this figure is even further expanded when one considers the obligations of members assigned to the 26 commissions and boards created by Congress.

Since our last inquiry into this matter in 1957, the Senate has added another standing committee, Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and a Special Committee on Aging. I am happy to advise, however, that it has reduced the number

of subcommittees by 6—from 115 in 1957 to 109 today. In addition, as all Senators know, the Special Committees on Water Resources and Labor Rackets have been abolished, the functions of the latter being transferred to the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

However, I doubt that we could equate the loss of these committees and 6 subcommittees with the addition of a standing committee and a special committee and thereby say that we are holding our own in this field.

Indeed, I am sure that many would agree that we must do more than hold the line in this area, for it seems to me that what we must do is reduce the burden of multiple committee responsibilities if we are to meet adequately the requirements attendant to effective committee work. Perhaps this can best be done through the consolidation of some of the subcommittees which have closely related functions.

My comments are not designed to indict our committee system, for as we all know it is essential to our legislative process. However, I do feel compelled to remind my colleagues of developments in this area since committee work demands so much of our time, and to bring the matter to the attention of each committee for whatever action may be deemed necessary. Additionally, I feel it appropriate to suggest that each committee might want to review its functional organization in order to determine its effectiveness.

Moreover, I feel that the results of this survey, which brings together a comprehensive listing of the various legislative units in the Congress, will be a helpful reference source to Members and their staffs, who must know where legislative responsibilities are lodged in the maze of committee structure.

I should point out, Mr. President, that not all units listed in the survey are in continuous operation, for some are special purposes groups maintained on a standby basis, ready for mobilization as the need arises. Likewise, I should hasten to point out that while some of the subcommittees operate with separate staffs and funds, the vast majority use the staffs and funds of their parent committees.

But the important point is that these units do exist and stand ready to make still further demands upon Members' already overburdened schedule.

Moreover, lurking behind this impressive list of existing legislative groups is still another potential time stealer in the form of ad hoc subcommittees which are frequently created to consider specific bills, nominations, or to conduct inquiries into various situations. These ad hoc units are temporary and come and go with the legislative tide, but like the tide, tend to wash away still a few more sands of a Senator's time.

As my colleagues well know, a body of the size of the Senate must spread responsibilities through the committee system. As a result, Members presently serve on two or three standing committees and on an additional number of subcommittees. I presently serve on 12 subcommittees. Members seeking diligently to discharge their many committee responsibilities are frequently faced with conflicting schedules and often have to resort to the expedient of dividing their time between committees meeting concurrently.

The frustration of Members seeking to meet the obligations attendant to multiple committee service may well reach the breaking point when a Senator stretches an already heavily filled schedule to include a committee meeting only to have it delayed or even canceled for lack of a quorum. In this connection it would not be inappropriate to consider also the plight of witnesses called before a committee, sometimes at great expense or inconvenience, only to be told that the meeting had to be canceled for lack of a quorum, or because there was objection under the rule to the committee meeting while the Senate is in session.

Thus far during this session, the Senate has been able to maintain, for the most part, its usual practice of meeting at the noon hour. However, on several occasions, the Senate has convened at an earlier hour and will probably do so again before this session ends. As Members know, such a schedule, however necessary, creates an obstacle to committee work and, of course, this situation is further compounded when objections are raised to committee meetings during Senate sessions. Such objections are, of course, entirely appropriate. However, I do think that we should maintain a proper perspective toward our legislative duties and obligations. For if, as indicated by the so-called LaFollette-Monroney committee, which held extensive hearings on the reorganization of Congress during the 79th Congress, 90 percent of our legislative work is done in the committees, then should we not seek a better allotment of our time? Should we not seek to allocate sufficient time for scheduling and holding committee meetings?

The Senate, in approving the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, attempted to provide more flexibility in the operations of the Senate, by the adoption of a provision recommended by the LaFollette-Monroney committee, which expressed the sense that the leadership of the Congress experiment with schedules for chamber sessions of the Senate and House, and for committee meetings, on alternate days. The provision was stricken from the bill in the House of Representatives, however, since its rules permit better control of time allocated for floor debates.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the results of the informal survey, compiled by the staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, of standing, joint, special and select committees, subcommittees, commissions and boards upon which Members of Congress serve. Incidentally, the committees are invited to review the survey and advise the Committee on Government Operations of any changes which should be made, before it is circulated to Members of the Congress and Senate and House committees.

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

STAFF MEMORANDUM NO. 87-1-27, SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, JULY 18, 1961

Subject: Standing, joint, special, and select committees and subcommittees, commissions and boards upon which Members of Congress serve.

At the direction of the chairman, the staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations has prepared the following list of standing, joint, special and select committees, and subcommittees, of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives. Also included are commissions and boards upon which Members of Congress serve, as of May 1961.

The list does not include Senate and House majority and minority legislative or political policy or campaign committees.

Congressional committees

	Standing committees	Select and special committees	Joint committees	Subcommittees	Total
Senate	16	2		109	127
House	20	1		131	152
Senate and House			11	13	24
Total	36	3	11	253	303

The following tabulation reflects the above information and includes a further breakdown of committees and subcommittees, and adds the number of commissions and boards:

I. Standing committees	36
Senate	16
House	20
II. Select committees	2
Senate	1
House	1
III. Special committees	1
Senate	1
IV. Joint committees	11
V. Regular subcommittees	213
Senate	95
House	105
Joint	13
VI. Special subcommittees	38
Senate	14
House	24
VII. Select subcommittees	2
House	2
Total	303
Commissions and boards	26
Grand total	329

SENATE COMMITTEES

I. Aeronautical and Space Sciences: No subcommittees.

II. Agriculture and Forestry:

1. Subcommittee on Soil Conservation and Forestry.
2. Subcommittee on Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification.
3. Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices.
4. Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation.

III. Appropriations:

1. Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies.
2. Subcommittee on Department of Defense.
3. Subcommittee on Deficiencies, Supplementals, and Foreign Operations (to be considered by full committee).
4. Subcommittee on District of Columbia.
5. Subcommittee on General Government Matters, Department of Commerce and Related Matters.
6. Subcommittee on Independent Offices.
7. Subcommittee on Department of the Interior and Related Agencies.
8. Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies.
9. Subcommittee—Legislative.
10. Subcommittee on Military Construction.
11. Subcommittee on Public Works.
12. Subcommittee on Departments of State and Justice and the Judiciary, and Related Agencies.
13. Subcommittee on Departments of Treasury and Post Office.

IV. Armed Services:

1. Subcommittee on the Central Intelligence Agency.
2. Subcommittee on Naval Petroleum Reserves and National Stockpile.
3. Subcommittee on Operation of the Status of Forces Treaty.
4. Subcommittee on Preparedness Investigating.

V. Banking and Currency:

1. Subcommittee on Housing.
2. Subcommittee on International Finance.
3. Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization.
4. Subcommittee on Securities.
5. Subcommittee on Small Business.

VI. Commerce:

A. Standing subcommittees:

1. Subcommittee on Surface Transportation.
2. Subcommittee on Communications.
3. Subcommittee on Aviation.
4. Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

B. Special subcommittees and studies:

1. Automobile Marketing Practices.
2. Study of Television Network Regulation and UHF Problem.
3. Freight Car Shortage Subcommittee.
4. Special Subcommittee To Study Textile Industry.
5. Study of Foreign Commerce (with following geographical subcommitteees):
   a. Africa.
   b. Asia.
   c. Canada-Iceland.
   d. Latin America.
   e. Europe.
6. Study of Transportation Policies in the United States.
7. Subcommittee on Freedom of Communications.
8. Special Subcommittee To Study Federal Trade Commission Reorganization.

VII. District of Columbia:

1. Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs.
2. Subcommittee on Judiciary.
3. Subcommittee on Public Health.
4. Subcommittee on Business and Commerce.
5. Subcommittee on Metropolitan Problems.

VIII. Finance: No subcommittee. (See Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.)

IX. Foreign Relations Committee:

1. Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs.
2. Subcommittee on European Affairs.
3. Subcommittee on Disarmament.
4. Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs.
5. Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs.
6. Subcommittee on Economic and Social Policy Affairs.
7. Subcommittee on African Affairs.
8. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs.
9. Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs.
10. Subcommittee on Canadian Affairs.

X. Government Operations:

1. Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
2. Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery.
3. Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations.

XI. Interior and Insular Affairs:

1. Subcommittee on Public Lands.
2. Subcommittee on Indian Affairs.
3. Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs.
4. Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels.
5. Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

XII. Judiciary:

1. Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure.
2. Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation.
3. Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments.
4. Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.
5. Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization.
6. Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery.
7. Subcommittee on Internal Security.
8. Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.
9. Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights.
10. Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act.
11. Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations.
12. Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries.
13. Subcommittee on Revision and Codification.
14. Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees.
15. Subcommittee on Improvements in Federal Criminal Code.

XIII. Labor and Public Welfare:

1. Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.
2. Subcommittee on Health.
3. Subcommittee on Education.
4. Subcommittee on Labor.
5. Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs.
6. Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement.
7. Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower.

XIV. Post Office and Civil Service:

1. Subcommittee on Contested Nominations.
2. Subcommittee on Postal Affairs.
3. Subcommittee on Civil Service.
4. Subcommittee on Retirement.
5. Subcommittee on Health Benefits and Life Insurance.

XV. Public Works:

1. Subcommittee on Flood Control-Rivers and Harbors.
2. Subcommittee on Roads.
3. Subcommittee on Public Buildings.
4. Special Subcommittee on Investigations.

XVI. Rules and Administration:

1. Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections.
2. Subcommittee on Standing Rules of the Senate.
3. Subcommittee on Printing.
4. Subcommittee on Library.
5. Subcommittee on Smithsonian Institution.
6. Subcommittee on Restaurant.

Senate Select Committee on Small Business:

1. Subcommittee on Taxes.
2. Subcommittee on Monopoly.
3. Subcommittee on Financing.
4. Subcommittee on Government Procuring.
5. Subcommittee on Relations of Business With Government.
6. Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Marketing Practices.

Senate Special Committee on Aging: No subcommittees.

HOUSE COMMITTEES

I. Agriculture:

A. Commodity subcommittees:

1. Cotton.
2. Dairy and Poultry.
3. Forests.
4. Livestock and Feed Grains.
5. Oilseeds and Rice.
6. Tobacco.
7. Wheat.

B. Special action subcommittees:

1. Conservation and Credit.
2. Departmental Oversight and Consumer Relations.
3. Domestic Marketing.
4. Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower.
5. Family Farms.
6. Foreign Agricultural Operations.
7. Research and Extension.

II. Appropriations:

1. Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies.
2. Subcommittee on Department of Defense.
3. Subcommittee on Deficiencies.
4. Subcommittee on District of Columbia.
5. Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.
6. Subcommittee on General Government Matters, Department of Commerce and Related Agencies.
7. Subcommittee on Independent Offices.
8. Subcommittee on Department of Interior and Related Agencies.
9. Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies.
10. Subcommittee on Legislative.
11. Subcommittee on Military Construction.
12. Subcommittee on Public Works.
13. Subcommittee on Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary and Related Agencies.
14. Subcommittee on Departments of Treasury and Post Office.

III. Armed Services:

1. Subcommittee No. 1 (no other designation).
2. Subcommittee No. 2 (no other designation).
3. Subcommittee No. 3 (no other designation).
4. Subcommittee on Real Estate and Construction.
5. Subcommittee on Central Intelligence Agency.
6. Subcommittee on Special Investigations.
7. Subcommittee on National Intelligence Agencies.
8. Special Subcommittee on Acquisition of Wherry Housing.
9. Special Subcommittee on Utilization of Naval Shipyard Facilities.

IV. Banking and Currency:

1. Subcommittee No. 1 (no other designation).
2. Subcommittee No. 2 (no other designation).

3. Subcommittee No. 3 (no other designation).
4. Subcommittee on Housing.
V. District of Columbia:
1. Subcommittee No. 1 (no other designation).
2. Subcommittee No. 2 (no other designation).
3. Subcommittee No. 3 (no other designation).
4. Subcommittee No. 4 (no other designation).
5. Subcommittee No. 5 (no other designation).
VI. Education and Labor:
1. General Subcommittee on Education.
2. General Subcommittee on Labor.
3. Special Subcommittee on Education.
4. Special Subcommittee on Labor.
5. Select Subcommittee on Labor.
6. Select Subcommittee on Education.
7. Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation.
8. Subcommittee on National Labor Relations Board.
9. Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment.
VII. Foreign Affairs:
1. Subcommittee on Far East and the Pacific.
2. Subcommittee on National Security and Scientific Developments Affecting Foreign Policy.
3. Subcommittee on Europe.
4. Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations.
5. Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.
6. Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy.
7. Subcommittee on Africa.
8. Subcommittee on Near East.
9. Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.
10. Special Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Programs.
VIII. Government Operations:
1. Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization.
2. Subcommittee on Military Operations.
3. Subcommittee on Government Activities.
4. Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations.
5. Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs.
6. Special Subcommittee on Donable Property.
7. Special Subcommittee on Government Information.
IX. House Administration:
A. Standing subcommittees:
1. Accounts.
2. Elections.
3. Printing.
4. Enrolled Bills and Library.
B. Special subcommittees:
1. Electrical and Mechanical Office Equipment.
2. Parking.
3. Audit.
X. Interior and Insular Affairs:
1. Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs.
2. Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation.
3. Subcommittee on Public Lands.
4. Subcommittee on Indian Affairs.
5. Subcommittee on Mines and Mining.
6. Subcommittee on National Parks.
XI. Interstate and Foreign Commerce:
1. Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics.
2. Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance.
3. Subcommittee on Health and Safety.
4. Subcommittee on Communications and Power.
5. Special Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies.
XII. Judiciary:
A. Standing subcommittees:
1. Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality.
2. Subcommittee on Claims.
3. Subcommittee on Revision of Laws, Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights.
4. Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization.
5. Subcommittee on Antitrust Matters.
B. Special subcommittees:
1. Subcommittee on Submerged Lands.
2. Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce.
3. Subcommittee on Administrative Procedures.
XIII. Merchant Marine and Fisheries:
1. Subcommittee on Merchant Marine.
2. Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.
3. Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation.
4. Subcommittee on Panama Canal.
5. Subcommittee on Oceanography.
6. Special Subcommittee on Steamship Conferences.
XIV. Post Office and Civil Service:
1. Subcommittee on Civil Service.
2. Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization.
3. Subcommittee on Postal Operations.
4. Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics.
XV. Public Works:
1. Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors.
2. Subcommittee on Flood Control.
3. Subcommittee on Roads.
4. Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
5. Subcommittee on Watershed Development.
6. Special Subcommittee on Federal-Aid Highway Program.
XVI. Rules: No subcommittees.
XVII. Science and Astronautics:
1. Subcommittee on Scientific Training and Facilities.
2. Subcommittee on Scientific Research and Development.
3. Subcommittee on International Cooperation and Security.
4. Subcommittee on Space Problems and Life Sciences.
XVIII. Un-American Activities: No subcommittees.
XIX. Veterans Affairs:
1. Subcommittee on Administration.
2. Subcommittee on Compensation and Pensions.
3. Subcommittee on Education and Training.
4. Subcommittee on Hospitals.
5. Subcommittee on Housing.
6. Subcommittee on Insurance.
XX. Ways and Means: No subcommittees established as yet; usually have about three. (See Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.)

Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business:
A. Standing subcommittees:
1. Subcommittee on Organization and Operation of Small Business Administration.
2. Subcommittee on Small Business and Government Procurement.
3. Subcommittee on Foreign Trade, Foreign Aid and Basic Metals.
4. Subcommittee on Taxation.
5. Subcommittee on Distribution Problems Affecting Small Business.
6. Subcommittee on Advertising and Growth Opportunities for Small Business.
B. Special subcommittees: Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry.

JOINT COMMITTEES

I. Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:
1. Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation.
2. Subcommittee on Communities.
3. Subcommittee on Legislation.
4. Subcommittee on Military Application.
5. Subcommittee on Raw Materials.
6. Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation.
7. Subcommittee on Security.
II. Joint Committee on Construction of a Building for Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution: No subcommittees.
III. Joint Committee on Defense Production: No subcommittees.
IV. Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers: No subcommittees.
V. Joint Economic Committee:
1. Subcommittee on Economic Statistics.
2. Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy.
3. Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments.
4. Subcommittee on Inter-American Economic Relationships.
5. Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, Automation, and Energy Resources.
6. Subcommittee on Defense Procurement.
VI. Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy: No subcommittees.
VII. Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: (Serves Senate Committee on Finance and House Committee on Ways and Means). No subcommittees.
VIII. Joint Committee on the Library: No subcommittees.
IX. Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration: No subcommittees.
X. Joint Committee on Printing: No subcommittees.
XI. Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures: No subcommittees.

COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS

I. Commissions:
1. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.
2. Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission.
3. Civil War Centennial Commission.
4. Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol.
5. Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.
6. Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.
7. House Office Building Commission (this is the only Commission listed on which Senators do not serve).
8. James Madison Memorial Commission.
9. Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.
10. Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission.
11. National Forest Reservation Commission.
12. National Memorial Stadium Commission.
13. National Monument Commission.
14. New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission.
15. Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.
16. Senate Office Building Commission (this is the only Commission listed on which Members of the House do not serve).
17. U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission.
18. U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission.
II. Boards:
1. Board of Directors, Gallaudet College.
2. Board of Regents, Smithsonian Institution.
3. Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

5. Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

5. Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy.

6. Board of Visitors to the Military Academy.

7. Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

III. Miscellaneous: The Interparliamentary Union.

JAMES R. CALLOWAY,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Chief Clerk and Staff Director.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this compilation, of course, does not reflect the demands made upon the time of Senators in carrying out essential congressional responsibilities requiring their personal attention. These include interviews with individuals and groups from their States; activities in connection with matters of interest to their respective States; contacts with heads of departments and other Government officials on behalf of constituents or in regard to pending legislation; appearances at committee hearings as witnesses in connection with legislation or other proposals in which they or their constituents have an interest; reviewing, analyzing, and revising committee reports; keeping up with official correspondence; the preparation of speeches; and numerous other matters requiring their personal attention.

I think Members will agree that these activities, along with those indicated in this committee survey, point to the need for the Senate to exercise a little introspection with regard to its legislative organization.

Perhaps the best approach to this problem would be for each Member to sit down and list—or attempt to list—the various standing, special, select and joint committees to which he is assigned, and then the subcommittees on which he serves. As the list grows I am sure that each Member will feel, as did the senior Senator from Arkansas, a growing sense of concern over his many and diverse legislative obligations. If we can lighten the burden of Senators by reducing the present scattered workload, if we can eliminate just one of the unrelated lines of legislation through consolidation of present diverse responsibilities, then it will be time well spent.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to commend highly my colleague from Arkansas for bringing before the Senate and before the public, particularly the public, this very enlightening picture of the conflicting and overwhelming burdens which every conscientious Senator inevitably must carry. Those of us who have been Members of the Senate for only a relatively short time, as I have, have come to realize regretfully that it is not possible for us to become thoroughly knowledgeable in all the lines of inquiry and study we would like to pursue in Congress—not merely would like to pursue, but which we have an obligation to pursue if we want to be fully conversant with every matter we vote on. We cannot do it. We have a primary duty in connection with the matters that come before the committees and subcommittees on which we serve. And there are other assignments which are thrust upon us. So far as thorough knowledge in other fields is concerned, we must depend to a large extent on the views of other Senators before whose committees these matters have come and must, in a way, carry on our voting in those fields by proxy, so to speak. That is certainly not an ideal method. However, it is inevitable that the situation does exist as the workload piles up in the face of the increasing complexity in our modern society, with the multiplicity of activities in virtually every field of human endeavor which are brought before the Senate for consideration and action.

Therefore I feel that the Senator from Arkansas is rendering a very useful service in bringing this information to the Senate and clarifying the dilemma which exists. I hope the public will take note of it, and that, as a result, it will be widely understood that every Senator cannot possibly be an expert on every subject that comes before the Congress.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my distinguished friend from Alaska. Incidentally, he is a member of the Committee on Government Operations. It is not I who should be thanked for doing this work, but rather the staff of our committee, who have done valuable work and have gone out and dug up the information and brought it to our committee. As chairman of the committee I felt that the information not only should be brought to the attention of our colleagues in the Senate but also should be made a matter of record, in the hope that the information may reach the citizens of this country, so that they may have a better understanding of the tremendous workload which Members of Congress carry, and will understand it is absolutely impossible—humanly impossible—to give our attention to all the problems and issues which come before Congress. It is not physically or mentally possible to do it.

One of the reasons for the situation and one of the causes for it is the bigness of government. The bigness of government is partly ascribable to world conditions. Our Government is probably twice as big, in the sense of expenditures and the workload of Congress and of the departments of Government, as it would be ordinarily if there were what could be termed a durable and reliable peace among the nations of the earth.

Because of world conditions, because of the situation confronting us today, the functions of Government have multiplied to almost unlimited proportions. Government has grown accordingly. Thus a Senator or Representative cannot possibly give thorough and searching and meditative attention to all issues that come before him. He just does not have the time or the capacity to give the thorough attention to all the issues that come before Congress that they deserve.

It would be well if we could get this information to the country, to the people, so they would have a keener appreciation and a better understanding of the burdens that are carried by their elected representatives.

SCANDINAVIA'S EFFECTIVE USE OF HYDROPOWER

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, authorized by its distinguished chairman, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] the Public Works Committee has conducted, during the first week in July, a most useful inquiry into the uses of hydroelectric power in the Scandinavian Peninsula. The membership composing this group was headed by the able senior Senator from Michigan, PAT McNAMARA.

The committee's interest was pertinent to the studies now underway by the Corps of Engineers of the Army as to the possible uses of the energy which will be generated by the great dam at Rampart on the Yukon in Alaska if it is constructed. Norway was selected as the ideal country for such study because it leads the world in per capita consumption of hydroelectric power and its industrial complex is based on the attraction of industries—electrochemical, electrometallurgical and others because of the low cost of its hydropower.

Sweden, which ranks third in the world in per capita hydropower consumption, has achieved also notable success in undersea transmission of power, exporting its current by marine cable both to its island, Gotland, 60 miles away from the mainland in the Baltic Sea, and to Denmark. The committee was accompanied by several specialists in the field of power generation: Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Interior in charge of power, Wendell Johnson of the Corps of Engineers, Theo Sneed, veteran staff members of the Public Works Committee, and my administrative assistant, George Sundborg, author of the definitive history of Grand Coulee entitled "Hail Columbia." Mr. Sundborg has written a preliminary report on this stimulating visit which appeared in two of my weekly newsletters. I ask unanimous consent that his account be printed at this point in my remarks as well as an editorial on the applicability of these studies to Alaska which appeared in the Anchorage Daily Times on this subject entitled "Two Changes Essential as Spur to Industry."

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

TRONDHEIM, NORWAY, July 6.—The striking similarity in natural conditions between Alaska and Norway, where he has been traveling for the past week with fellow members of the Senate Public Works Committee, was remarked on by Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska.

Norway, he observed, lies in the same latitudes, has a similar climate, almost identical topography and some of the same resources as Alaska, fisheries, timber, power, and scenery. If anything, the Senator noted, Alaska is more richly endowed, as Norway has no oil, coal or natural gas, and lesser reserves of many metallic minerals.

"Yet Norway," Senator GRUENING observed, "supports 3.6 million people on a high standard of living in a land area less than one-fourth that of Alaska. The important assets which Norway has utilized to build a strong economy are hydroelectric power, low cost water transportation, and the wonderful, industrious Norwegian people."

It is to study the first of these, hydroelectric power, that Senator GRUENING and five other members of the Public Works Committee have spent a week in Norway visiting power stations, and the plants of the electrometallurgical and electrochemical industries which use the large quantities of cheap energy which they produce.

Because of the use of power by such industries Norway has the highest production of electric energy per capita in the world, amounting last year to about 9,000 kilowatt hours. This almost doubles the per capita production of power in the United States, which ranks fourth after Norway, Canada and Sweden. Coming up very fast is Iceland, which has large hydroelectric power resources and a very small population, and this nation may soon rank first. Power there is being used largely, to date, in nitrate and cement manufacturing. Practically no thermal power is produced in Norway; it is all hydro. In 1960 total production was 31 billion kilowatt hours.

"It was explained to us," Senator GRUENING said, "that since 45 percent of the goods needed by Norway must be imported, the nation has had to develop exports of goods and services to maintain a balance of trade. Foreign trade plays a dominant role in the Norwegian economy. It is made up 45 percent from commodities, 10 percent from services to tourism and another 45 percent by shipping.

"The income from shipping is essential. Norway considers itself fortunate in being a long, narrow country along a deeply indented coast, as this permits water transportation; no other form of transportation is so economical—at least in Norway. In addition to furnishing transportation within Norway and between Norwegian ports and those of other countries, the Norwegian merchant fleet carries the goods of all the world. Although Norway ranks well down the list of maritime nations as far as population is concerned, the Norwegian merchant fleet is the fourth largest in the world.

"But it is in the production of hydroelectric power and the uses made of it in industry that Norway has set the greatest example, which I believe can be emulated by Alaska, which has so many similarities," Senator GRUENING continued. "Although pulp and paper, fish products and whale oil are still important export products, light metals produced by hydroelectric power are now the No. 1 export commodity, accounting for one-third of Norway's total exports.

"Cheap power in Norway has caused alumina to be brought nearly half way around the world from Jamaica to be processed into aluminum in Norwegian plants. We visited two of the largest of these at Ardal and Sunndal. We also saw huge plants at Eidanger where nitrates are produced from air and magnesium from sea water. It is because of the use of huge quantities of power in these electrometallurgical and electrochemical processes that Norway leads the world in per capita power production.

"Alaska could, and will, do the same. We saw industrial plants in locations which could be duplicated exactly in Alaska. Both Ardal and Sunndal present striking examples of what an aluminum plant at Dyea, using power from the Taiya project, would have been. The physical situations are identical. The two plants have a combined production which about equals that which the Aluminum Co. of America proposed a few years ago at Taiya. They employ 5,000 men. Employment totals 5,000 also in the Eidanger nitrate and magnesium works at Norsk Hydro.

"Lest we should be discouraged about development of the Taiya project because of initial refusal of the Canadians to permit diversion of water to the coast from the Yukon headwaters," Senator GRUENING went on, "we find between Norway and Sweden an example of exactly the kind of internatioanl cooperation for mutual benefit that would be required."

The Senator was referring to development of a 230,000 kilowatt NEA-power project in which water stored in Sweden is diverted by tunnel to a Norwegian power station. In this development, carried through by the municipality of Trondheim, one-half of the power produced is used in Norway and the other half is transmitted to Sweden.

Senator GRUENING commented on how Norway has been able to make the development of heavy industry compatible with preservation of the natural beauty of the country. "In fact," he said, "the presence of the neat factories and the colorful homes of the people who work in them add to the attractiveness of the landscape, in my opinion, rather than detracting from it. Although the physical surroundings of the two places are practically identical, Sunndalsore, the site of the Sunndal aluminum works, is more scenic and interesting than Dyea. It is precisely because of the development there, nestled at the foot of the mountains at the head of the fiord, that tourists want to see it."

Three of the power stations visited, at Ardal, Fortun, and Aura, are built underground, as the Taiya power station would have been. The Norwegian power is produced for an average of 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour. This compares with an estimated cost at the Rampart project in Alaska of 2 mills at the busbar or 3 mills transmitted to tidewater. Norway is continuing to bring new power into production at the rate of 500,000 kilowatts per year. By 1965, capacity is expected to be 9.3 million kilowatts from all the plants of the nation. This compares with at least 4.6 million kilowatts installed capacity estimated as possible from the single site at Rampart on the Yukon.

In Norway, the nation owns 25 percent of the power production capacity, municipalities 45 percent and private companies only 35 percent. With only minor exceptions, the private power is used directly in industrial plants owned by the firms developing the power. Under Norwegian law, all privately developed power sites and power plants revert to the state after 60 years. The trend is toward more and more state ownership, as the large projects which are most economical to develop require investments which are beyond the means of private companies or even the municipalities.

Senator GRUENING observed that Norway has no difficulty finding industrial customers for the new power production which comes in. "Actually," he said, "it is the other way around and industries are clamoring for more power. Power has to be rationed in many places now. I am confident that with the development of truly cheap power from Rampart our experience in Alaska would be the same; there would be no lack of an industrial market for 2 or 3 mill power, and the industries would revolutionize the economy of Alaska."

Like Alaska, Norway provides opportunity for agricultural development on only a small proportion of her land. Less than 4 percent is arable. But because of the energy and hard work of the Norwegian people, 293,000 are employed productively in farming. Utilization of power is mainly responsible for 374,000 being employed in manufacturing and mining.

"One of our overwhelming impressions," Senator GRUENING said, "was the industriousness and happiness of the people. They have learned to live well in their country, which is almost an exact counterpart of Alaska.

"The conditions which caused the great migration to America, which brought the sturdy sons of Norway to our Northwest and Alaska, no longer exist in the mother country. Intelligent development of Norway's resources has provided a sound, thriving and well diversified economy which in turn has made possible general happiness and high economic, social, and cultural standards. Norway is a splendid example of what Alaska, with similar wise utilization of its resources, can become."

Norway has developed a rewarding tourist trade, as Alaska can do with the same ingredients. "We were interested," the Senator said, "in seeing how Norway has built roads along her fiords in rocky cliffs which are fully as sheer and difficult as those along Lynn Canal, the Taku, the Iskut-Stikine, the Unuk, and elsewhere in southeastern Alaska. We were also interested in seeing, and riding on, car ferries such as those which the State of Alaska is now establishing. They are invaluable in Norway in connecting places where roads cannot go."

The itinerary included Oslo, Drammen, Horten, Sandefjord, Larvik, Moss, Ski, Sandoika, Honefoss, Fagernes, Grindaheim, Tyin, Ardal, Laerdal, Kaupanga, Sogndal, Turtagro, Lom, Otta, Dombas, Oppdal, Sunndalsora, Lokkew, Orkanger, Trondheim, and in Sweden, Stockholm.

It was planned in Stockholm to study the underwater transmission of power which Sweden has pioneered so successfully. The abundant power is exported to other nations and Sweden's offshore islands, crossing waters wider and deeper than Lynn Canal or Shelikof Strait.

Senator GRUENING and other members of the Senate Public Works Committee returned early this week from Scandinavia, where 6 days last week were spent in Norway visiting power stations and electroprocess industries in that nation which has achieved the highest per capita use of hydroelectric power in the world.

The later stages of the trip were highlighted by a visit to Stockholm for a conference with officials of the Swedish State Power Board on underwater transmission of power, a field in which the Swedes have made great advances. The Senators learned that not only is power being transmitted from the Swedish mainland to the island of Gotland and from Sweden to Denmark but that the Swedes have been called on to build a transmission line under the English Channel from England to France.

Senator GRUENING pointed out that this underwater transmission of power will have direct applicability in Alaska when Rampart Dam is built and the huge production of low-cost power from that project becomes available. It is hoped that the underwater transmission techniques developed in Sweden can be used, for example, in carrying power down Lynn Canal to southeastern Alaska and across Shelikof Strait to Kodiak.

Walton Seymour, vice president of the Development and Resources Corp., which is making a study for the Corps of Engineers on how power from Rampart could be utilized, commented this week to Senator GRUENING on a brief preliminary report on the Norway trip which was included in last week's newsletter, as follows:

"We agree completely with the view that Norway presents an example of the significance to economic development of low-cost hydroelectric power, which is of substantial significance in appraising the Rampart project. It is our plan to include Norway in our study for the Corps of Engineers as such an example."

[From the Anchorage Daily Times, July 15, 1961]

TWO CHANGES ESSENTIAL AS SPUR TO INDUSTRY

Senator GRUENING makes interesting observations when he compares Norway to Alaska.

Norway has a population of 3,600,000 in an area one-quarter that of Alaska. Many geographical and resource features are the same.

During a recent visit there, Senator GRUENING cited three things as the ingredients for Norway's success: hydroelectric power for industry, cheap water transportation, and industrious people.

Those three things are in short supply in Alaska.

There is no hydroelectric power for industry.

There is no cheap water transportation. Freight rates to, from, and within Alaska have been termed the highest in the world.

Our people are industrious but they are too few. Sparse population results from the lack of industries and the limited opportunity for employment. Experience has shown, however, that people will come when there is something for them to do.

To emulate Norway, Alaskans must make two drastic changes:

1. Production costs must be reduced. These include wages, one of the main items. Nothing produced here can compete with the same item produced in other parts of the Nation, because of high operating costs.

2. A business climate must be created. Capital is not lured to an area of hostility. The eminent Norwegian, Trygve Lie, has said that "the basic guiding principle of the Norwegian Government is to encourage foreign investments on the basis of mutual interest." This State should have the same basic guiding principle in regard to outside capital.

Without both those changes the three ingredients that made Norway successful would be ineffective even if they were present in Alaska.

REGULATION OF TELEVISION—ADDRESS BY JOHN W. GUIDER

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a speech was recently delivered by Mr. John W. Guider, president, WMTW-TV of Littleton, N.H., before the Rotary Club of Portland, Maine. Mr. Guider's presentation provides an excellent analysis of the problems and dangers of one man or a group of men setting the entertainment, the news, and the educational standards of TV for 180 million Americans.

I believe it is interesting to make particular note of Mr. Guider's contention that any attempt to order specific programing is basically unsound because of the nature of the production. Programs are not a commodity, Mr. Guider says, and they cannot be turned out on a production line, measured on a meter, bought by the pound or the gallon, or mined out of the earth. They involve a tricky thing called creativity.

Mr. President, creative beauty is in the eye of the beholder. What is good programing to one person may fall far short of his neighbor's standards. I suggest that Federal officials encourage superior programs on television, but I submit that interference can only muddy the road to excellence for which the television industry is striving.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the address be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

TALK BY JOHN W. GUIDER, JUNE 23, 1961

I would like to speak to you today about what sort of job is being done in this country by the people who have been licensed to operate television stations. I feel the publicity on this subject in the last couple of years, and particularly in the last 3 or 4 months, has been distinctly one-sided. As you know, a television station is an expensive proposition to build and to operate. It is distinctly a risk venture which is entered into by individuals acting as private citizens. Unless they can meet the competition they find in the marketplace from other television stations and from other advertising media including radio, newspapers, and magazines, they will promptly find that operating a television station is an opportunity to lose money as well as an opportunity to make it. Many stations operate at a deficit for many years before turning the corner into the black. We did. A license to operate a television station is definitely not a guarantee that you will make money.

Impressed on the business at all times during 16 or 17 hours of operation every day for 7 days a week and 52 weeks a year is the necessity of meeting the statutory standard of "public interest, convenience, and necessity," a vague requirement which has always defied definition and which can mean a great many different things for as many different people or groups. Nevertheless, upon this vague standard is based the original grant of a license, and the renewal thereof at short periods of 3 years. The investment made, not only in money but in flesh and blood, and patient building, and in sacrifices which it is hoped will ultimately be rewarded, depends upon the shifting policies of an administrative agency in Washington, D.C. which at all times holds the threat that a license may not be renewed. The investment may be made worthless, since it may not perform the only function for which it was intended, and the operators of television stations have the dubious distinction of being the least secure in their business of any important category of commercial enterprise in our country.

Perhaps, because of this insecurity, or perhaps because they voluntarily assume the public service obligations which are inherent in the business, it could be said without fear of successful contradiction that there is no major business or industry in America where dedication to public service plays so great a part so many times each day, in the operation of a business as it does in television broadcasting. For those who hold these licenses, public service is as fundamental as the Ten Commandments or the Bill of Rights of the Constitution, or the multiplication tables. It penetrates every nook and crevice of our operations. This is not only because we hold our license under an obligation to meet the "public interest, convenience, and necessity," but because we cannot conduct a successful business operation unless we render to the public a service which the public of its own free choice is willing to accept to an extent that will permit our business to meet its expenses. We are not a monopoly. We are subject at all times to spirited competition.

So much for the basic obligation of every television station licensee, and for the compelling reasons he has to meet that obligation to the best of his ability.

In recent months you have heard much about television being a "vast wasteland." That's a colorful phrase but it is also sheer poppycock. Television, as it is operated today, is making the greatest contribution that has ever been made to the people of this or any other country, in the wealth of information it affords in the fields of news, culture, observation of government and public affairs, and in the contribution it is making to the "pursuit of happiness" which the Founding Fathers thought important enough to group with life and liberty in the Declaration of Independence.

Let me state both frankly and emphatically at this point that I think there is a great deal wrong with television and television programs. I think the most valid charge that is being made against television today is the charge of excessive violence in television shows. I deplore it, and in recent years I have never failed to take every opportunity to speak out against it within our industry. The thing that prevents this point of view from being more effective is merely that a very large percentage of the viewing public chooses to watch the programs that include these very violent sequences. I think that is a phase. I believe that any type of program which was on the crest of popularity during the past year or two is likely to find itself out of favor 2 or 3 years from now. There must be novelty and change in entertainment and cycles are as inevitable as the ebb and flow of the tide. But we know there will be much less violence in TV next winter than last, and a great deal less in the following year.

There are other criticisms with which I could also agree. I do not think I am in the least unique in my views. I believe that most operators of television stations will go to any reasonable lengths, and even some unreasonable ones, to include in their schedules more programs that will bring home to the public generally the problems of the world in which we live, the necessity of a strong national spirit with which to combat these problems, the importance of an informed and educated public, a greater contribution to the successful rearing and training of our children, the advantages of the broad and cultured point of view rather than the narrow and provincial one, the appreciation of better writing, better music, and better thinking, and in general all of the things which improve the mind, enrich the spirit, and cast light into the shadows of ignorance or uncertainty.

This, I assure you, the pros in our still new and young business are trying to do. I think they know best how to go about accomplishing the effort. I do not think it can be accomplished by the threatening mandates of Federal regulatory agencies, or even by acts of Congress. The pros of the business understand the problems as much as people who come and go in the regulatory agencies or in the Halls of Congress. But they understand also that you cannot legislate or regulate taste or intellectual curiosity any more than you can morals. We tried to regulate morals with the great experiment, and it proved to be a colossal failure. It did much more harm than good. It had to be abandoned. This could be another great experiment if it is tried.

Now let's take a minute or two to emphasize a very important point. Practically every criticism of television is based on the quality or the nature of the programing. Programs are not a commodity that can be produced on a production line, measured on a meter, bought by the pound or the gallon, or mined out of the earth. They involve a tricky thing called creativity.

A Federal agency might conceivably order us to devote so many hours a day to this or that kind of public service program, but that would be no assurance that the programs would be worth looking at or that people

would look at them. Perhaps the script writing that has gone into many television shows is lacking in originality or novelty, but remember the voracious appetite the television industry has for the material which is created by writers and script writers and comedians. Remember that more people see the "Real McCoys" every Thursday night than saw all of the performances of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," all of the Victor Herbert operettas, and "Showboat," "Oklahoma," and "South Pacific" put together.

Remember, too, that more people watched John Fitzgerald Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon in their TV debates last fall than ever heard all of the Presidents of the United States in their personal appearances from George Washington to Dwight Eisenhower. Madison Avenue refers to this fact as the "exposure" which is given to a program. This exposure uses up a creation, however talented, in a single evening, and this results in a demand for creative talent that is far in excess of the supply. This is a serious problem that has the best attention of an industry that is only as old as a boy who has just reached his 15th birthday. I think most people will conclude that the way to meet the problem is not by governmental dictation of the type and numbers of different kinds of programs that television stations must broadcast if they wish to have their licenses renewed.

We don't have to speculate about what television is when it is in private hands that are earnestly trying to improve the quality and balance of programs, as compared to what it is when the Government decides what shall be broadcast. We have before us the example of Great Britain. No critic of American television today could ask for a greater measure of government control of television programing than resided in the British Broadcasting Corp., a governmental agency, for the first 10 years of television in England. The programs met the highest standards of good taste, intelligence and culture. They were completely free from any of the characteristics which have been criticized in American television. The English programs were frequently cited as examples of what American television should be. The only trouble with them was that not many people were very interested in looking at them. After 10 years of proceeding along the lines the Govenment decreed, only a million television sets had been sold in a country which had over 50 million inhabitants. Then a modified form of commercialized television was permitted in England. American programs were imported and English programs were created that were similar to the American format of programing. Within 2 or 3 years this great service to the public which had been held in leash by government domination for 10 years was discovered and approved by the 90 percent of the British people who had previously exhibited not the slightest interest in television. Within 3 years the number of sets in England increased from 1 million to 10,469,753 in 1960, and that in spite of the fact that a substantial Government license fee has to be paid annually on every one of that number of television receivers.

Now voices are raised in this country that want us to reverse the English experience. They want to dictate what the people shall hear and see. They won't admit this in so many words, but neither can they deny it because it is the plain implication of what they are saying. They do it by criticizing the present programs and insisting that the Government, by processes ranging from threat of failure to renew a station's license to administrative examination of a station's program format, shall conform to somebody's idea at Washington as to what the public should see and hear.

They resent deeply the charge that they are proposing censorship. They resent it because they do not know how to escape it. And escape it they must, under the law, as I will shortly point out. They do not dare admit or possibly they do not realize that what they are proposing is censorship, plain and simple, and different only in degree, at least at first, from that imposed by totalitarian states.

Does it seem to you that I am overemphasizing the gravity of this point? Life magazine, in last week's issue, devoted two pages to the views of the youthful new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. To him Life imputes the view that, "Some people say that restricting one type of television program in favor of another is a form of censorship." Obviously this powerful head of one of our great regulatory agencies does not think it is censorship. Of course, it is the very essence of censorship.

I want to ask simply if the power of the Government to restrict one type of program in favor of another is not precisely the difference that exists today between American television and Russian television? Life goes on to say that the Chairman believes he has news for the people who take the view that this is censorship. He takes the position that they have not watched 1 hour, 1 minute, or even 1 second of uncensored television since the first day they switched on a TV set. He says it is a censorship that is far more arbitrary and far more damaging than any of which people could ever accuse him. He says it is censorship by popularity charts.

It occurred to me when I read these words for the first time that here is a perfect example of a case where a word may mean very different things to different people. Students of the law and of political history know that censorship is something that is imposed by governmental authority. The key word is "government." It is not called censorship when an editor decides to feature one type of news and suppress another in his newspaper. It is not thought to be censorship when politicians argue their side of the case and ignore the virtues of the other. It is not considered censorship when the publisher of the printed word exercises editorial judgment as to what he will give to his readers in his editorials. It only becomes censorship when governmental authority tells these people what they may publish or say and what they may not. This has been the meaning of censorship from the time of the government magistrates who supervised public morals in early Rome to the government censors who read your oversea mail during the war.

Coming more specifically to the issue before us here, it is therefore not censorship when the public gets programs that have been selected by the networks, and by individual stations, because of popularity charts, or surveys. It is a travesty on the meaning of words and the developments of history to say that we are censoring your programs because we have tried to find out what you, the public, prefers and because we have tried to meet these preferences.

It might be pertinent at this point to identify the two different forms of censorship. The one most familiar to the public is censorship by prior restraint, such as that which is exercised by the official censor in England over dramatic productions, or by the cable censor in Moscow where he declines to let an American correspondent file his story to an American newspaper.

Of the two sorts of censorship this is the less troublesome. At least you don't get into any trouble with it. You may not publish what you desire to publish, but you are not subjected to punishment since there was no publication.

But there is also a thing called censorship by fear of subsequent punishment. That is what we are threatened with here. You go ahead and publish something at your peril, and later you are punished for doing it. The thing that you did during the first year you had your license might not have seemed serious then but because of later events became a punishable affair. In a sense this is something like an ex post facto penal proceeding.

Time and again during the past few weeks we have heard plainly voiced threats that station licenses may not be renewed unless stations conform to the current thinking in Washington. This is censorship by fear of subsequent punishment.

A point frequently overlooked is that any criticism of TV sound or unsound, is usually given the broadest and most prominent coverage by the newspapers and magazines that are the unhappy commercial competitors of TV. It is perhaps quite understandable that they should strike back at a competitor that reaches more homes with much more commercial impact and for fewer advertising dollars than is possible in magazines or newspapers. You should realize that great prominence is happily given to any and all television cirticisms by the people who operate newspapers and magazines. Any TV critic can view with alarm and know he will get a wonderful press. It is perhaps significant that here too is a one-sided attack. Television stations do not attack the printed media. They don't need to. But television stations are subjected to a daily barrage of caustic comment from the printed media. All we ask is that when you read these criticisms of us please consider the source. Remember that the paper or the magazine you are holding in your hand has probably suffered a decline in advertising income because of the very existence of TV. It is too much to expect their publishers to be objective and unbiased in their handling of TV news. They are human. They have been hurt. But you should not be misled.

I'd like to spend a minute or two to get one more point in focus. One of the favorite battle cries of the critics of TV is this one: "Remember that these frequencies belong to the public." Sure they do. More than 30 years ago I was the Washington lawyer for a colorful character who owned a radio station in Zion, Ill., and who headed a religion that contended the world was flat, not round. He also thought he had a vested interest in the particular frequency on which he had been operating. I told him he didn't. There has never been any serious challenge to the proposition that the public-at-large has the complete property rights to radio (or television) frequencies as against any claim of an individual property right. The same is true of the air we breathe. It is true of the air through which our commercial aviation moves. It is true of the public highways on which so much of the commerce of our Nation travels. But it is a monumental non sequitur to jump from this premise of public ownership to a conclusion that it justifies a Federal administrative agency assuming the right to decide what the people shall hear and see on their television sets, and what may not be broadcast, under the threat that if it does not comply a station may lose its license and have its investment rendered valueless.

Of course, there is no room for doubt on the point. Congress may have been less than specific in setting up for licenses the statutory standard of operating in the "public interest, convenience, and necessity" but it stated in flat and unmistakable language that the agency it created, the Federal Communications Commission, should not have the power of censorship.

From the day in 1927 when the first Radio Act was enacted, Congress has specifically told the successive Commissions it created that they were not to have "the power of censorship over the radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station and that no regulation or condition shall be

promulgated or fixed by the Commission which shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communications."

These words I have just quoted are taken from section 326 of the Communications Act of 1934, which is the act now in force.

Neither the Federal Communications Commission, nor the individual commissioners have any power except the power which Congress has given to them. Congress in the plainest language imaginable has said that the Commission is to keep its hands off the program content of radio and television broadcasting.

The Commission should not do indirectly or by threats of nonrenewal of license, or by excessive harassment of licensees in the administrative processes what Congress has plainly said it must not do.

Congress was wise in putting the noncensorship provision into the original Radio Act and in the subsequent statutes passed for the regulation of broadcasting. As informed and intelligent individuals, you would be wise to see that these protections to our liberties are not eroded by the enthusiasms of Government administrators, however well intended and however well grounded on valid criticisms of some television programs. There are proper ways to improve television programs, but Government censorship is not one of them.

And don't be misled by people who deny the intent to censor while saying as Life quoted the Chairman of the FCC—that he planned to use all his statutory powers to gain more balanced programs.

It is censorship when "Big Brother" in Washington decides what you shall see and hear regardless of your own personal preferences.

We may deplore the taste of 95 percent of the public if we are one of the 5 percent who believe that because of superior education, or superior mentalities or superior taste or superior culture or maybe perhaps of superior egos, that we are a cut better than the other 95 percent. But have you ever observed that these views are always expressed by people who do not run for office? No politician would ever be guilty of predicating his argument on the proposition that in following popularity charts what is being done is to cater to the "most unthinking, more tasteless element of the population—to nurture and propagate the lowest common denominator and impose its subterranean standards on everybody else." These are not my words. These are the words that are imputed to the head of the agency that issues licenses to television stations and renews them, not for the 5 percent only but for the other 95 percent as well.

I think it is frightening. I think it is frightening that in such a high place there should be such a misconception of the essence of democracy, of the belief in the majority rule, and a reversion to a type of aristocratic or dictatorial thinking which believes that some tiny percentage of the public should impose its will on the overwhelmingly large percentage of the public. I believe we should stay with the principles that have caused this Government to endure for a longer period than any important government existing today. Let us trust all the people to deal with this problem as they do with other pressing and important difficulties.

I have told you that the story has been given to the public in a one-sided manner. It has. You hear nothing about the good side of television—only the bad, or to be more precise, only what a small percentage of the intelligentsia think is the bad side of it. These gentlemen who deal in theory rather than fact, in which they think is original thinking and that presumably takes the place of experience, in ideals rather than realities, could profit from my own experience of having known hundreds of people who have written to me or spoken to me about the wonderful change that television has made in their lives. If I were to tell you some of the actual instances of people who have thanked me because they felt I had something to do with bringing television to them, I would doubtless be accused of maudlin sentiment. And yet, during the first year or two that our station was operating from the top of Mount Washington, simple country folk, people who live on backroads and in remote areas, old and sickly people, including many who were quite knowledgeable, would come up to me on the street and tell me that television was the most wonderful thing that had ever come into their lives.

If any of those people find a certain program too violent, or too trashy, or if they think it is bad for the children, they have a choice of other programs to which they can turn. Or, like everyone else in America they can switch off the TV set and do whatever they did before 1946 when TV was first introduced generally. But tens of millions of these people are happy with the new life that television has opened up for them, with the wonderful talent that performs for them in any given week, they are grateful to have fast news, expertly interpreted, and for sports, and great public events where they have the chance to share the sense of "being there" that television alone can give.

If you doubt that there is a great deal more that is good about TV than bad—ask yourself what the reaction would be if every TV station went off the air at 6 p.m. tonight. On total, would this be a good thing for the country or a bad one? And if it would be bad to take all of the TV away from the people, then in principle it is equally bad to substitute something most of them will not look at for something which they are now watching. The degree is all that would vary and that would be determined by the amount of Government dictation.

There is no compulsion to look at television. Therefore it is all the more significant that in tens of millions of homes people do look at it for 5 or 6 hours a day, every day.

In the scathing indictments which we have heard leveled against television, the proponents of these views usually seem to make no effort to be fair. All they do is condemn. They do not recognize the fact that in any week there will be found included in the programs of the three networks and of independent stations, hours and half-hours which would satisfy in both quality and quantity the most sensitive of tastes and the most exquisite of demands for intellectual stimulation. It is one of the ironies of the situation that so often our critics say, after delivering a stinging tirade against television in general, "Why, I would not even have a set in the house." But they undertake to say what should be seen and heard by the 50 million homes that do have one or more television sets in the house. I think it is about time that someone called attention to these facts. My voice is a small one. It will not be heard beyond the confines of this room. But if a couple of hundred of you, leaders of your community, go out of here today feeling that the remedies recommended in Washington are worse than the disease they are supposed to cure, I will feel that my efforts have been amply rewarded.

LIVE FREE OR DIE—TRIBUTE TO PATRICK HENRY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, sights that we see from day to day become so familiar to us that we look at them without actually seeing them. This morning, as I approached the Capitol, I saw something that all of us look at day after day after day.

In front of the National Archives are two quotations: One, from William Shakespeare, says—"What is past is prologue;" the other, by Confucius, admonishes—"Study the past." The import of the combination of these two familiar quotations had a particular impact on me this morning because of an editorial I had just read in the April 25 issue of the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, entitled with another familiar quotation—at least, familiar to us New Hampshirites—the State motto of New Hampshire, "Live Free or Die."

In this editorial, William Loeb tells of how one of his readers recently called his attention to the immortal speech given by Patrick Henry in the Virginia House of Burgesses in March 1775, and how the reader pointed out that what Patrick Henry said then about England and the tryant King George III "could just as well apply completely today to Communist Russia and to Khrushchev." It was in this speech that Patrick Henry gave the world the immortal words, "Give me liberty or give me death."

The entire speech of Patrick Henry is reprinted in the editorial with certain emphasis supplied as set forth by the reader who brought it to Mr. Loeb's attention.

Mr. President, given as I seem to be to quotations today, I state my position in the words of another great Virginian, Thomas Jefferson:

> I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

For that reason, I ask my distinguished colleagues to "study the past" with me today in rereading the words of Patrick Henry, and ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Apr. 25, 1961]

LIVE FREE OR DIE

The State motto of New Hampshire, "Live Free or Die," is another way of stating Patrick Henry's immortal words, "Give me liberty or give me death."

Most Americans know that phrase of Patrick Henry's, but few have read the complete speech of which these were the last seven words.

Recently a reader called our attention to the complete speech which was delivered by Patrick Henry in the Virginia House of Burgesses in March of 1775. The reader points out that what Patrick Henry had to say while he was speaking of England and the tyrant King George III could just as well apply completely today to Communist Russia and to Khrushchev.

As a matter of fact, Patrick Henry has set forth clearly what should be the attitude of every free people toward every tyrant and every tyranny forever more.

We reprint below Patrick Henry's complete speech. The emphasis on certain parts of it were set forth by our very helpful reader, who is responsible for placing before all our other readers this immortal testimony for freedom.

WILLIAM LAUB,
Publisher.

Patrick Henry's immortal speech—"Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction?" follows:

No man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism, as well as abilities, of the very worthy gentlemen who have just addressed the House. But different men often see the same subject in different lights; and, therefore, I hope it will not be thought disrespectful to those gentlemen if, entertaining as I do, opinions of a character very opposite to theirs, I shall speak forth my sentiments freely and without reserve. This is no time for ceremony. The question before the House is one of awful moment to this country. For my own part, I consider it as nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery; and in proportion to the magnitude of the subject ought to be the freedom of the debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth, and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to God and our country. Should I consider myself as guilty of treason toward my country, and of an act of disloyalty toward the Majesty of Heaven, which I revere above all earthly kings.

It is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth, and listen to the song of that siren till she transforms us into beasts. Is this the part of wise men, engaged in a great and arduous struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and, having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it.

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past. And judging by the past, I wish to know what there has been in the conduct of the British ministry for the last 10 years to justify those hopes with which gentlemen have been pleased to solace themselves and the House. Is it that insidious smile with which our petition has been lately received? Trust it not, sir; it will prove a snare to your feet. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a kiss. Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with those warlike preparations which cover our waters and darken our land. Are fleets and armies necessary to a work of love and reconciliation? Have we shown ourselves so unwilling to be reconciled that force must be called in to win back our love? Let us not deceive ourselves, sir. These are the implements of war and subjugation; the last arguments to which kings resort. I ask gentlemen, sir, what means this martial array, if its purpose be not to force us to submission. Can gentlemen assign any other possible motive for it? Has Great Britain any enemy, in this quarter of the world, to call for all this accumulation of navies and armies? No, sir, she has none. They are meant for us; they can be meant for no other. They are sent over to bind and rivet upon us those chains which the British ministry have been so long forging. And what have we to oppose to them? Shall we try argument? Sir, we have been trying that for the last 10 years. Have we anything new to offer upon the subject? Nothing. We have held the subject up in every light of which it is capable; but it has been all in vain. Shall we resort to entreaty and humble supplication? What terms shall we find which have not been already exhausted? Let us not, I beseech you, sir, deceive ourselves longer. Sir, we have done everything that could be done to avert the storm which is now coming on. We have petitioned; we have remonstrated; we have supplicated; we have prostrated ourselves before the throne, and have implored its interposition to arrest the tyrannical hands of the ministry and Parliament.

Our petitions have been slighted; our remonstrances have produced additional violence and insult; our supplications have been disregarded; and we have been spurned, with contempt, from the foot of the throne. In vain, after these things, may we indulge the fond hope of peace and reconciliation. There is no longer any room for hope. If we wish to be free—if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending—if we mean not basely to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been so long engaged, and which we have pledged ourselves never to abandon until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained—we must fight. An appeal to arms and to the God of hosts is all that is left us.

They tell us, sir, that we are weak; unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But when shall we be stronger? Will it be the next week, or the next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed in every house? Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs and hugging the delusive phantom of hope, until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot? Sir, we are not weak if we make a proper use of those means which the God of nature hath placed in our power. Three millions of people, armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemy can send against us. Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations, and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave. Besides, sir, we have no election. If we were base enough to desire it, it is now too late to retire from the contest. There is no retreat but in submission and slavery. Our chains are forged. Their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston. The war is inevitable—and let it come. I repeat it, sir, let it come.

It is in vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry "Peace, Peace"—but there is no peace. The war is actually begun. The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms. Our brethren are already in the field. Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death.

THE RECORD OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last night I was privileged to deliver a major address at Syracuse University, in New York, as a part of the summer lecture series of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs.

This graduate school represents a distinguished and important segment of America's academic community. Its faculty members and students continue to contribute valuable knowledge and research in the field of public affairs to scholars and political scientists.

With such efforts as the Maxwell summer lecture series, the school also helps to broaden general public understanding of the basic and immediate questions of government and politics.

This year's Maxwell summer lecture series at Syracuse University focuses attention on the new administration. Several distinguished American leaders are participating, as speaker, to discuss such areas as specific domestic programs of the new administration and specific foreign policies.

It was my opportunity and pleasure last night to discuss the administration's legislative program in Congress.

I included in my address a detailed review of the legislative record of the 87th Congress to date, and a statement of the prospects for additional action. I said last night—and I repeat now—that I am proud of the record this Congress has established so far in this session. Our work is not done and our record is not perfect, but I believe that this Congress has produced and will produce more significant, progressive legislation than any Congress in which I have served.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of my address, entitled "The New Frontier in Congress," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE NEW FRONTIER IN CONGRESS

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY at the Maxwell summer lecture series, Syracuse University, New York, July 17, 1961)

It is a pleasure to be with you this evening to discuss the work of Congress on the administration's legislative program. I want you to know first that I am sincerely proud of the initial record of this 87th Congress. I am especially proud to be part of the leadership in the Senate to transform the New Frontier's program into action. It is both a great responsibility and a great honor to serve as the assistant majority leader in the Senate of the United States.

This is my 13th year in Congress. Without any hesitancy, I say that the 87th Congress is establishing the best and most constructive record of accomplishment of any which I have served. I believe that by the time the 87th Congress adjourns next year, we will have seen the greatest outpouring of constrctive, responsible legislation enacted by any Congress since the days of the New Deal in the early thirties.

Today we have an administration and a congressional majority which share common goals and a common philosophy of Government. This is an exciting time in Washington. There are new faces and new ideas. There is a spirit to move forward to respond to the challenges facing America. There is a new determination to work and build.

Our work has been constant and successful since the change of administrations last January. Let me present now the details of our record.

As the 87th Congress convened, prompt attention was given to bolster the economy. We were in a recession affecting millions of American workers and their families. The economy needed a boost and the Congress moved promptly in that direction. The first bill that we passed was the Area Redevelopment Act, to provide assistance to economically distressed areas in the form of loans and grants for construction of industrial plants and public facilities.

To help raise the living standards of those Americans at the bottom of the economic ladder, the Congress increased the minimum

wage from $1 to 1.25 an hour, and extended coverage to 3.6 million additional workers in the retail and service trades. This was the first major extension of coverage since the first minimum wage legislation in the thirties.

Earlier this year, hundreds of thousands of jobless workers had exhausted their unemployment compensation benefit payments. The Congress promptly enacted legislation to advance funds to the States to extend unemployment benefits up to an additional 13 weeks, thus providing the unemployed worker with benefits up to a total of 39 weeks. We took the same action for unemployed railroad workers under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

To help ease the critical financial stress of so many of our elderly citizens, the Congress increased minimum old-age insurance benefits, liberalized the disability provision of the act, and provided that men may retire at reduced benefits at the age of 62. We also increased for 1 year the public assistance payments for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

To keep our Federal interstate highway building program on schedule—so that this 41,000-mile program will be completed in 13 years as originally planned—the Congress increased the Federal Government's share from $25 billion to $37 billion. This has provided a tremendous boost to the economy and hastens the day when we will have a magnificent highway program completed. As an aside, I should also note that we scored an important victory in extending for an additional 2 years the incentive bonus for States to enter into agreements for control of billboard advertising along the interstate highways.

Perhaps the greatest legislative triumph in the economic area was the passage of the comprehensive Housing Act which authorized $4.9 billion in new funds. This act provides for a new 2-year experimental plan of small downpayment, 35-year loans for moderate-income, single-family housing. The act authorizes $75 million to assist communities to provide mass transportation systems. It liberalizes FHA regular home mortgage terms by raising the maximum mortgaged maturity for new homes from 30 to 35 years. It authorizes an additional $2 billion in Federal capital grants for urban renewal projects. It raises by $500 million the community facilities loan fund for local water, gas, and sewage plant improvements.

It increases by $200 million the authorization for the farm housing program. It authorizes $50 million in Federal grants to States and local communities to pay up to 30 percent of the costs of acquisition of land in and around urban areas to create open space areas for recreational, conservation, scenic, and historic purposes. It increases the Federal revolving fund for low-interest, long-term loans to colleges, universities, and hospitals for construction of housing. It increases by $75 million the revolving fund to make direct loans below the market rate to nonprofit groups for construction of housing for the elderly.

The Congress also extended the direct and the guaranteed home loan program for World War II and Korean veterans, and authorized an additional $1.2 billion for the direct loan program through fiscal 1967 to aid communities in their efforts to construct water sewage treatment plants. This is intended to assure an adequate supply of clean water; the Congress has authorized an additional $235 million in Federal grants.

Another important achievement was the passage of legislation amending the Social Security Act to permit States to use matching Federal grants to aid children of the needy and unemployed.

Previously, the law provided that payments could be made to children only when the family had been broken up or the father had deserted. The father could have been out of work through no fault of his own and his family without money, but the State still couldn't make use of any Federal funds for the children of that family.

Major attention is being focused, of course, on the Federal aid to education bill. As you know, the Senate has already passed a measure providing $2.5 billion in grants over a 3-year period to the States for school construction and teacher salaries at the grade and high school level. Similar legislation has already been approved by the House Education and Labor Committee, but has yet not been cleared by the House Rules Committee. Some observers feel that the House will never get a chance to act on an aid-to-education bill, but I am not that pessimistic. I think that we are going to get an aid-to-education bill passed by the House and enacted into law. I am hopeful that we will be able to do it before this session of the Congress adjourns.

It would be tragic if this bill was scuttled. The need for such a program is apparent.

We need more schools. We need better paid and better trained teachers. Most of our local communities have reached the point where it is almost impossible for them to get increased funds for their school problems. They need these funds desperately. The Federal Government alone has a broad enough tax base to provide such funds. This legislation is not an attempt to take over control of the schools. As a matter of fact, the legislation which we passed in the Senate specifically prohibits any Federal interference in control of administration of schools. The school programs will be run as they are now, by the counties and by the States and by their duly constituted educational boards.

Another item which is of major concern to the people—and judging from my mail perhaps this item is one in which there is the greatest interest of all—is medical care for the aged. For many years I have had a deep interest in this subject and have pressed for adoption of legislation to help alleviate the insecurity and anxiety of so many of our older citizens. They simply do not have the funds to meet the heavy costs of unexpected illness in their old age. I wish that you could read the letters which I receive every day from older citizens pleading for action to pass a bill for medical care under social security. It appears now that no action will be taken in the House of Representatives, where all such measures involving taxes must originate, to consider this legislation this year. The timetable appears to be that it will be brought up in the second session of the 87th Congress in 1962. I feel confident that this Congress will pass the medical care bill before we adjourn in 1962.

It won't be easy. The organized opposition to this plan is tremendous and well-financed. But I am convinced that we will succeed.

To ease the present workload and overcrowded court calendars, the Congress has created an additional 73 U.S. district and circuit court judgeships. Such action was long overdue and will mean less delay in the adjudication of lawsuits.

Both the House and Senate have passed legislation to establish a Cape Cod National Seashore Park so as to preserve for public enjoyment the scenic, scientific, and historic features of the cape. This legislation should soon go to the President for his signature and I am hopeful that other legislation now pending before the Congress to preserve our shoreline areas for the public will be enacted into law.

It has been my privilege to introduce on behalf of the administration a bill to establish a Department of Urban Affairs. My subcommittee on reorganization has already held hearings on this measure and we will soon report the bill to the Senate for its consideration. Similar action is being taken in the House and I am hopeful that before we adjourn this summer that this Department will begin operation. Far too little attention has been given to the problems of our urban areas. The need for such a Department is all too apparent.

The administration has also presented to the Congress a proposal to close the various loopholes in the present tax code. The House Ways and Means Committee has been considering these proposals. While it appears that the committee will not approve all of what the administration is asking, there will be progress. Congress has been most concerned about the flagrant abuses in regard to expense accounts. Loopholes in this area will be closed so that the expenses that have nothing to do with business can no longer be treated as a tax deduction.

There has been a great deal of interest in my proposal of the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps of young men to work in our Nation's parks and forests on conservation projects. I have introduced such legislation and the administration has given its backing of the establishment of such a corps. I am pleased to report that this legislation is now being considered by committees in both the House and the Senate, and last week a Senate Labor Subcommittee approved the bill.

On the civil rights front, I am confident that in this session of Congress legislation will be enacted to extend the Civil Rights Commission which is due to expire in the fall of this year. I have been a strong supporter of the Civil Rights Commission. Years ago I proposed such a commission to study civil rights problems. The Civil Rights Commission has been performing an excellent function and must be continued.

One of the great stumbling blocks to enactment of civil rights legislation in the Congress has been the threat of the filibuster in the Senate. Under present Senate rules it is most difficult to limit debate. Senate rule XXII provides that Senate debate may be ended only upon the vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. Senator MANSFIELD, the able majority leader, has announced that he will bring to the Senate for its consideration this year a resolution to liberalize rule XXII.

As a Senator from one of America's great farm States, I have been deeply concerned about agriculture legislation. Action in this area, unfortunately, has been slow and most difficult. Earlier this year we did provide for an emergency price support program for feed grains to cut back feed grain production, while assuring the farmer a fair price for his products. The administration, as you know, has presented to the Congress a comprehensive farm program which is designed to bring order out of the present chaos in which we find ourselves. Despite the stories you might hear to the effect that the farmers are getting too much, the fact of the matter is the farmers are facing extreme economic difficulties. Our farm laws now are inadequate. They fail to provide the farmer with a decent standard of living or to keep our so-called food surplus within reasonable bounds. The need for new legislation is only too clear. Unfortunately, the Congress is so split on what should be done that no common area of agreement has been established.

Legislation dealing with international affairs is also moving ahead. As a matter of fact, at the present time in Washington, international affairs is the primary consideration and the major topic of conversation. Tonight I want to discuss in detail the foreign aid bill which is presently being considered in the House and Senate. But before I do so let me give a brief report of other

items of international interest which the Congress has acted on already this year.

First of all, we appropriated $600 million for the Latin American aid program—the Alliance for Progress—which is designed to encourage and promote social reform and economic development.

The Senate also ratified the creation of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which consists of some 18 European member nations, the United States and Canada. This group is designed to promote economic stability and an orderly growth of the economies of member states.

The Congress recently passed and the President signed into law an act to establish U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce to promote and encourage tourist travel from abroad.

I was most pleased that the Senate approved my resolution expressing an interest in exploring with other nations the possibility of establishing an international food and raw materials reserve under the auspices of the United Nations. We need to acquire and store in appropriate countries raw or processed farm products to ease the effects of famines as they develop throughout the world.

The Senate also approved my resolution authorizing the President to establish a White Fleet—to assist in disaster areas in any coastal region of the world as well as to carry on a regular program of logistics support in the field of public health and other works of technical assistance.

One of America's greatest God-given resources is its great food abundance. I believe that this food abundance should be utilized fully to assist people in other areas of the world who suffer from food shortages. That is why I have been such a strong supporter of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act—Public Law 480. Under this act, our so-called food surpluses are made available to other countries by way of direct sales, or barter, or by outright grants. This Congress authorized the disposal of an additional $2 billion in surplus commodities under this act. We also extended the title II of Public Law 480 which provides for helping needy people in the less developed countries through economic development programs.

This year I have introduced legislation to give statutory authority to the Peace Corps. I know you have all read and heard much about this program which has already been put into operation by an Executive order of President Kennedy.

Through the Peace Corps, talented and dedicated Americans are offering their services to other countries to work in the fields of education, agriculture, medicine, construction, and a host of other types of activities. This is a most exciting program and it has caught the imagination of the American people. I believe it will succeed. Hearings have already been begun on this measure before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I am hopeful that after the Foreign Relations Committee has finished its work on the foreign aid bill, it will turn its attention to this measure and it will be able to test the bill before this session of the Congress adjourns.

Another bill that was presented by the administration, and which I introduced in the Senate, would establish a new Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. We have paid all too little attention to the need for serious study and attention to the many difficult and complex problems involved in disarmament. The purpose of this bill is to establish an agency which would have the sole responsibility for research and study on the scientific, technical, and political problems of disarmament.

Now I turn to the legislation which is at the very center of the congressional stage. I refer, of course, to the foreign-aid bill which the President has presented to the Congress. As you know, the President is vitally interested in seeing that this bill is enacted into law and that it is not stripped of its key provisions. He is throwing the entire weight of his administration behind the passage of this measure.

This is a big foreign-aid bill. It will provide $4½ billion for fiscal 1962.

The outlines of the bill indicate there will be larger requests in the years to come.

I support the foreign-aid bill. I have in the past, under previous administrations, and I shall continue to support the foreign-aid program.

I support the long-term financing which the President has requested. When the President was a Senator, he voted for that in this body. I voted with him as a U.S. Senator. A year-by-year program is wasteful, leads to little or no planning, and results in mismanagement and the wasteful use of public funds.

I shall do my best, as a Senator, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, to see to it that our foreign-aid program is put on a continuing, long-term basis, rather than operated as a year-by-year, hypodermic, prophylactic treatment which cures nothing. We have had enough examples of that type of program.

The most important feature of the President's foreign-aid program is not the $1,750 million for technical assistance and economic aid. It is not $1,880 million for military assistance. It is not even the $900 million borrowing authority for the Development Loan Fund.

The most important feature is the reorganization of the foreign-aid agency.

The reorganization of the foreign-aid establishment is a minimum requirement for congressional support for foreign aid. I wish to say, as a loyal supporter of the administration, that we want that reorganization not merely to be on top, but all the way down.

If our country is to be asked to pay a bill of over $4 billion in foreign aid this coming year, we are entitled to have the best administrators that the country can supply.

It will be difficult to obtain congressional approval of the proposed $4½ billion program. I doubt that we will be able to bring it through without some cuts. But whatever foreign aid program goes through the Congress of the United States, it will have to be administered in a frugal, prudent, and imaginative way. I want to see a foreign aid administration that is filled with its mission for cooperative assistance to nations in other parts of the world. I want to see foreign aid administrators who will see to it that foreign aid results in social, economic, and political reform. I want to see the foreign aid administrators who will be able to say, "No; we think the project is unworthy or should not be undertaken."

I wish to see foreign aid mission chiefs who understand the people of the country in which they are working. I wish to see chiefs who do not live in American ghettoes, where all the Americans gather to play bridge and pinochle, and where all the Americans get together so they can eat the same kind of food. I want to see a foreign aid program through which we can learn to know the people of the countries that we seek to help.

Let my remarks not be misunderstood. There are many loyal, faithful, dedicated and self-sacrificing servants in the International Cooperation Administration. I want it quite clear that most of the activities of the ICA have been commendable. I want it equally clear that the overwhelming majority of the personnel have been able, competent, and trustworthy. I want it equally clear that those who are not competent should be removed.

I want to make sure that the money goes for the purpose for which it was authorized and for which we will appropriate it. What is that purpose? To build the areas of freedom. Freedom in many areas requires social reform. Freedom requires that the benefits of liberty and freedom should be carried to the people, to the grassroots.

Our mission and objective for the foreign-aid program must carry a new sense of purpose and dedication, and a new willingness to pioneer in the areas of economic improvement and social betterment. We must seek not only to change the scenery on top, but also to change the whole philosophy and the whole administration of foreign aid from top to bottom. Building areas of freedom, with social justice, must be the commanding yardstick of our success.

I wish to make sure that those who administer the program administer it with a crusading zeal to accomplish our objectives. Unless we do so, we shall lose and waste money. A nation that can spend this amount of money for foreign aid can afford to make sure that what it spends is spent well and in the interest of the people.

That is the purpose of the New Frontier. The New Frontier requires the will, the dedication, and the zeal of all Americans to build a better life for mankind.

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL KENNEDY AT FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last month it was my privilege to attend the graduation exercises of the 67th session of the FBI National Academy. At this occasion, Attorney General Robert Kennedy made an eloquent plea for a great national effort against racketeering and organized crime.

Since that time, many of the measures which Mr. Kennedy advocated have made rapid progress in the Judiciary Committee and are well on their way toward becoming law.

The actions of Mr. Kennedy since he took office, in deed and in word, indicate that a supreme effort is now being launched against syndicated crime in this country. His position is eloquently expressed in the commencement address he delivered, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, GRADUATION EXERCISES, 67TH SESSION, FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM, JUNE 7, 1961

Dr. Bartley, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Derning, Mr. Burke, Senator Dodd, distinguished Members of Congress, graduates, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to pay my respects to you gentlemen upon completion of your work here in the last 4 months. I think that the sacrifices that you have made to attend this school, the sacrifices that your communities have made and that your families have made will be looked back upon years ahead as a great source of pride to you. I am indeed honored to be in your midst today.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy is one of the most significant of the many contributions which Mr. Hoover has made to strengthening law enforcement in our country. Many well-deserved tributes have been paid to Mr. Hoover throughout the years. I think two things stand out as I look at his record and the record of the FBI. One, of course, is the Bureau's matchless efficiency in getting the job done and

the second is that Mr. Hoover through the years has been extremely careful to see that the Bureau remained exactly what it was intended to be—a highly trained investigative force, capable of meeting many of the Federal Government's responsibilities in law enforcement. Mr. Hoover himself has exercised restraint and sound judgment in the use of the power that goes with his office. I salute him for this and for the unchallenged record which he and the FBI have made.

I was a great admirer of Mr. Hoover before I came with the Department of Justice. I might say to you, gentlemen, and to you members of the families of the men who are about to graduate, that the time that I have spent with the Department of Justice has made me even a greater admirer of Mr. Hoover and I think that the country is very fortunate in having him and the Federal Bureau of Investigation as the most efficient and dedicated group working in this country.

I would also like to pay my respects to Special Agent Cecilio Santiago Soliman, of the National Bureau of Investigation of the Republic of the Philippines, who is the 4,000th law enforcement officer to graduate in the 26-year history of the National Academy. We have been very pleased to have Special Agent Soliman and his fellow officer, Senior Agent Jose Delos Reyes, attend the school and we wish them good fortune upon their return to our sister republic.

Over the last 10 years, in the work that I have undertaken, I have been in contact almost continuously with law enforcement officers, and I have come to have great respect for the thousands of honest law enforcement officers—for their skill, for their devotion to duty and for their willingness to undertake a job that is difficult at best, often dangerous and often unpleasant. Since coming to the Department of Justice, I have been quite aware of the fact that the job of law enforcement in this country is not getting any easier. It is, in fact, becoming far, far more difficult.

We, in the Department of Justice, have become increasingly concerned about organized crime. It has become so rich and so powerful and so well-entrenched that it has often become beyond the reach of law. We submitted eight bills to the Congress early in April which we believe are extremely important, if the Federal Government is to meet its responsibility in combating racketeering and organized crime.

Very frequently, the newspapers and magazines carry a boxscore of the important bills before Congress to show what progress they are making. I have yet to see a boxscore which shows the status of our crime bills. Some of them are very far reaching and have been endorsed at least in general terms by most of the leading newspapers in the country.

However, we need now more than talk; more than general references. We need action.

We, in the Department of Justice, think these bills are extremely important. As I testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee yesterday, the kingpins of organized crime are able to operate beyond the reach of local authorities in many areas. They are able to reap millions of dollars in profits and use these profits to cheat honest Americans, to corrupt officials, and to undermine our national strength.

These bills seek to strike blows against organized crime activity which has been brought to public attention effectively by committees of Congress, by several of my predecessors, by Mr. Hoover, and by many State and local law enforcement officials for more than 10 years. So, frankly, I think it's about time that action is taken. In fact, the tools which were adequate in the days of Al Capone are just not adequate any more.

In general, the purpose of these bills is to deny to organized crime the use of interstate commerce, and communications, and to give the Federal Bureau of Investigation more tools to aid their fellow law enforcement officers.

I am going to seek your help in this effort. I think the choice is between taking action soon or seeing the racketeers and the hoodlums tighten their hold on illegal enterprises and move more and more into legitimate labor and into businesses. I ask you to join Mr. Hoover and me in strengthening law enforcement in this country, in preserving its vigor and its vitality. I ask that you look closely at these bills and, if you think they are worth while, that you give them your active support.

It is not our purpose or our desire to interfere in any way in the traditional responsibilities of local law enforcement. But we wish to meet our responsibilities. We know that Federal and local law enforcement officers working side by side have been most effective against narcotics, auto theft, prostitution, bank robbery, kidnapping, and other crimes. These bills have been drafted so that this same kind of effective cooperation can be carried out against organized crime which operates on this interstate basis.

Of course, these bills are not enough of themselves. They are only as good as the men who enforce them. This Nation became great because it was led by toughminded men. They risked their security and their future for freedom and for an ideal. This is a time that demands a new toughness—new only in the sense that we have not been toughminded enough in recent years. If we—you and I—are not going to be relentless and unyielding in dealing with hoodlums, racketeers, and vice lords, then these people will continue to dishonor and weaken our country and these laws will not be effective.

For our part here in the Department of Justice, we have taken certain steps to coordinate all Federal investigations into organized crime and racketeering. We are pooling all available information about known hoodlums and racketeers. We are not making any big promises. In fact, we haven't said much about what we are doing. We will let the record speak for us, and we will meet our responsibilities, and we will try to get the job done.

I can report to you that there is a new awareness in law enforcement throughout the country, the need for cooperation by the Federal and local authorities in combating the underworld. We will give information to local police whom we know to be trustworthy. And, of course, this exchange of information works both ways.

I think everyone in this country and certainly you gentlemen are aware that for the past 3 weeks our immediate concern about local law enforcement has not been in the field of organized crime, however. Very reluctantly, we had to deputize some 600 Federal officers as U.S. marshals and send them into the State of Alabama to guarantee the safety of interstate travel and to restore law and order. I hope that out of the tragic events in Alabama there will not again arise in this country of ours a time when local law enforcement officers will not do their duty to preserve law and order no matter how unpleasant the job.

You and I and all fellow law-enforcement officers have sworn to uphold the law and we have a duty to enforce the law, and to protect the rights guaranteed by our Constitution. It is not our job to make or interpret the law. It is our job to enforce the law and there is only one way that we can do it and remain true to our oath and that is to enforce the law vigorously, without regional bias or political slant.

The ramifications of the violence in Alabama are far reaching. The reputation of Alabama—Birmingham and Montgomery—has been needlessly harmed. The record shows that in situations like this, recovery is neither quick nor complete.

The United States has been harmed in the eyes of people around the world, and while this is no reason in of itself to do or not do something, it is a fact of which we must be very much aware in these times.

We cannot expect that our problems and difficulty in connection with civil rights in the South will be solved without discord and disagreement. But we do have a right to expect that local law-enforcement officers will do their jobs at all times; that they will preserve law and order.

This is true whether it is in Birmingham or Montgomery, Ala., or in cities in other areas of our country where gangsters and corrupt officials gained control—in Beaumont, Tex., as an example; or where there has been a corrupt district attorney, as in Lake County, Ind.; or where organized crime has an inordinate amount of power as it appears to have in some of our northern cities in the United States. Various areas of our country have different problems. Only where everyone exercises his duties and obligations as citizens, where law enforcement officials meet their responsibilities, can we make progress. No one area can point to another and say, "There the fault lies." Where local law enforcement breaks down, whether because of civil rights agitation or gangster control, this is a reflection on all of us as American citizens. I hope that the lessons of Alabama will be learned and learned well. If so, we will have passed through a period of national trouble and we will have made progress for the attainment of equal rights and protection for all of our citizens.

During the American Constitutional Convention, there was behind the desk of General Washington a picture of a sun low in the horizon and many of the delegates wondered whether it was a rising or a setting sun. At the conclusion, Benjamin Franklin stood up and said:

"Because of what we have done here today, we know it is not a setting sun, but it is a rising sun and the beginning of a great new day."

We face a difficult and dangerous time, but if we are toughminded, if we are strong, and if we are dedicated to the ideals which have made this country great, we need not fear for the future.

Great responsibility has been placed on your shoulders. I wish you good luck and Godspeed.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2043) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two additional staff members be permitted to attend on the floor during the debate on S. 2043.

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

Mr. PASTORE. 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. PASTORE. 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. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. What is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Senate bill 2043, the Atomic Energy authorization bill. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate today, S. 2043, is the annual AEC authorization bill which authorizes necessary projects and funds for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1962. The Subcommittee on Legislation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held hearings on this bill on May 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 17, 18, 19, and June 6. We carefully reviewed each and every project contained in the bill before reporting the bill to the full committee, which in turn has recommended it in its present form.

I believe I can say with complete accuracy that with the exception of one project, this bill received the unanimous support of all members of the committee. The one project where there is a difference of opinion—and I might say an honest difference of opinion—is project "62-a-6," electric generating facilities for the new production reactor at Hanford, Wash., in the sum of $95 million.

Mr. President, in order to save the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my explanation and analysis of the bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PASTORE

S. 2043 authorizes funds for plant and facility acquisition and construction for the Atomic Energy Commission during the fiscal year 1962. The bill contains 10 sections.

Section 101 authorizes the appropriation of the sum of $226,440,000 for new construction projects during fiscal year 1962. The sum authorized by this section will be used to provide funds for 40 line item projects in the following category amendments: (1) Special nuclear materials, $114,725,000; (2) atomic products, $14,500,000; (3) reactor development, $33,375,000; (4) physical research, $21,440,000; (5) biology and medicine, $1,960,000; and (6) community, $2,930,000.

Also included in section 101 is a subsection concerning general plant projects which provides for miscellaneous minor construction items in the sum of $34,510,000.

The $226,440,000 authorized in section 101 compares with $211,476,000 authorized in fiscal year 1961, and $227,580,000 requested by the AEC for this bill.

Sections 102 to 106 of the bill contain provisions identical, or similar to, corresponding sections in previous AEC Authorization Acts.

Section 102 sets forth certain cost limitations on the initiation of projects.

Section 103 concerns authorization for advance planning, construction, design, and architectural services.

Section 104 concerns restoration and replacement of plants or facilities destroyed or otherwise seriously damaged.

Section 105 authorizes the appropriation of such sums of money as may be currently available to the AEC in order to accomplish the purpose of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Section 106 permits substitutions to be made for certain projects if the substituted project is essential to the common defense and security, required by changes in weapons characteristics or weapons logistic operations and if its estimated cost does not exceed the cost of the original project.

Section 107 of the bill amends last year's AEC Authorization Act (Public Law 87-457) by increasing the total sum authorized from $211,476,000 to $338,476,000. This additional authorization includes $111 million authorized for the Stanford linear electron accelerator, and an additional $16 million to cover certain increased costs and the addition of test loops for the advanced test reactor at Idaho Falls.

In connection with the Stanford linear electron accelerator, the majority of the committee last year recommended, and the Congress authorized, $3 million for design and engineering studies on the accelerator in lieu of authorizing the full construction cost on the ground that further studies of cost data were required. The requisite studies have now been completed, and the committee endorses going ahead with the full project.

Section 108 amends various prior year authorization acts by rescinding certain projects which are no longer considered necessary by the AEC. A total of 8 projects, amounting to $19,027,000, will be rescinded, except for funds already obligated.

Section 109 concerns the power reactor demonstration program. In subsection (a) the date for approving projects under the third round of the program is extended from June 30, 1961, to June 30, 1962. Subsection (b) authorizes an additional $7 million funds, and $5 million waiver of use charge authority for use in the cooperative power reactor program. The Commission is further permitted to use an additional $7 million of authorized funds for research and development assistance in support of unsolicited proposals from the utility industry. Subsection (c) provides that the Commission may use funds previously authorized in the cooperative power reactor program for a cooperative arrangement with the Dairyland Power Cooperative and the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. for a boiling water reactor designated as the La Crosse boiling water reactor.

Section 110(a) of the bill concerns the disposition of electric energy during the operating life of the electric generating facilities at the new production reactor, Hanford, Wash., constructed under subsection 101(a) of the bill. This subsection provides that the electric energy so produced shall be delivered by the Commission at the Hanford site to, and pursuant to agreement with, the Secretary of the Interior. In disposing of such energy, the Secretary of the Interior will act under the authority of section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Subsection (b) provides for the allocation of costs to the electric energy production. The allocation will be made jointly by the AEC and the Secretary of the Interior and should there be any disagreement between these parties, the President shall make the final allocation. Finally, subsection (b) provides that costs so allocated shall be repaid to the Treasury from revenue derived by the Secretary from the disposition of electric energy marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if any Senator wishes to ask a question about any section of the bill or any project, I shall be pleased to respond. In the absence of any such question, I believe much valuable time can be saved if we address ourselves to that one item in which there is a variance of opinion and which, in the committee report, is the subject of separate views by some members of the Joint Committee.

As I have said, the expenditure of $95 million to add electric generating facilities to the new Hanford reactor is a matter in which there is a difference of opinion. The committee report, No. 414, on pages 6-11, sets forth the views of a majority of the members in support of this project. A separate statement in opposition to the project is set forth on pages 25-35. Two of nine Senate Members signed the separate view. They were joined by three of nine House Members.

I personally endorse this project and urge that it be supported. I do so after having carefully listened to the testimony of the experts from the General Electric Co., the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Department of the Interior. I do so on the basis of studies made by the Federal Power Commission. I support the project because I do not want to see valuable energy wasted.

The new plutonium production reactor, it will be recalled, was authorized by Congress in 1958 for the purpose of producing special nuclear material for weapons purposes. The reactor is now under construction under the technical direction of the General Electric Co. Construction is expected to be completed in October 1962. The reactor is designed to maximize plutonium production and is not the type or design one would select for the commercial generation of electricity. All reactors, however—whether they be designed for the production of weapons material or for the generation of electricity—produce heat.

In 1958, when Congress authorized the construction of this new plutonium production reactor, based upon studies made by the General Electric Co., Congress stipulated that it be a convertible type. Certain features were built into it to give it the flexibility to utilize the otherwise wasted heat for the generation of electricity if Congress subsequently deemed it desirable.

This reactor, therefore, when it is completed, will be operated for the principal purpose of producing plutonium which is needed in our national defense program. The reactor is a large reactor. It will be the largest reactor in the entire world. As a byproduct it will make available approximately 11 million pounds of steam per hour. This is a greater volume of steam than is produced by any single existing steam-generating facility not only in the United States, but in the world.

We can throw that steam away if we wish to; we can dump it into the Columbia River if we wish to; or we can attempt to make use of it, and we do intend to make use of it.

Project 62-a-6 would provide for the expenditure of $95 million for the construction of electric generating facilities that would capture that 11 million pounds of steam coming from the reactor each hour and convert it into useful energy. We would convert it into 700,000 to 800,000 kilowatts of electric power.

In my opinion, the 11 million pounds of steam that will be made available from this reactor is similar to the potential energy contained in the waters of the various rivers of the Northwest on which great hydroelectric plants have been and are being constructed. Steam is nothing but water in a different form.

Since 1958, a number of very detailed and comprehensive studies have been made of the economics of using this otherwise wasted steam from the reactor. The most recent of these studies which was made for the Federal Power Commission in cooperation with the AEC, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the General Electric Co., and the Bonneville Power Administration was completed in February 1961. These studies reflect that it is economically justified and that the economic benefits would vary over the lifetime of the reactor from a few million dollars to more than $200 million.

The Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration testified before the committee that the BPA can use the additional power. He informed the committee that if he knew this project would be built even though it would not be generating electricity until late 1964, the Bonneville Power Administration could immediately release 400,000 kilowatts of firm power from its present facilities on a long-term basis, which it cannot do now because it does not have sufficient backup for the next 5 years.

The Government operations at Hanford today require approximately 350,000 kilowatts of electric power which is being taken off the Bonneville grid. This is approximately one-half the amount that would be produced by the facilities if they were built. It is estimated that this will increase to approximately 400,000 kilowatts within the next several years. Approximately one-half, therefore, of the electricity to be generated by this project will offset the Government requirements at Hanford.

I am not from the Northwest area of the country, the area which would benefit from this additional source of energy. I am from that part of the country where the cost of electricity is high, where we do not have the benefit of low-priced hydroelectric systems.

I do not believe the private versus public power controversy is at issue in this project. What is at issue is: Shall we waste energy, or shall we utilize this source of power to help the citizens and industries of an important area of our country, and in turn help the entire country?

Ours is a rich country. We are very fortunate to have the natural resources with which we have been blessed. We are not so rich, however, that we can continue to waste them. I support this project because I do not believe in waste.

I believe S. 2043 is a good bill. I urge all Senators to vote for the bill in the form recommended by the Joint Committee, which includes project 62-a-6, the electric generating facilities for the new production reactor at Hanford.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a cogent editorial entitled "The Hanford Issue," published in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, July 15, 1961.

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

THE HANFORD ISSUE

The House used poor judgment in rejecting, by a vote of 176 to 140, the proposal to convert the new reactor at Hanford, Wash., into a dual-purpose facility capable of producing not only plutonium for weapons, but also between 700,000 and 800,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for peaceful uses.

Unless the Senate reverses the House action, and the item is then restored in conference, the reactor—which is in the process of being built and which will be completed next year—will serve only a strictly military purpose. Yet, as it produces the plutonium, it will give off a byproduct of great potential economic value. This will be a tremendous quantity of heat that could be so utilized as to make the facility, wholly apart from its weapons role, by far the biggest of the world's present atomic electrical powerplants.

The proposal turned down by the House would create this facility by investing $95 million in equipping the reactor (which would more than pay for itself) to harness the heat and turn the resultant electricity into the Bonneville network for distribution—largely through private utility systems—in the Pacific Northwest. But the private utilities have lobbied vigorously against the idea, and so have coal interests, and it has been defeated primarily on the ground that it would put the Atomic Energy Commission in the public power business and thus constitute another socialistic encroachment on free enterprise.

In the debate on the issue, however, Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee, has pretty well demolished these and kindred arguments. He has shown, for example, that the basic law governing the AEC specifically authorizes the sort of power output that the dual-purpose reactor would generate. He has made clear, too, that such a reactor at Hanford could not hurt the coal industry, and would actually make additional electricity available to private utilities "at a very cheap price." And Representative ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, has backed up Mr. HOLIFIELD with this telling point: "The installation of the electric generating facilities at the Hanford reactor is in the best interest of all of the American people. What could be more justified than to convert into electricity—at no cost to the taxpayers—the tremendous amounts of reactor heat which otherwise will be wasted? To blow this steam into the air or use it to heat up the Columbia River surely would be regarded by people everywhere as an incredible extravagance."

Everything considered, the weight of logic and commonsense rests heavily on the side of those who advocate the dual-purpose facility. Accordingly, we hope that the Senate will support the proposal and that the House will reconsider what it has done and enable the project to go forward.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I shall read from the editorial a part which I believe is pertinent to the discussion before the Senate today:

Unless the Senate reverses the House action, and the item is then restored in conference, the reactor—which is in the process of being built and which will be completed next year—will serve only a strictly military purpose. Yet, as it produces the plutonium, it will give off a byproduct of great potential economic value. This will be a tremendous quantity of heat that could be so utilized as to make the facility, wholly apart from its weapons role, by far the biggest of the world's present atomic electrical powerplants.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understood the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island, he said that 325,000 kilowatts of this power would be used to supplant an equal amount of power now being obtained from the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. That would leave about 400,000 to 500,000 kilowatts for other purposes, would it?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. What part of that 400,000 to 500,000 kilowatts would be required for the production of plutonium? Can the Senator from Rhode Island estimate that?

Mr. PASTORE. No, I cannot estimate it as precisely as all that. At our entire installation at Hanford we are now using 350,000 kilowatts of electricity, which we obtain from the Bonneville grid.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. That will increase to 400,000 after this installation is built. So I think it fair to say that the increment will come about, not only because of this installation but also because of other developments taking place at Hanford.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the Bonneville Power Administration will be able to use that amount of power—now being used at Hanford—to increase its sales of firm power, will it?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I assume that the power that Bonneville now supplies to Hanford is firm power.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct; and they would be in a position to firm up other power but for the simple reason that they do not have sufficient backup. But this development will give them the additional backup with which to immediately firm up 400,000 kilowatts of power.

Mr. AIKEN. And thus Bonneville will have a market for it?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. The testimony before our committee was that they have an immediate need for it. As a matter of fact, as the needs develop, there will even be a shortage of power by 1965.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator from Rhode Island tell us how the cost of the power produced at Hanford will compare with the cost of the power now being received from Bonneville?

Mr. PASTORE. It will be put into the grid, and then—predicated upon the cost of the installations, that is to say, the amount of money that will be spent for attaching the generating facilities to the reactor, and predicated upon all the other costs involved—a cost will be determined between the Government departments which are interested in this matter—the AEC and the Department of Interior or, if they cannot agree, it

will be submitted to the President, for his final determination.

Mr. AIKEN. What does Bonneville sell power for now?

Mr. PASTORE. Seventeen dollars and fifty cents a kilowatt-year.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that while Bonneville power in the past has accumulated reserves, they have been reduced somewhat in the last 2 or 3 years. Has that reduction been caused in any way by selling power to the Hanford establishment?

Mr. PASTORE. Let me refer that question to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. AIKEN. And at a lower price, perhaps, than it should have been sold for?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield now to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. As I understand, the Atomic Energy Commission pays the going rate—the same rate that is charged to utilities, both public and private, in the Northwest—namely, $17.50 a kilowatt-year. The problem in regard to power in recent years in the Northwest relates to what is called secondary or dump power. There is a surplus of that. The Senator will recall that was discussed during the hearings.

But as I understand, the power during the dual purpose period—that is to say, when both plutonium and power are being produced—will cost approximately $8.70 a kilowatt-year. That is compared with the present sale rate of $17.50 a kilowatt-year. But the problem they have had in connection with the drop in revenues relates to the excess of secondary power; and, as the Senator knows, in that connection there is discussion about a possible tie-in with California, in order to sell the dump power or the secondary power.

Mr. AIKEN. If the steam at Hanford is converted into electric power, what will be the effect on the finances of the Bonneville Power Administration?

Mr. JACKSON. They will pick up approximately $7 million immediately. The reason for that is that they will be able to enter into firm contracts, primarily with private utilities; and they will be able to sell that power right away. They can do that now, because they know that in the water shortage period, which is for a 1965–1966 base, they will have this firm power coming from Hanford, and that makes it possible for them to "pick up the tab" right away.

Mr. AIKEN. And they will be able to furnish the utility companies with a larger amount of firm power, whereas in the past they have had to sell, not at the firm power price, but at the dump power price, a certain percentage of their power output? Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, this will add to the firm power output that will be available to the utilities in the Northwest; and, as the Senator will recall from the testimony taken before the committee, it is contemplated that the power from this undertaking—from the dual-purpose reactor—will be sold to the private utilities in the Northwest on a 10-year contract basis, with no pullback.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there any likelihood that in the near future—for instance, within the next 8 or 10 years—there will be interconnection between the power-producing areas of the Northwest and the power-deficit areas of California?

Mr. JACKSON. This matter is under study by the Department of the Interior. No decision has been reached, and it is hard to predict. It is a very "hot," shall we say, political issue in the Northwest and in California. It is not involved in this project.

Mr. AIKEN. Assuming that no plutonium at all would be produced—for instance, assuming that we were to enter into a perfect disarmament agreement with the rest of the world, and did not need any plutonium—what would be the cost of producing power at the Hanford plant, as proposed in this bill?

Mr. JACKSON. All that we can say is that the studies show that during the dual-purpose period it would be less than the cost of producing it under comparable conventional situations and that assuming no more plutonium would be needed after approximately 10 years that it would be competitive.

The cost of power on a single-purpose basis is classified. But assuming a dual-purpose operation of at least 10 years, first it will be less than the conventional power charge that would be made under those circumstances if you average out the life of the reactor.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it expected that the Hanford generators would be operated continuously, or that they would be operated intermittently? And what percentage of the capacity would be used?

Mr. JACKSON. Representatives of the Bonneville Power Administration, which would have overall supervision, testified that it is contemplated that it would be operated like a dam—that is to say, about 85 percent of the time; whereas representatives of the Federal Power Commission, following their study, said that the operation would be for approximately 31 percent of the time. That is why they have a different figure.

Mr. PASTORE. In that connection, I think we should consider the other side of the coin, as well. In the event we reach a perfect disarmament agreement—as all of us pray will be the case—and thus it becomes necessary to run the reactor solely for the purpose of generating electric power, there is this to be said: As far as we know, most of the production reactors in Russia are dual purpose.

Should there be a clandestine violation, or should there be an open act of violation on the part of another nation, or should there be a repudiation of any set agreement of disarmament, the fact of the matter is that we would have a plant that was already running, if it became necessary to produce again weapons material, so we in this country would not be caught short and be at a disadvantage. I am not suggesting that conjecture as the argument for the $95 million authorization, but inasmuch as the Senator brought up the question of what the cost would be if we stopped producing plutonium, I point out it would be almost on a par with the cost of conventional fuel.

The fact is that, should there be a violation, or should a disarmament agreement be discarded, at least we would not have rendered ourselves so impotent that we would not have weapons production facilities.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Rhode Island to advance the argument that, if the production of plutonium and its cost to the Government were eliminated as a part of the plan, electricity would be produced at a lesser cost than with conventional fuels?

Mr. PASTORE. That is the understanding of the staff.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My understanding is diametrically opposite; that the cost of the electricity is evaluated by placing a certain cost on the production of plutonium, which, in my judgment, is a disproportionate cost.

Mr. PASTORE. In my introductory remarks, I said that there was a sincere and honest difference of opinion. I realize we are getting into a realm that is somewhat less than certain, but it is the best information the Senator from Rhode Island has. I have listened to the same witnesses that my distinguished colleague has listened to. I have stated the impression I got, and I am fortified in my point of view by the staff, which has made a very careful study of the record.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will have some remarks to make a little later; but with regard to the questions raised originally by the Senator from Vermont on the question of the power and its disposition, the power from the plant is to be sold; is it not?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I recall the calculations from the testimony, roughly, and without getting into an engineer's slide-rule operations or technical calculations, the power is going to cost the Government at least 3½ mills a kilowatt-hour, and it is going to be sold into the grid at 2½ mills a kilowatt-hour. Is that not correct?

Mr. PASTORE. No, it is not correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think it is, according to the evidence. So on every kilowatt-hour that the Atomic Energy Commission sells, we are going to lose money. It is like the old story of bananas. The fellow said he lost money on every banana he sold, but he made a profit because the volume was so big, or like saying that we are earning money because we are selling hundreds of thousands of kilowatts, when in reality we are losing on each one produced.

Mr. PASTORE. It was the undisputed testimony before the committee, on the part of the AEC and the Federal Power Commission, and as substantiated by Mr. McCone, Dr. Seaborg, and by all the persons who have made an analysis and a very thorough study of the question, that the project is economically feasible. Certainly, the Senator from Rhode Island would not be for a program that

was not economically feasible. If the Senator from Iowa chooses to challenge the experts who have given their testimony, he has a perfect right to do so, and to gather testimony from his own experts. But the complete testimony, including that of the Bonneville Power Administration, and all the rest of the testimony before the committee, is that it is economically feasible. If it were not, the Senator from Rhode Island would be the first to vote against this particular amendment.

One can take all of the ramifications involved, and dissect them into any proportions he wants to, and reach any conclusion he desires. But how is one going to get away from all the testimony—the testimony of the AEC, including Mr. McCone, Dr. Seaborg, the Federal Power Commission, the Bonneville Power Administration? How is one going to get away from the undisputed testimony that it is economically feasible?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What does the Senator mean by "economically feasible"?

Mr. PASTORE. That it is going to pay. That is what I mean by "economically feasible." I mean the Federal Government will get every cent of its costs out of it. I cannot say it more unequivocally or more clearly than that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I certainly do not agree that that is the burden of the testimony. The burden of the testimony is that it can be done, that it is feasible, but I think the burden of the testimony is that it is not competitively feasible.

Mr. PASTORE. I said "economically feasible." I mean that for every nickel we put into it, we will get the nickel back, at least. I said, if it is measured in the short term or the long term, it can run from $7 million to $200 million. I have given the figures.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not know that there is any need to go into it further at this time, but, like anything else, it depends on what kind of assumptions one makes. The testimony is that if the reactor operates on a dual-purpose basis, at 85 percent of capacity, as compared with 31 percent, as estimated by the Federal Power Commission, then we come out with a figure of $8.70 per kilowatt-year, which is much less than 3½ mills. It is about 1.4 mills.

I think the Senator from Iowa has reference to a set of assumptions which includes operations on the basis of 31 percent of capacity. If one does that, he can come to any kind of conclusion. The point that the able and distinguished Director of the Bonneville Power Administration made was that it is going to be operated as a hydroelectric dam is operated, which means it will operate, roughly, on an 85-percent-of-capacity basis. It is on that basis that the figure of $8.70 a kilowatt-year was achieved.

As I said, if one uses assumptions that are not applicable to operations in the Northwest, he can come to any conclusion. The testimony of Mr. Luce, who is the Director of the Bonneville Power Administration, represents the way in which these operations are operated and managed in the Northwest. It is only on that basis that one can make sensible deductions and conclusions with reference to the cost of this project.

Mr. PASTORE. On that point, at this juncture, I desire to read into the RECORD from the transcript of the hearings, at page 355, the testimony of Mr. Luce, on the point that was brought up by my very respected friend, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and my other colleague:

> Confusion enters in when a figure of 3.7 mills is quoted for this Hanford power, because that assumes that the plant will be operated less than 40 percent of the time. If you assume that Lower Monumental or John Day or any other dam will be operated only 40 percent of the time, you come up with a much higher cost. In order to compare these projects, you have to assume that they are operated at their full capacity.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator will recall that I debated this subject with the Senator from Rhode Island and with the Senator from Washington on July 15, 1958. At that time it was stated that if this convertible feature were included, it would not be used for power purposes without a further debate or a further discussion in the Congress.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This is the discussion that has been brought out.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At that time the cost was estimated at $70 million. It is now estimated at $95 million, is it not?

Mr. PASTORE. That may be so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Are all the costs included? I have read the House debate on the bill. Are all the costs included in the $95 million?

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator refer to the costs of construction?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The costs of construction.

Mr. PASTORE. So far as I know, yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I invite the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to the fact that I do not refer to the costs of construction only, which I understand now to be estimated at $95 million. Is that correct?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Three years ago that cost was about $70 million?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With reference to the cost of operations, are all the overhead costs of the power feature costs included? I refer particularly to the House debate on page 12450 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, July 13, when Representative BATES, of Massachusetts, stated:

> When we are told that this project is economical, it does not take into consideration a good portion of properly assignable or even direct costs. Yet, under the "power only" phase which represents 75 percent of the estimated life of the plant, the economics claimed are about "break even or moderately favorable."

Does the Senator say that all the costs are included?

Mr. PASTORE. All the costs of the power features enter into the estimate of the cost of the electricity. I would not think that the departments of Government which are concerned with this problem—including the President of the United States, who has the final right to determine when the departments cannot agree—would so juggle the figures that we would get a distorted picture.

It is my firm conviction that in the establishment of the cost of the electricity which will be pumped into the grid we shall take into consideration every single penny which goes toward producing the power, excluding the cost of the production of weapons material.

Where one would draw the line of demarcation, I suggest to my good colleague from Massachusetts, I do not know. I do not know that I could do that precisely. I do not know that any man in this Chamber, or possibly any man in the whole Congress of the United States, could do that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may interject myself into the discussion, so that we may have a three-way discussion?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; that will be delightful.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if in the cost studies upon which the so-called economic feasibility is based there has been included the convertibility cost of the reactor, or the related additional operating costs involved in operating the convertible reactor, and whether there is included the plutonium loss which results from the convertibility features? Are those considered in the capital cost structure in arriving at these figures? It is my understanding they are not included, and that their inclusion would substantially increase the cost of the electricity.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course, the $25 million for the convertibility is money which has already been spent, no matter what we do. That has been spent, no matter what we do. That money has already been authorized and appropriated. If we stop now, what will become of the $25 million? If we do not approve the $95 million to build the generating facilities, we shall actually send $25 million for the convertibility features down the drain.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is very true, but the fact that we have wasted $25 million, in my opinion—and I was opposed to doing so when the Congress voted to do so—would not justify us in throwing $95 million more down the drain.

Mr. PASTORE. No. I would hope that problem could be resolved. The present status, as I understand it, is that the $25 million is not included. There was quite a bit of discussion in the Joint Committee, as the Senator will recall, at the time the subject came up. I think we were told that matter has not been finalized. It will be finalized. We have to remember that the final decision will

be made by the President of the United States, if these agencies cannot get together as to what should be done.

I say to my friend from Iowa that I, from Rhode Island, am one of those who feel that in all probability the $25 million should be included.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Absolutely it should be. It is part of the capital investment.

Mr. PASTORE. That is my personal feeling. That is only a personal feeling. The argument is being made that if we do nothing about the $95 million we shall have wasted $25 million. Again I go along with my distinguished friend. After all, the $25 million expenditure was a predicate for what we are trying to do today, and is enough related to it and is enough related to the convertibility for the electricity that in all probability it should be counted. I am one of those who feel it should be counted. I feel it will not vary the figures in such a way as to render the project not economically feasible.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I agree that it has to be counted, exactly like the brick and mortar which makes up the convertibility feature.

I say again to my friend that I was against the allowing of $25 million when it was first proposed. If that was a waste of money, my argument at this point is that there is no use in sending $95 million more bad money after $25 million bad money which has already been wasted.

Mr. PASTORE. Now, now—that is where I disagree with the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We would be better off to lose only the $25 million.

Mr. PASTORE. I disagree with my colleague. This is not bad money. This is not bad money at all. This is the situation:

There are 11 million pounds of steam per hour that may be wasted. That is a tremendous amount of heat which can be put to use. The electricity is needed in that part of the country. All I say is, "Let us tap it." In order to tap it, we have to spend $95 million.

The question is, Will we spend $95 million or will we lose 11 million pounds of steam per hour? I say that we should not waste good resources. I say we should put the steam to work. Let us make the electricity, and let America grow.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator says that we should use the 11 million pounds of steam, and so on. What will we do with it?

Mr. PASTORE. What will we do with it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that the Hanford plant will require 400,000 kilowatts to produce the plutonium.

Mr. PASTORE. At the Hanford installation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At Hanford.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The 400,000 kilowatts now come from Bonneville. Is that correct?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we relieve Bonneville of the need to supply 400,000 kilowatts to Hanford by building this project there will be 400,000 kilowatts more in the Bonneville supply.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There will be 400,000 kilowatts more from Bonneville plus 400,000 kilowatts from Hanford which will have no use at the present time.

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, my goodness, gracious, no. After we allocate the 400,000 kilowatts to the Hanford installation, the power will go into the grid. Where will it go after it gets into the grid? It will go to the private companies, mostly. I think about 65 percent of it will go to the private companies.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I will yield to the Senator in just a moment.

The power will go to the private companies and to the public companies. I understand that by 1965 even this amount of power will not be sufficient. That is how fast America is growing.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts.

It is true that it is contemplated the power we are talking about, from the nuclear powered reactor, will be sold to private utilities and private industries. They are ready and willing to buy on a 10-year contract basis. That is where the power will go. These companies and utilities will enter into contracts immediately, if the project is approved, which they could not enter into now to buy firm power out of the Bonneville grid. That is where the Bonneville power will go. All of this power will go into the grid system.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This project will supply approximately 800,000 kilowatts more?

Mr. JACKSON. A possible 800,000 kilowatts more.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There will be an additional 800,000 kilowatts. Where will that power go?

Mr. PASTORE. May I explain this to the Senators. If we tap the 11 million pounds of steam per hour, we shall be able to produce between 700,000 and 800,000 kilowatts of power. At the present time, Hanford is drawing from the grid about 350,000 kilowatts per year. If we put in the 800,000 kilowatts, that will allow Bonneville to distribute the amount over and above what Hanford uses among its customers, and these users have a need for the power. Not only that, it will allow them to firm up power, which they cannot do now, with 400,000 kilowatts of power.

Mr. Luce, who represents the administration, came before our committee and stated that the power could be used.

Mr. President, it seems that we have a little competition.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I understand that there has been an accident in the corridor, which accounts for the commotion.

It has nothing to do with the discussion here.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether he has discussed the following point: It is my understanding that the power from the proposed project would cost 3.7 mills per kilowatt-hour, and the average revenue today from Bonneville sales is 2.32 mills. Therefore, we would start with a loss.

Mr. PASTORE. The figure of 3.7 mills is projected on a 31-percent utilization of the facilities, which, of course, is a low figure. But, if we consider the maximum capacity of the plant, I understand the price would be much cheaper than that at which the current is now being produced.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator state affirmatively that when the plant is completed it will be utilized to the extent of perhaps 70 percent immediately?

Mr. PASTORE. That is the present contemplation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I read the debate that took place in the House, and from that debate I understood otherwise.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know what the Members of the House debated. I am speaking of the evidence before our committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understood that a certain amount of power would not be used.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. This question arose earlier. One can reach any cost figure he wishes, depending upon the assumptions that are used. The Federal Power Commission made an assumption of 31 percent usage of the facility.

With that kind of assumption, we arrive at a figure of 3.7 mills. The figure was arrived at in that manner.

The Bonneville Power Administration, which is operating the system, stated that the proposed plant would be operated as a part of the system. It will be operated by General Electric and the AEC. An 85-percent operation, which is comparable to the operation of a hydroelectric dam, is contemplated.

The Federal Power Commission came to the conclusion that the project would be similar to a steamplant, which it is not. Therefore a 31-percent figure was used. In that manner the Federal Power Commission arrived at its figure.

By operating the plant in the manner in which a hydroelectric plant would be operated—at about 70 percent of capacity—we would arrive at the figure of 1.6 mills. At an 85-percent capacity, the figure would be 1.4 mills.

Have I answered the question of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator's statement answers my question, but——

Mr. JACKSON. My figures are all based upon assumptions. Let us be frank. I am trying to explain the figures.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was my understanding from reading the discussion in the record, the minority views of the committee, and other statements, that there is no present use for the surplus power over and above what would go into the Hanford plant. My argument is based largely on that point and the cost of the power.

Mr. JACKSON. There is confusion with respect to available power. As the Senator from Massachusetts knows, there are two kinds of power. First, there is firm power, which is power that can be made available the year around on a firm basis. There is a shortage of such power in the Northwest.

Second, there is what is known as secondary or dump power. Of that kind there is a surplus. The difficulty arises in that division. Secondary or dump power, of course, is not usable for household purposes. It is usable by industry on a long-term basis. We must have power for which we can contract on a long-term basis.

The power to be generated from the proposed facility would be used to firm up the secondary or dump power during that period of the year when there is a surplus, which is the period when the water flows over the dams—from May to September. Then in the period of the year when there is a shortage of water, which is the opposite period from fall to spring, the plant would be operated so as to make possible the storage of water and its release later, during the period when the water is needed. Have I answered the Senator's question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think that answers my question.

Mr. JACKSON. I assure the Senator that there is not a surplus of firm power in the Northwest. We are not considering the case in which a surplus occurs in secondary or dump power. This is why there has been so much discussion about a possible intertie with California to sell such power to California. Private utilities are now delivering some of the so-called secondary or dump power from Oregon into California.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I invite the Senator's attention to a point in the statement of Mr. BATES, of Massachusetts, which appears in the third column of page 12450 of the RECORD:

> This year, Mr. Luce of BPA indicates that if there is a critical water shortage in the Pacific Northwest in the year of 1965–66 there will be a shortage of 117,000 kilowatts. In the following year, the power supply will be increased by 780,000 kilowatts by reason of the Canadian treaty. The critical power shortage in the 1965–66 period was determined by taking the worst year on record for precipitation in the last 60 years. The picture could not be painted worse. Yet, even if this should happen the shortage would only amount to less than one-fourth of 1 percent. This is insignificant and meaningless.

Mr. JACKSON. One-fourth of 1 percent can be very crucial when an area begins to have brownouts. Actually the project would represent about 1 year's normal load growth in the Northwest. I emphasize again that this problem is one which is faced by all utilities, both public and private, in the Northwest community.

So we do not have a surplus of firm power. Such statement is not true. On this point all witnesses who appeared before the committee and who are qualified to speak on the subject were agreed. Others can argue about it, but it was agreed that there is need for additional firm power.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the need for firm power will be in the next 5 or 6 years is a question of opinion.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

I do not believe anyone can predict with precision what the load growth will be, except that if the past is prologue, we have a pretty good indication. We have a continuing growth in the power field in the Northwest each year, as there has been a similar growth throughout the United States.

The Federal Power Commission, of course, recommended the project. They know the growth factor.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in order that the discussion may be taken out of the context of the present administration vis-a-vis the previous administration, let me read into the RECORD a statement from the transcript of the executive session of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on June 24, 1958, which appears at pages 36 and 37 of that transcript:

> Senator BRICKER. I would like to ask, if we are going to then authorize this reactor for special nuclear material, should it be limited to a convertible type, should the committee and the Congress tie you down to a certain type of reactor?
>
> Representative VAN ZANDT. Do you mean a single purpose reactor?
>
> Senator BRICKER. Whether it should be a convertible type or whether it should be left to the judgment of the Commission.
>
> Mr. STRAUSS. Without knowing anything about the Johnson testimony, I would say this, that had it been possible at the time that the Hanford reactors were built and the Savannah River reactors were built to make them convertible at will, it would have been, I think, the smart thing to do. As far as I know there was not any such possibility available to the Manhattan District originally or to the Commission in the days when it decided on the Savannah River plant.
>
> Senator BRICKER. If this authorization was made, you would desire to put up a convertible type at the present time?
>
> Mr. STRAUSS. Personally I would. I do not know how the Commissioners feel about it. He said they testified to the same effect, so we are in accord.

I merely wished to show in the context what I have stated was the point of view of the members of the Commission at the time that Mr. Eisenhower was President. This is the point of view of the Commission now that Mr. Kennedy is President.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As a matter of fact, is it not true that last year Congress authorized a project at Shippingport, Pa., for several million dollars, to dump steam, because it was not economically sound to try to produce electric power from that excess steam?

Mr. PASTORE. I understand that is true with that type of reactor. However, we are dealing with a low-pressure steam reactor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is this not also a low-pressure steam operation in Hanford?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It has a steam pressure of about 250 pounds per square inch. Is that not correct? At least it is in that vicinity, I understand.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is telling me. I wish he would proceed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If I am wrong, I can stand corrected. However it is my understanding that that is about the pressure of the steam out there. Will not the Senator admit that the efficient electric producing plants are using steam in the form of thousands of pounds of pressure per square inch, as the efficient method of production electricity, and that a low-pressure operation today is about as antiquated as the age of the horse and wagon?

Mr. PASTORE. I have before me a list of low-pressure plants. It is shown at page 12448 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 13, 1961. These are shown: Detroit Edison, Appalachian Power, Ohio Power, Indiana-Kentucky Electric, Ohio Valley Electric, Illinois Power, Commonwealth Edison, Metropolitan Edison, South Carolina, Consolidated Edison, Detroit Edison, Union Electric, Chicago District, and Niagara Mohawk.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Certainly there are a great many plants which are using low-pressure operations, because they put those systems in years ago, and they must try to work the utility out of them. However the plants which are now being put into operation are not that kind of operation. I do not believe the Senator from Rhode Island can find even one such plant that is using low-pressure steam.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand that these are rather recent plants that I have referred to. Certainly this matter was investigated thoroughly, and the investigators went into it completely. They reached the conclusion that it was economically feasible. I am not a scientist. I am not an engineer. I am a layman, as is the Senator from Iowa. I must be guided by the testimony of the experts. That is the testimony that I read.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator has stated that the steam is going to waste out there. It seems to me that it is a great deal like the situation with the

Potomac River right here in Washington. Millions of gallons of water are flowing down the Potomac. That water is being wasted. So the question is, Why do we not build a dam on the river and generate electricity? The reason is that even though all that water is flowing down the river, it is not efficient to build such a plant at a dam, because the cost would be prohibitive, and therefore it would be a waste of money. We are dealing with the same kind of situation out there in Washington.

Mr. PASTORE. It is not done on the Potomac because it is not economically feasible. We have some rivers in Rhode Island, and we do not have hydroelectric plants on them either.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is going to waste. Of course they could blow some whistles with it.

Mr. PASTORE. Maybe they will. When 5 o'clock comes, perhaps they will use some of it to blow some whistles.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In Rhode Island steamplants have been built because we in Massachusetts and Rhode Island know that it is cheaper to build those plants than it is to build hydroelectric plants.

Mr. PASTORE. I would like to say that it is unfortunate that we do not have hydroelectric facilities in Rhode Island and Massachusetts. It is unfortunate that the cost of electricity in our part of the country should be what it is. I wish we could tie in to this sort of thing. However, just because we cannot do it does not mean that we can hold up progress. This is still one Nation. I come from Rhode Island. This project does not mean anything to me from the point of view of a Rhode Islander, but as an American it does mean a great deal to me, because it means that America will grow. It means that America will prosper, and that as Oregon and Washington prosper, so we in Rhode Island will get more jobs, and in Massachusetts too.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understood the Senator from Washington to say a moment ago that the cost of producing electricity, under 80 percent of operation, is cheaper than it can be produced at Bonneville. If that is correct, I would suggest that the Senator from Rhode Island consider building an atomic plant in Rhode Island, because electricity could be produced cheaper than at Bonneville. He would find, of course, that he could not get a private industry to agree with those figures.

Mr. PASTORE. Some day when the Senator from Iowa, who is the ranking Republican member of the committee, is in that mood, I hope he will join the Senator from Rhode Island in seeing to it that we will build an atomic facility in Rhode Island. It has been a long time in coming. As a matter of fact, all that construction goes to the State so ably represented by my friend from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. I hope the Senator from Idaho will some day agree to share his largess with his friend from Rhode Island. Then we will get an atomic plant in Rhode Island.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In Idaho it is an experimental plant. Nobody claims they can show the country it is economically feasible.

Mr. PASTORE. Look at all the jobs it has created.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Jobs and contractors' fees in the State of Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. We might as well be facetious about it. After all, a great part of the enterprise that is being developed out there is under the direction of General Electric. I believe they have their headquarters and backup at Schenectady, N.Y. The turbines will not be produced in the State of Washington. This material will come from all over the country. However, the main effort is being made by General Electric. Most of the equipment will come from all over America, and will be supplied on a competitive basis. This is not a local or parochial project in any sense of the word. It will be important for this country to be able to say at some time, after all the talk we have heard about atoms for peace, that we have at last in this area the world's largest nuclear powerplant. There we have indeed a sword and a plowshare—a sword which will help to defend our country through the production of plutonium, and a plowshare in the form of the production of electricity. Here we have a golden opportunity to demonstrate to the world that we mean what we say when we on this occasion authorize the world's largest nuclear powerplant.

Mr. PASTORE. Before I conclude my remarks and relinquish the floor to my colleagues who are in opposition to the authorization, I would merely like to add that in 1958, when it was my honor to be a congressional adviser to the International Conference for the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, at Geneva, I was deeply impressed when we were invited to attend a moving picture showing a Russian reactor. This was said to be the largest in the world at the time. In the opinion of our scientists, the reactor, which was supposed to be producing electric power, was in fact a plutonium-producing reactor. That is the story in Russia.

I say to my colleagues in the Senate this steam at Hanford is being wasted. I am not getting into propaganda. I am not getting into emotions. I am not getting into sentimentality. I am talking about economic feasibility. Even discounting all that for the moment, it might still be well to tell the world that the biggest reactor in the world is in the United States and it produces peacetime electric energy. It might be necessary, as I said before, if ever we reach a disarmament agreement, and then there is a violation of that agreement, we in America will not be caught as we were caught at Pearl Harbor, and that at least we will have something underway, that we will have some men in training and some technicians in training and available to produce nuclear weapons material.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There has been much discussion of the question of cost. I am interested in this debate because I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and if this authorization is approved there will no doubt be a request for an appropriation. I should like to ask the Senator to look at page 34 of the committee report, the fourth paragraph on that page. It discusses the cost. Does the Senator from Rhode Island say that those figures, quoted by the minority in the fourth paragraph on that page, are wrong?

Mr. PASTORE. They are acceptable in the sense that the minority report will take figures which will bear out its interpretation.

It has been abundantly testified this afternoon—and we are repeating, repeating, and repeating it—that if the reactor is utilized at 85 percent of capacity, as under the pending proposal it will be, after all, it will be used for firm power. If it is to be used for firm power, it will have to be used at 85 percent capacity. It has been brought out that Bonneville will be getting the power cheaper than Bonneville is getting its electricity today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, Hanford will have to be used at 85 percent capacity?

Mr. PASTORE. It will be used at 85 percent of capacity. If it is brought down to 31 percent, then, of course, the figure will be thrown out of balance, as will everything else.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator says these figures are incorrect, if the powerplant is used at 85 percent of capacity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I support the position taken by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the majority of the committee.

On June 8, I presented to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy my statement in support of the power generation facilities at Hanford. I ask unanimous consent that my statement of June 8 be printed at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. My statement goes into much statistical and technical detail in support of the project. Taken with the testimony given by others in support of the power program, I believe this material provides a convincing statement of the feasibility and desirability of the project.

During the debate on the bill in the House last week, several points were made against the Hanford power project by its opponents. It is evident from reading the RECORD of that debate that the opposition to this provision of the pending bill boils down to two issues, issues which are political and not technical. The two issues are: First, should the sale of the power be ruled out because it will be from a publicly owned

project; second, does regionalism come first in deciding whether a worthwhile project is to get the green light.

With respect to the reflections cast against the technical feasibility of the Hanford project, I cite the engineering surveys made by General Electric Co., Burns & Roe, Inc., the Federal Power Commission, and R. W. Beck Associates, all concluding that the conversion of the new production reactor to a dual-purpose plant is technically and economically feasible.

I am not an engineer, but those who are experts in the field have found the project to be sound. In my judgment, this is one of the major premises of the debate. It ought to be made crystal clear—and I state it again for the purpose of emphasis, because it needs to be emphasized—that when we propose this project, we are proposing a project which is engineeringly sound and technically sound.

The verification of that belief is borne out by such unquestioned experts in the field as General Electric Co., Burns & Roe, Inc., the Federal Power Commission, and R. W. Beck Associates. We are not asking the Senate to vote for a project which cannot stand on its scientific legs. It is a project which is scientifically sound.

With respect to its economic feasibility, I point out that the Director of the Bonneville Power Administration, Charles Luce, has flatly declared that the Bonneville Power Administration is prepared to pay the costs allocated to power out of the Bonneville Power revenues. He has stated that the benefits of adding this large block of firm power to the Bonneville system will be great enough to pay the allocated costs, with interest, with no adverse effects upon the Bonneville rates.

I wish to emphasize what the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] have stated with respect to firm power. The Pacific Northwest will need this firm power at just about the time it would be available. All of the West is anticipating a need for firm power in the next few years. This power will help meet that need.

I was so glad to hear the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] emphasize the relationship of Hanford power to the need for an expanded economy. We need an expanded economy in Massachusetts and an expanded economy in every other State. The economy of the Nation grows when we take advantage of a scientifically and economically sound development project, because as we proceed to build and use such projects, we experience economic repercussions and benefits across the entire Nation.

I simply say, let us keep our sights high. Let us recognize that when we make a plea for a scientifically sound project in the State of Washington, we are helping Massachusetts and Rhode Island and every other State. In fact, many of the contractors who will supply machinery and materials for the generating facilities have their plants in the eastern United States.

In my 17 years as a Member of the Senate, I have never refused to vote for any sound, economic, expansion project anywhere in the Nation on the basis of the argument of sectionalism, and I never shall. That is a dangerous premise on which to act in Congress. It has been against much criticism that I have sometimes voted for projects in other parts of the country when those who followed a regionalistic argument asked, "What good will that project do to Oregon?" My answer was, "The real question is, What good will it do to America?"

Mr. President, I referred to that situation because I believe I have a right to speak on this particular proposal; during my 17 years as a Member of the Senate, I have never voted against a project because it might bring an immediate benefit to a particular section or region of the country other than my own.

My question always has been: Is the project needed? My second question has been: Is it sound from an economic and engineering standpoint? My third question has been: Will it help, over the long pull, in expanding the economy of the Nation?

Let there be no doubt that the greatest defense ability we have is the development of an ever-expanding economy for our Nation. Let our economy become static, and the Nation will start to decline.

So I urge the support of Senators from all sections of the country for this project. It will meet a great need in my section of the country that we must plan to meet in the immediate future. No only my section of the country, but the Nation from coast to coast will be helped so far as the expanding needs of the economy are concerned.

COST ALLOCATION QUESTION

The statement by Mr. Luce, that the benefits of adding this large block of firm power to the Bonneville system will be great enough to pay the allocated costs, with interest, with no adverse effects upon the Bonneville rates, is a very important and vital fact in this debate. It is an important statement to keep in mind, because it is true that the exact cost allocation on which rates and repayment schedules are based has not been made. Opponents of the project have tried to cite this fact as a reason why the authorizing legislation should not be approved. But it is the common practice for the detailed cost allocations to be made after a multipurpose project is authorized. Mr. Luce is so certain of the economic advantages of Hanford power and so familiar with the estimated costs of its power that he has put Bonneville Power Administration on record in advance as being ready to assume this responsibility.

Another objection made to the cost features of Hanford power is that the $145 million cost of the reactor itself is not allocated to power. This refers to the economic evaluation, and not to the specific cost allocation which has not yet been made. But the economic evaluation did assume the payment out of power revenues of about $25 million in insurance costs, which in fact will not be incurred. Moreover, the economic evaluation shows that the benefits would exceed by about $45 million the cost of the generating facility itself, plus interest. That means that a part of cost of the reactor could be assigned to power revenues, and the project would still be economically feasible.

More important, the reactor is going to be built, whether the generating facilities are added or not. What we really have here is a plan for an investment that not only will repay itself, but could help pay off a cost that otherwise will not be recouped for the taxpayers—the cost of a reactor which will go out of the plutonium production business in from 8 to 15 years.

The fact that these points raised against its technical and economical feasibility are unreal is made evident by the further arguments against the authorization. After arguing that the Hanford facility is impractical and too costly, its opponents then argue that if Hanford power goes on the line, it will give the Pacific Northwest more cheap power and thus will enable it to be in competition with the high-power rate areas of the country. This is where the real opposition to the measure becomes evident. Obviously, the Hanford facility cannot be both impractical and costly, on one hand, and a competitive threat, on the other.

SHOULD NOT BE REGIONAL ISSUE

To my mind, the saddest and most unfortunate argument made against this authorization is the one of sectionalism. We all know where it originates, because there have come to my office, too, the pamphlets of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce and of the private electric utilities, such as the Connecticut Power & Light Co. The theme they all follow is that tax dollars collected in the various States will be spent in the State of Washington, for the use of power consumers in the Pacific Northwest. One of these pieces of literature calls Hanford a project "that will take many dollars from taxpayers, and from which they will receive little or no benefit."

Mr. President, this is no new argument. I have been hearing this argument from my own State of Oregon for many years, in connection with legislation I have sponsored and voted for, to help stimulate business activity in what are referred to as the Nation's depressed areas.

But I have said to the people of Oregon, "You must raise your sights. After all, a development which benefits one section of the country has a definite beneficial effect on all sections of the country. Expansion in one section of

the country certainly has the additional result of helping expand the economy in other sections of the country, as well."

I do not know how many times I have cosponsored and voted for a depressed areas bill. Yet as drafted, and as the economic statistics on unemployment go up and down in Oregon, the depressed area or area redevelopment bill has no present application in my State, although I fought for its enactment, and voted for it, and will continue to do so. It may have some day, although we hope its benefits will never be needed in Oregon.

Yet the letters and literature against the depressed area bill which have come from my State have repeated the argument heard now—that tax dollars collected in Oregon would benefit people 2,000 or 3,000 miles away.

I rejected that argument in regard to the depressed areas bill, just as I plead that the same argument be rejected in connection with this project, which is needed in my section of the country.

The same was true of the food stamp program, which has been established on a pilot basis in areas of heavy unemployment. Here again, appeals made by the Oregon delegation in the Congress for a pilot food stamp program in Oregon were rejected on the basis that the areas of the heaviest and most chronic unemployment should have them.

The fact is that the priority legislation of the new administration has been aimed at stimulating business activity in the Nation's areas of heavy and chronic unemployment. This includes the measure making the children of the unemployed eligible for public assistance payments, and the temporary extension of unemployment compensation benefits.

From my State came opposition to all these measures, based on the contention that they would cost Oregon tax dollars to be spent elsewhere.

But, Mr. President, I voted for all those measures, because in my judgment they were needed in order to improve the general economic condition of our country.

I do not know of any Members of Congress from any region of the country who gave firmer and more consistent support to these measures than did those of us from the Pacific Northwest. Why?

My answer to my Oregon constituents is that what stimulates economic activity in one section of this country helps business and employment everywhere. I explained my support for the area redevelopment bill, for example, by pointing out that families who are chronically poor do not build homes and do not build a market for Oregon lumber. I have told Oregon audiences many times that I do not sit in the Senate as the ambassador from my State, but I serve here as a lawmaker for the entire Nation. I repeated time and again that keeping one area depressed does not create jobs and prosperity anywhere else.

So I am very sad to read the record of the debate on this bill in the other body. In it, I find repeated references to the possibility that more cheap power in the Pacific Northwest will attract business away from other sections of the country.

I want to ask this rhetorical question: Does anyone know of a single job that would be created for an eastern coal miner by the defeat of this authorization? Is the retardation of one section of the country going to make new business and job opportunities in some other section?

The answer is obviously "No." However these kilowatts are finally provided, they will not come from Appalachian coal.

What we have here from the standpoint of taxpayers in other sections is an investment that will repay its own cost and which may pay at least part of the cost of the reactor which is going to be constructed in any case and which otherwise will not be self-liquidating. So the literature of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce and of the Connecticut Power & Light Co. is just plain wrong in making that argument, and it is not an argument in the interest of sound public policy.

HEAT FROM REACTOR BEING WASTED

More important, the authorization of the Hanford facility represents the development and use of a resource that is owned by all the American people. The Hanford plant is a going affair. Its heat is now being produced and wasted.

Here is a program in which the American taxpayers have invested many millions of dollars for defense purposes. Its heat is a byproduct. We could be harnessing and using that byproduct.

As I said in the statement to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the real wastrels are those who are opposed to using this power in an economical and self-liquidating way.

Mr. President, the burden of the argument I made on June 8, 1961, to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was that we should prevent that waste; we ought to put that wasted heat to good use; we ought to put the heat to constructive use—which this particular part of the bill will do.

In closing, let me say that my colleagues are accustomed to having strong editorial positions taken by the newspapers published in their States, and therefore I wish to submit an editorial for the reading of my colleagues.

I do not ask any Senator who opposes this proposal to agree with this editorial, but it will be helpful to Senators to know what the leading Republican newspaper in Oregon has to say about this matter, and what its reaction was to the action taken by the House. So I wish to read most of an editorial published on July 15, 1961, in the Oregonian, a newspaper which in its masthead claims to be an independent Republican newspaper. Certainly I can testify that it is a Republican newspaper.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator from Oregon familiar with the fact that in Rowe, Mass., there is an atomic plant which is known as the Yankee Atomic Corp.?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, I know there is such a plant there.

Mr. PASTORE. It is a combination of the various private utilities in the Northeast or the New England section of the country, which have pooled their resources, for the purpose of erecting that atomic energy electric-generating plant at Rowe, Mass.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, I understand that; and I have been briefed on it by my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that one of the members of that combination is the Connecticut Power & Light?

Mr. MORSE. No, I am not.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator further familiar with the fact that the Government of the United States has already committed $5 million for research and development for that plant, and more than $3 million in waiver of fuel costs? If we are going to argue that the taxpayers of the United States of America have all contributed to the pool of $8 million for the benefit of New England, and for that reason it is sectionalism or provincialism, and therefore is not in the interest of all America, then I think we are going to lose sight of what America stands for and what it is.

Mr. MORSE. I agree.

Mr. PASTORE. After all, we know that, as ambassadors for our own States, to a certain extent we have to rise above exclusive consideration of our own sections, and consider matters that help all America, in one big panorama of progress.

I will support the amendment, even though New England will get no direct benefit from it, because there will be a tremendous amount of steam involved which will produce between 700,000 and 800,000 kilowatts of electrical energy and that will be used to advantage to develop America.

It would be a sad commentary on the spirit of the whole development of America if we said, "Let us waste this heat because it is going to help only one part of the country." We would never have had a a TVA. We would never have had Boulder Dam. We would never have had the Yankee atomic powerplant. We would never have had similar large resources developed if we had engaged in that sort of provincial thinking.

That is the reason why I am supporting the amendment—not because it will bring immediate help to my own part of the country, but because it will help all of America. This heat should be utilized for the benefit of all of America. That is why the money should be expended for this purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I not only agree with what the Senator from Rhode Island has said, but, if he will close his ears, I should like to say something personal

about him. Mr. President, here we have a dramatic demonstration of what I would call true statesmanship.

It was not so long ago that, on the floor of the Senate, we had another measure in which the Senator from Rhode Island was much interested. It was a measure which would have been a great help to Senators from areas of the country with large metropolitan centers. Some of us fought for the adoption of a particular provision in that bill which would have been of assistance to those metropolitan areas.

It provided for the establishment of much needed park areas, watershed areas, playground areas, and areas that were vital for the welfare of many children in this country who are born in great metropolitan cities and very often reach the age of 12 before they get out of the city limits. It was with great regret that, on a rather close vote, we lost that amendment in this body.

The Senator from Rhode Island was pretty sad and disappointed about it; but, to give Senators some idea of the high level of his statesmanship, he stands on the floor of the Senate pleading for a project in another section of the country that will not give any immediate, direct help to Rhode Island—which the open space program on which he lost the other day would have given—but, as he has said, in the long run will be of great help to his country.

That is what is important in his sights, and I agree with him; but I wanted to make this personal reference to the Senator from Rhode Island because I think it is a dramatic illustration of the fact that he is true to his principles, and he does not let any selfish factor ever cause him to depart from his principles.

As one who comes from the section of the country which would have an immediate benefit from the Hanford facility, I want to thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his statesmanship.

To return to the editorial of the Portland Oregonian, it gives a pretty good idea of editorial opinion in my State on this issue. Here is the attitude of the editor of a great Republican paper in my State. The title of the editorial is "Cutting Our Throat." It reads, in part:

The House vote eliminating a $95 million item to add nuclear power to the plutonium reactor at the Hanford project was an incredible piece of congressional stupidity. And the reasons given by the opponents to sugar-coat their votes were as phony as a lead wedding ring.

The dirt-cheap proposal to add around 700,000 kilowatts to the Northwest power pool was not a party issue. It had been urged by the Eisenhower administration and it was urged by the Kennedy administration. The feasibility was assured by engineering consultants who had no ax to grind. Where else in the Northwest, which faces a power shortage in the latter 1960's, could that amount of power be obtained at so low a cost? Not in hydro, certainly.

The private utility and coal lobbies which fought the dual-purpose reactor found attentive ears among Congressmen who fear—or say they fear—that the Northwest will grab their industries. It was all right for the South to capture industries from the industrial East with the lure of tax rebates and low labor costs. But the Northwest must not take advantage of its resources. Beyond that, they did not take the trouble to find out that industries in the Northwest are new industries, locating where there are natural regional advantages.

The argument against admitting another agency to the Federal power field was meaningless. The Atomic Energy Commission has overall supervision at Hanford, but General Electric Co. would have built and operated the power reactor, and the Federal Bonneville Power Administration would have marketed the excess not needed to get the Hanford project off the backs of Northwest consumers. And private utilities, now buying a major portion of Federal power in the Columbia Basin, would have got the lion's share of the Hanford production.

Which causes me to say that is pretty much true of the Connecticut Power & Light and the Yankee Atomic powerplant to which the Senator from Rhode Island has referred.

The editorial goes on to discuss the need to develop power in our section. It points out the benefit of such development to the entire country. It makes the argument, which I made, that here is a way to build up the whole country, and as we build up our economic expansion, we help create market and economic investment in other parts of the country as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD. It is an editorial which reflects the point of view of much of the press in my section of the country.

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

CUTTING OUR THROAT

The House vote eliminating a $95 million item to add nuclear power to the plutonium reactor at the Hanford project was an incredible piece of congressional stupidity. And the reasons given the opponents to sugar-coat their votes were as phony as a lead wedding ring.

The dirt-cheap proposal to add around 700,000 kilowatts to the Northwest power pool was not a party issue. It had been urged by the Eisenhower administration and it was urged by the Kennedy administration. The feasibility was assured by engineering consultants who had no ax to grind. Where else in the Northwest, which faces a power shortage in the latter 1960's, could that amount of power be obtained at so low a cost? Not in hydro, certainly.

The private utility and coal lobbies which fought the dual-purpose reactor found attentive ears among Congressmen who fear—or say they fear—that the Northwest will grab their industries. It was all right for the South to capture industries from the industrial East with the lure of tax rebates and low labor costs. But the Northwest must not take advantage of its resources. Beyond that, they did not take the trouble to find out that industries in the Northwest are new industries, locating where there are natural regional advantages.

The argument against admitting another agency to the Federal power field was meaningless. The Atomic Energy Commission has overall supervision at Hanford, but General Electric Co. would have built and operated the power reactor, and the Federal Bonneville Power Administration would have marketed the excess not needed to get the Hanford project off the backs of Northwest consumers. And private utilities, now buying a major portion of Federal power in the Columbia Basin, would have got the lion's share of the Hanford production.

It will be particularly damaging to the Northwest and to the Nation's defense strength if the Hanford power reactor, capable of producing as much as a major Columbia Dam, has been killed at this time. Its energy could be put on the line in about 3 years to fill the gap before John Day Dam comes into production in 1968.

Both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations had pinned their hopes of avoiding a Northwest shortage and stimulating the economy of the Northwest on two prospects: Hanford, and the treaty with Canada, But the treaty has run into a political battle between the province of British Columbia and the Federal Government at Ottawa. It has not been ratified, and it may not be. The United States cannot even start on Libby Dam on the border. They go up to 2 million kilowatts for the Northwest in the next decade. Now, if the Hanford project is in the ashcan, will the House of Representatives give the Northwest hydro projects to make up the deficit?

The House vote was to continue to waste the heat of the plutonium reactor into the Columbia River, rather than use it for electricity at a repayable cost lower than hydro. The project was sacrificed on the altar of obstructionism and selfish regionalism. The Republican Policy Committee which led the attack was politically befuddled. It will be too late to reconsider during the congressional and presidential elections from 1964 to 1968—if the Northwest economy is harmed by a shortage of power and there are brownouts and rationing.

There is a prospect that the Senate will vote to include the Hanford reactor in the AEC program, and that enough support can be rallied among the 120 nonvoting Members of the House to restore the item on the basis of a conference agreement. Perhaps this can be done, but not unless the political and business leaders of the Pacific Northwest take more interest in the project than they have to date, and go to bat behind the Kennedy administration.

This is a fight which calls for a merging of forces. Frankly, the Oregonian, which has urged construction of the dual purpose reactor for several years, is disgusted with the apathetic attitude of Northwest civic and business leaders who have not taken the trouble to learn the facts and who have been misled by false propaganda about private enterprise. Let's get to work.

Mr. MORSE. I am certain, that in supporting this section of the pending bill, I am supporting a project which is not only in the interest of the Pacific Northwest, but in the interest of giving the entire country some guarantee of a needed energy supply in the immediate future.

Who among us really knows what our contest with the Russians is going to be in the next 10 years? We had better see to it that, from the standpoint of our national defense, we do not this afternoon throw away an opportunity to provide a needed supply of power that will help meet the threat of the rise of Russian industrialization.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I urge support of the majority of the committee.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I commend the able senior Senator from Oregon for his very fine statement. He has supported this project from its inception. As a matter of fact, I believe the head of the General Electric Co., Mr. Cordiner, first advocated it in 1953. I commend the Senator for his statement this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. I am simply following the leadership of the two Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I join my colleague in commending the Senator for his very fine presentation. I am not a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, nor do I know very much about the technical aspects of the problem. It is my understanding, from having discussed the problems with Senators who have gone into this at great length—it happens that my colleague [Mr. JACKSON] is a member of the committee, but the facts would be the same whether or not that were true or whether or not the project were in the Pacific Northwest—that one of the principal justifications for the project is that it would provide some experience in the field and would be pretty much a large pilot plant operation.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. It would be the largest producer of electric power from atomic energy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would help us to advance technologically in this field. We are going to build the reactor, anyway. For this amount of money we shall be able to find out things usable all over the United States for peaceful development of atomic energy.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know I have supported appropriations of many millions of dollars, even more than the amount involved for this particular project, no matter where the operation was to be located or whether it was to be provided by private industry, to experiment and to learn and to get to know how to use atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is completely correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is only one facet of the problem. In many cases there has been no particular return, except what we have learned. Now we shall not only learn something but also we shall receive a return in dollars and cents for the Treasury while we are learning.

I hope Senators will read the report. The report says, in part:

Although the principal justifications for the addition of electrical generating facilities relate to the economic benefits and benefits concerning national defense and international prestige, technical benefits will also accrue.

One of the main items is know-how.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

VISIT TO SENATE BY LEBANESE PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure I invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that we are honored by a visit of six very distinguished visitors from the country of Lebanon, together with their Ambassador. Our distinguished visitors are Mahmoud Amar, Hazem El-Kadri, Edouard Honein, Habib Mutran, Abdu Saab, and Fedellah Talhouk; and they are accompanied by the Honorable Nadim Dimechkié, the Ambassador of Lebanon.

Mr. President, Lebanon has been one of the stanchest friends of freedom and independence, and has been a very great friend of this country for many years. Several hundred thousand people of our country derive their nationality from and are descendants of citizens of Lebanon.

Mr. President, we have enjoyed a fine luncheon with these gentlemen, who are on a tour, having already visited in the Far East. They will visit many fellow countrymen of theirs who live in our country during the coming days.

I hope Members of the Senate will be able to greet these gentlemen, and I know I speak for the Senate in extending to them a warm welcome and telling them we are delighted to have them. We hope they will have a successful and pleasant visit in our country.

I am sure that as a result of their visit there will be much closer relations and greater understanding between our two countries.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in welcoming our distinguished visitors from Lebanon. I assure them we are happy to have this opportunity to see them and to have them visit us in the Senate. I have visited in Lebanon on several occasions and have been cordially received. We are glad that in some small measure we can return the hospitality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). On behalf of the Senate, the Chair extends a hearty welcome to our visitors of the Lebanese parliamentary delegation and their Ambassador.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 17, 1961, pp. 12766–12768, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7444, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
July 18, 1961.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 19, 22, 35, and 38 to the bill (H.R. 7444) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by the Senate insert the following: "*Provided further*, That $10,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for assistance under section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, in addition to amounts normally expended for commodity procurement under that section, $2,500,000 of which may be distributed to provide special assistance to needy schools which because of poor local economic conditions (1) have not been operating a school lunch program or (2) have been serving free or at substantially reduced prices at least 20 percent of the lunches to the children."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure "15" contained in said amendment insert the figure "10".

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 17 and 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a comparative table showing appropriations for 1961, and amounts and estimates recommended in the bill for 1962.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD,

Comparative table of appropriations for 1961 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1962

TITLE I—REGULAR ACTIVITIES

Item	Appropriations, 1961	Budget estimates, 1962 (revised)	Amount recommended in House bill, 1962	Amount recommended in Senate bill, 1962	Conference allowance, 1962
Agricultural Research Service:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Research	[1] $71,233,000	$77,174,000	$76,558,000	$78,015,500	$77,311,000
Plant and animal disease and pest control	53,970,000	55,390,000	55,165,000	55,540,000	55,352,500
Pest inspection	23,126,000	24,216,000	24,216,000	24,216,000	24,216,000
Total	148,329,000	156,780,000	155,939,000	157,771,500	156,879,500
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	15,131,000	5,265,000	5,265,000	5,265,000	5,265,000
Construction of facilities	7,750,000	550,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
State experiment stations: Payments to States and Puerto Rico	32,553,000	34,553,000	34,553,000	36,553,000	35,553,000
Penalty mail	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Total	32,803,000	34,803,000	34,803,000	36,803,000	35,803,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	204,013,000	197,398,000	196,807,000	200,639,500	198,747,500
Extension Service:					
Payments to States and Puerto Rico	56,578,000	58,790,000	58,790,000	59,790,000	59,590,000
Retirement costs for extension agents	5,961,000	6,260,000	6,260,000	6,260,000	6,260,000
Penalty mail	2,490,000	2,490,000	2,490,000	2,490,000	2,490,000
Federal Extension Service	2,402,000	2,500,000	2,452,000	2,477,000	2,464,500
Total, Extension Service	67,431,000	70,040,000	69,992,000	71,017,000	70,804,500
Farmer Cooperative Service	657,000	657,000	657,000	657,000	657,000
Soil Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	88,604,000	89,725,000	89,725,000	89,725,000	89,725,000
Watershed protection	36,725,000	53,787,000	53,787,000	53,787,000	53,787,000
Flood prevention	19,570,000	19,463,000	25,000,000	22,231,500	25,000,000
Great Plains conservation program	10,168,000	10,168,000	10,168,000	10,168,000	10,168,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service	155,067,000	173,143,000	178,680,000	175,911,500	178,680,000
Economic Research Service	[1] 9,049,000	9,533,000	9,049,000	9,364,000	9,360,000
Statistical Reporting Service	[1] 8,188,000	8,722,000	8,688,000	8,978,000	8,748,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing research and service:					
Marketing research	[1] 4,217,200	4,515,000	4,515,000	4,870,000	4,740,000
Marketing service	29,694,900	[2] 33,295,000	[2] 33,187,000	[2] 33,370,000	[2] 33,299,500
Total	33,912,100	37,810,000	37,702,000	38,165,000	38,039,500
Payments to States and possessions	1,195,000	1,195,000	1,400,000	1,325,000	1,325,000
School lunch program	[3] 110,000,000	[3] 120,000,000	[3] 125,000,000	[3] 125,000,000	[3] 125,000,000
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	145,107,100	159,005,000	164,102,000	164,565,000	164,364,500
Foreign Agricultural Service:					
Salaries and expenses	[1] [4] 15,275,300	[4] 12,760,000	[4] 12,457,000	[4] 12,457,000	[4] 12,457,000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	3,465,200	3,444,000	3,444,000	3,444,000	3,444,000
Total, Foreign Agricultural Service	18,740,500	16,204,000	15,901,000	15,901,000	15,901,000
Commodity Exchange Authority	990,000	1,007,000	1,000,000	1,007,000	1,007,000
Commodity Stabilization Service:					
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	43,598,000	44,833,000	44,098,000	44,098,000	44,098,000
Sugar Act program	74,500,000	81,314,000	78,000,000	78,000,000	78,000,000
Agricultural conservation program	242,000,000	238,000,000	238,000,000	238,000,000	238,000,000
Special agricultural conservation program	----------	20,500,000	15,000,000	18,500,000	18,500,000
Conservation reserve program	330,000,000	330,000,000	300,000,000	312,000,000	312,000,000
Total, Commodity Stabilization Service	690,098,000	714,647,000	675,098,000	690,598,000	690,598,000
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Operating and administrative expenses	6,561,000	6,561,000	6,561,000	6,561,000	6,561,000
Rural Electrification Administration: Salaries and expenses	10,024,000	10,024,000	10,024,000	10,024,000	10,024,000
Farmers Home Administration: Salaries and expenses	33,017,000	33,317,000	33,017,000	33,167,000	33,017,000
Office of General Counsel	3,625,000	3,650,000	3,650,000	3,650,000	3,650,000
Office of Secretary	3,080,500	3,130,000	3,096,000	3,103,500	3,096,000
Office of Information	1,548,000	1,610,000	1,584,000	1,597,000	1,590,500
Centennial observance of agriculture	----------	130,000	----------	100,000	100,000
Library	951,000	1,057,000	1,000,000	1,057,000	1,028,500
Total, regular activities	1,358,147,100	1,409,835,000	1,378,906,000	1,397,897,500	1,397,934,500

TITLE II—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Public Law 480:					
Sales for foreign currencies	($1,353,000,000)	$1,310,500,000	$1,250,451,000	$1,250,451,000	$1,250,451,000
Emergency famine relief	(255,685,000)	140,868,000	140,868,000	140,868,000	140,868,000
Long-term supply contracts	----------	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
Total, Public Law 480	(1,608,685,000)	1,464,368,000	1,404,319,000	1,404,319,000	1,404,319,000
International Wheat Agreement	(88,790,000	70,681,000	70,681,000	70,681,000	70,681,000
Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile	(163,163,000)	174,800,000	125,000,000	125,000,000	125,000,000
Total, foreign assistance programs	[5] (1,860,638,000)	[5] 1,709,849,000	[5] 1,600,000,000	[5] 1,600,000,000	[5] 1,600,000,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative table of appropriations for 1961 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1962—Continued

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

Item	Appropriations, 1961	Budget estimates, 1962 (revised)	Amount recommended in House bill, 1962	Amount recommended in Senate bill, 1962	Conference allowance 1962
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Administrative and operating expenses	($2,630,000)	($2,830,000)	($2,830,000)	($2,830,000)	($2,830,000)
Commodity Credit Corporation:					
Restoration of capital impairment (price support and related operations)	1,226,500,000	1,017,610,000	1,017,610,000	1,017,610,000	1,017,610,000
Reimbursements of prior year expenditures for foreign assistance and other special activities:					
Public Law 480:	(1960 costs)	(1961 costs)	(1961 costs)	(1961 costs)	(1961 costs)
Sales for foreign currencies	881,000,000	1,353,000,000	1,353,000,000	1,353,000,000	1,353,000,000
Emergency famine relief	107,094,000	255,685,000	255,685,000	255,685,000	255,685,000
Total, Public Law 480	988,094,000	1,608,685,000	1,608,685,000	1,608,685,000	1,608,685,000
International Wheat Agreement	32,572,000	88,790,000	88,790,000	88,790,000	88,790,000
Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile	422,950,000	163,163,000	163,163,000	163,163,000	163,163,000
Grain for migratory waterfowl	18,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
Grading and classing activities		1,264,000	1,264,000	1,264,000	1,264,000
Total, reimbursements	1,443,634,000	1,861,915,000	1,861,915,000	1,861,915,000	1,861,915,000
Reimbursement for special milk program		90,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000
Administrative expense limitation	(45,726,000)	(48,316,000)	(47,500,000)	(47,916,000)	(47,916,000)
Total, corporations	2,670,134,000	2,969,525,000	2,969,525,000	2,969,525,000	2,969,525,000

TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES

Farm Credit Administration: Administrative expense limitation	($2,589,000)	($2,590,000)	($2,590,000)	($2,590,000)	($2,590,000)
Department of Interior: Grain for migratory waterfowl	(7)	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
Total, related agencies		35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Advance appropriations (fiscal year 1962):					
Title I—Regular activities	$1,358,147,100	$1,409,835,000	$1,378,906,000	$1,397,822,500	$1,397,934,500
Title II—Foreign assistance programs (to put on pay-as-you-go basis)		1,709,849,000	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000
Title IV—Related agencies		35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
Total	1,358,147,100	3,119,719,000	2,978,941,000	2,997,857,500	2,997,969,500
Restoration of CCC funds expended for prior year operations:					
Title III:					
Price support program	1,226,500,000 (1959 costs)	1,017,610,000 (1960 costs)	1,017,610,000	1,017,610,000	1,017,610,000
Foreign assistance and other programs financed by CCC at direction of Congress	1,443,634,000 (1960 costs)	1,951,915,000 (1961 costs)	1,951,915,000	1,951,915,000	1,951,915,000
Total	2,670,134,000	2,969,525,000	2,969,525,000	2,969,525,000	2,969,525,000
Total in bill	4,028,281,100	6,089,244,000	5,948,466,000	5,967,457,500	5,967,494,500

[1] Adjusted for comparability to reflect changes in organization and appropriation structure.

[2] Includes $2,813,000 for grading and classing activities formerly financed through Commodity Credit Corporation. $1,264,000 provided for fiscal year 1961 as reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation under title III of this bill.

[3] In addition, transfers of $45,000,000 from sec. 32 funds provided.

[4] In addition, transfers of $3,117,000 from sec. 32 funds provided.

[5] Amounts carried for comparative purposes only. Funds provided under title III for reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation.

[6] These funds for fiscal year 1962, through June 30, 1962, carried for first time as advance appropriations.

[7] $13,000 provided for fiscal year 1961 as reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation under title III of this bill.

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS

Item	Authorizations, 1961	Budget estimates, 1962	Increase or decrease
Agricultural Marketing Service:			
Removal of surplus agricultural commodites (sec. 32)	$319,960,723	$337,500,000	+$17,539,277
Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act fund	670,000	670,000	
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	320,630,723	338,170,000	+17,539,277
Commodity Stabilization Service: National Wool Act	67,189,909	59,000,000	−8,189,909
Total, permanent appropriations	387,820,632	397,170,000	+9,349,368

NOTE.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January 1961 budget document for 1962. Subject to further revision.

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

Item	Authorizations, 1961	Budget estimates, 1962	Amount recommended in House bill, 1962	Amount recommended in Senate bill, 1962	Conference allowance 1962
Rural Electrification Administration:					
Electrification loans:					
Direct authorization	$110,000,000	$195,000,000	$125,000,000	$195,000,000	$175,000,000
Contingency authorization	60,000,000		70,000,000	50,000,000	70,000,000
Total	170,000,000	195,000,000	195,000,000	245,000,000	245,000,000
Telephone loans:					
Direct authorization	80,000,000	150,000,000	120,000,000	150,000,000	132,500,000
Contingency authorization	60,000,000		30,000,000	12,500,000	30,000,000
Total	140,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	162,500,000	162,500,000
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	310,000,000	345,000,000	345,000,000	407,500,000	407,500,000

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS—Continued

Item	Authorizations, 1961	Budget estimates, 1962	Amount recommended in House bill, 1962	Amount recommended in Senate bill, 1962	Conference allowance 1962
Farmers Home Administration:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct authorization	$26,900,000	$31,900,000	$31,900,000	$40,000,000	$40,000,000
Contingency authorization	5,000,000				
Total	31,900,000	31,900,000	31,900,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Farm operating loans:					
Direct authorization	197,100,000	232,100,000	225,000,000	237,500,000	237,500,000
Contingency authorization	35,000,000		25,000,000	37,500,000	37,500,000
Total	232,100,000	232,100,000	250,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000
Soil and water conservation loans (direct authorization)	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Total, Farmers Home Administration	267,000,000	267,000,000	284,900,000	318,000,000	318,000,000
Total, loan authorizations	577,000,000	612,000,000	629,900,000	725,500,000	725,500,000

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. If I understand correctly, the agricultural appropriation bill is now on the way to the White House.

Mr. RUSSELL. This completes legislative action on it.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senate salutes our gallant friend from Georgia. This is the first appropriation bill which is on its way to the White House in this session of Congress. We should have completed action on appropriation legislation before the end of the last fiscal year. We have not done so. I wish to say to the able Senator from Georgia: Congratulations. The logjam is broken. Maybe if we can keep it up we will be able to get out of here and go home.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. I hope that this will be the first of a number of final actions on the supply bills for the operation of the Government.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2043) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the issue before the Senate has revolved around project 62-a-6 in the bill. So that the issue may be clear cut, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. The Senator from Rhode Island, who is in charge of the bill, is thoroughly familiar with the amendment. It would merely strike this particular item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike the figure "$226,440,000" and substitute the following: "$131,440,000".

Page 2, lines 12 to 14, inclusive, it is proposed to strike out "Project 62-a-6, electric energy generating facilities for the new production reactor, Hanford, Washington, $95,000,000."

Beginning page 11, line 22 and continuing to page 12, line 12, inclusive, being section 110, it is proposed to strike out:

SEC. 110. DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY.—(a) Electric energy produced during the operating life of the electric generating facilities constructed under section 101(a) shall be delivered by the Commission at the site of said generating facilities to, and pursuant to agreement with the Secretary of Interior who shall transmit and dispose of such energy under the terms prescribed by section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

(b) Allocation of costs to the production of such electric energy shall be made jointly by the Commission and the Secretary of the Interior, and, in the event of disagreement, shall be made by the President. Costs so allocated shall be returned to the Treasury from revenue derived by the Secretary from the disposition of electric energy marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I think it is abundantly clear, from the presentation made today by those in charge of the bill, that project 62-a-6 in the bill before the Senate today is a project not for the scientific advancement of atomic energy nor for the development of scientific knowledge. It is purely and simply a measure for the production of commercial electricity in the Pacific Northwest.

There has been not one argument advanced by the Senator from Rhode Island or by the Senator from Washington that the operation of this electrical facility which, in and of itself, will cost over $120 million, will contribute a single provable benefit to the advancement of the art of atomic energy or to the art of the production of power. The argument has been based solely on the production of commercial power by the Atomic Energy Commission.

I wish to make my position perfectly clear. I have supported power projects in the Pacific Northwest and in other places. I am not opposed to such projects when they are the proper province of the Government or its properly constituted agencies. I have supported power projects developed and operated by the Department of the Interior under a proper approach.

I have supported other Federal power projects when I have thought such projects were within the proper province of the Government. But now we are presented with an innovation in Government policy. While the proposal is not the first one that has been made, we hear proposed for the first time that the Atomic Energy Commission, which is a scientific investigating commission and a scientific commission for the development of the art of atomic energy, enter into the commercial production of power. I say that such action would be wrong. It would be contrary to the purpose of the act. It would be contrary to the spirit that created the Atomic Energy Commission.

If we wish to produce electric power using atomic energy as heat, let us face the issue, as we have in respect to other projects under the Department of the Interior or other agencies, and create a commercial operating agency for the production of such heat.

Again I emphasize that no serious attempt, either in the committee or in the Senate, has been made to maintain that the operation of the proposed electrical facility attached to the plutonium plant will, in any material or substantial way, advance the production of power using atomic heat. Why? Because reactor technology is known. It has been proven. Nothing material would be added to the known technology of reactors except as we learn more about a Ford automobile every day by driving it. We learn a little about it. Perhaps it may have a wobbly back wheel. We learn about it and fix it. But nothing has been advanced about the proposed reactor that is not already proven, and certainly nothing has been advanced in respect to the generating facilities that are supposed to be added to the reactor.

Therefore the operation is purely one for the commercial sale of power. It would violate the principles of the Atomic Energy Act. I believe it is wrong to approach the question in this way. I think the proposal would not contribute anything to the advancement of the atomic art. On the contrary, it would create inexcusably expensive electricity in the area in which its installation is proposed. Needed electricity could be produced by other means at a lesser cost.

We have heard a great deal about the cost per kilowatt-hour of the electricity proposed to be generated by the reactor.

A short while ago we discussed the fact that the reactor would produce low-pressure steam. The Senator from Rhode Island read a list of companies that are still using low-pressure steam. Those companies are still using the tag end of the old machinery which in most cases they have had. For several years all new installations in this country have been built otherwise. Their operators know that efficient plants are operated on high-pressure steam, steam having pressure in the neighborhood of thousands of pounds per square inch. The steam generated in the proposed plant would have a pressure of at best 250 pounds a square inch, which, from a pressure standpoint, would make the plant as antiquated as the model T Ford.

We have talked about the cost of the proposed electricity. Depending entirely upon which set of figures is used and how much is charged for the plutonium which is produced, those who cite the figures can go as far as they want in order to write the figure down so that the electricity appears not to cost anything. They can do so merely by charging more money for the plutonium. In other words, the books could be manipulated so that the cost of the proposed electricity would appear to be low. But the fact is that those who use such figures in arriving at the cost of the electricity have not included in the capital investment many items that must go into the computation. They have not included the cost of plutonium lost. Those who compile such figures have not included the cost of the convertibility feature, which is $25 million. They have not included the cost of actually operating a plutonium facility that would create the heat. One would have to include the cost of boilers that produce heat in a steamplant, or many of the features in a waterpower plant. If all realistic costs were included, the cost per kilowatt-hour of the electricity sought to be generated by the proposed project would be substantially more than the high costs that were admitted in the testimony.

Over the years it is very likely that if a realistic cost accounting yardstick were applied to the cost of electricity, one would find that if he built a steamplant in the Hanford area to produce the same amount of electricity as is proposed, using coal in the area, to say nothing of the waterpower, in the long run, over the reasonable anticipated life of the plant, it would be paid for from the savings over and above what the proposed program would cost, as computed under an unrealistic accounting system.

I wish to make clear at this time that the remaining provisions of the bill have the unanimous approval of all members of the Joint Committee, so far as I know. There is no contest on the part of the members with the exception of the one provision to which I refer. Some of us have opposed it from the start.

Three years ago some of us opposed as vigorously as we could the inclusion of the first $25 million for the convertibility feature in the proposed reactor. We said before, and we repeat now, that the project is uneconomic, unwise, and would put the Atomic Energy Commission into the power-producing business. We make that statement now; we made it before.

We have considered this subject carefully. There is an honest difference of opinion on the part of Members. But I submit that the question is how we look at the figures and calculate the costs.

Who will operate the proposed project? We have heard that General Electric would operate it. Would General Electric operate the project? General Electric will not operate the plant on the basis outlined by its proposers. I wish to read a portion of a letter from General Electric on this subject. Then, in order that I may not be accused of merely taking a paragraph out of context, I shall ask to have the entire letter printed in the RECORD. The letter is signed by Mr. W. E. Johnson, general manager of General Electric, dated Richland, Wash., February 17, 1961. One who reads Mr. Johnson's letter will find that he wanders all around Robin Hood's barn, but I think he is clearly saying, "We do not want any part of the proposed operation. We do not want any part of the responsibility of this operation. But if you, the Commission, make us take it, we, as general contractors at Hanford, will have to take it. But we will only take it within certain limitations." This is what Mr. Johnson said:

The company would not wish to undertake (or, having undertaken, would not wish to continue beyond a reasonable transition period) operation of electrical facilities involving a commitment to generate at capacity or energy levels significantly above the Hanford electrical load.

So that no one will be able to say that I am quoting out of context, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter of Mr. Johnson of the General Electric Co. be printed in the RECORD at this point. It is printed at pages 16 and 17 of the hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the subject "Power Conversion Studies. Hanford New Production Reactor." It is a committee print.

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

GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.,
Richland, Wash., February 17, 1961.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Hanford Operations Office,
Richland, Wash.
(Attention of Mr. J. E. Travis, Manager).

GENTLEMEN: We have received an oral inquiry from the Commission asking whether the General Electric Co. would agree to extend its operation of the new production reactor to include operation of an electric generating plant provided the power production were limited to the approximate requirements of the Hanford operation.

As early correspondence discloses, electric power generation is not a normal business for the General Electric Co., nor one in which it would engage except under special circumstances. However, it is apparent that the addition of electric generating capability to the new production reactor with the capacity of such generating station approximately equal to the estimated requirements of the Hanford plant, plus the necessary reserve capability to provide interchange energy in return for backup, would create a special situation in which it may be appropriate for the company to perform the operating function as part of its general operating responsibilities at the Hanford plant. In view of these circumstances, and in response to your request, the company would agree to the Commission including operation of the generating station within the scope of work of the operating contract.

This statement of intent on the part of the company is premised on the following understanding which may have to be more precisely defined as this situation is developed:

1. The commitment presently being made is not in the nature of a contractual commitment, but is rather a good-faith expression of intent and is naturally subject to continuity of some contractual arrangement between the Commission and the company that is mutually satisfactory. In the event, however, that a satisfactory contract arrangement is not forthcoming, the company would fully cooperate with the Commission in transferring its responsibilities to any successor contractor.

2. The company would not wish to undertake (or, having undertaken, would not wish to continue beyond a reasonable transition period) operation of electrical facilities involving a commitment to generate at capacity or energy levels significantly above the Hanford electrical load.

3. The company would not propose to be involved directly, except to assist the Atomic Energy Commission, with any regulatory agencies concerned with power generation or distribution and would expect that any such arrangements, hearings, or other matters would be handled directly by the Commission.

4. The company would deliver power only to the Atomic Energy Commission for disposition by that agency. Contractual arrangements with the Bonneville Power Administration or with any other entity for wheeling of power, reserves, power interchange, transmission to or off the project, or for any other purposes directly related to utilization of the electric power would be handled by the Commission. However, the company would participate in cooperative scheduling at the operating level.

5. The company would be willing to cooperate, under AEC sponsorship, with public and/or private utilities in providing training and experience to selected personnel of such utilities in operating techniques pertaining to the reactor and generating station. Such personnel would necessarily be under control of the company for safety reasons.

Very truly yours,

W. E. JOHNSON,
General Manager.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, what does that mean? It means that the General Electric Co. says, "If we have to operate it, we would want only to be compelled to operate it for just as much capacity as is needed by the Hanford plant, and no more. We do not want to have to undertake and operate this plant at its rated capacity. We do not want any part of it." That is my interpretation of what the letter says. I believe any objective reading of the letter will show that that is the situation.

Several of us on the committee on both sides of the Capitol believe that this would be uneconomical expenditure of $95 million, and we have filed separate views in connection with the report on the bill. Those views are found in the report. We join in the committee report on all other features of the bill

with the exception of this one item. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the part of the report entitled "Separate Statement," beginning at page 25 of the committee report.

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

SEPARATE STATEMENT ON HANFORD REACTOR POWER FACILITIES, H.R. 7576, SECTIONS 101 (a) AND 110

We are opposed to the authorization of project 62-a-6, which would authorize $95 million for the installation of power generating facilities in the new production reactor at Hanford, Wash.

We believe that there are a number of compelling reasons why this project should not be authorized. Among them are:

1. It would not advance nuclear power technology.

2. It would be contrary to the spirit, intent, and specific language of section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

3. It would violate assurances given to Congress in 1958 when the new production reactor was authorized.

4. It would not, as is alleged, aid national defense.

5. It is not needed to meet the power requirements of the Pacific Northwest.

6. It would be used to attract industry from other regions.

7. It would also be used to justify the construction of transmission lines leading to a gigantic Federal electric power grid.

8. It would not produce power economically.

9. It would not enhance international prestige.

10. It would constitute a precedent for the further encroachment of Government in private business.

Evidence in support of these points is presented herewith:

1. The project would not advance nuclear power technology. Chairman Seaborg of the Atomic Energy Commission said in the hearings on the bill that the project "is not being justified primarily" on the basis that it would advance nuclear technology. It would only have "limited benefits to nuclear power technology * * *," he said.

Congress consistently has agreed that the proper role of the Atomic Energy Commission in the development of nuclear power should be research and development in processes that might ultimately lead to economic and efficient nuclear power. The expenditure of the proposed $95 million would be far more effective in advancing the art of nuclear power if applied to the development of new techniques and processes than to the addition of 800,000 kilowatts of generating capacity at the Hanford reactor which will contribute little to the goal of competitive nuclear power. In fact, whatever nuclear technology is obtainable from the reactor will be obtained whether or not electrical generating facilities are installed since, at least for the dual-purpose period, the reactor will be operated in the same manner whether or not electrical facilities are added.

2. The project raises important questions of law and policy as to the proper role of the Atomic Energy Commission, which must be resolved by the Congress. Section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 states that "Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Commission to engage in the sale or distribution of energy for commercial use except such energy as may be produced by the Commission incident to the operation of research and development facilities of the Commission, or of production facilities of the Commission."

In disposing of a block of power of some 800,000 kilowatts, enough to supply the needs of a city of over 1 million people, the Commission can hardly be considered to be doing anything else but selling "energy for commercial use." Furthermore, the proposed power facilities are not "incident to the operation of research and development facilities," nor can they be considered as incident to "the operation of * * * production facilities," since it is planned to operate the reactor for 25 years only for power purposes.

The proposed bill covers the authority of the Atomic Energy Commission to generate electrical energy in the following way:

"SEC. 110. Disposition of Electric Energy.

"(a) Electric energy produced during the operating life of the electric generating facilities constructed under section 101(a) shall be delivered by the Commission at the site of said generating facilities to, and pursuant to agreement with, the Secretary of the Interior who shall transmit and dispose of such energy under the terms prescribed by section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended."

By referring to "* * * during the operating life * * *" the bill glosses over the question of whether or not the AEC has the authority to operate facilities primarily for the generation of electrical energy.

During the debate in the Senate on the Atomic Energy Act, July 16, 1954, Senator HICKENLOOPER stated:

"So far as the public power problem is concerned, it is not even touched in the bill; in the bill there is no provision for the development by the Commission of public power. The only place in the bill where that subject is touched is in the section that provides that if, in connection with research and development, the Atomic Energy Commission produces some incidental power—power which is not primary in its operations—and if the Commission has an opportunity to sell the power, it may sell a few kilowatts which otherwise might be wasted.

"The question of the direct production of competitive power by the Atomic Energy Commission is not raised in this measure, and it is not authorized. If the Congress ever wishes to authorize it, now or at any time in the future, that question can be taken up at the proper time."

The "proper time" referred to by Senator HICKENLOOPER for the consideration of this issue by the Congress is the present, since the proposed facilities are primarily for the generation of electrical energy and the economic study being used to justify the project is based on an operating period of 25 years for the production of electrical energy only.

It is not being argued that the generation of such energy would be illegal since this bill is intended to provide adequate authorization. We do contend, however, that the Congress must squarely face up to the issue of whether the AEC is to take its place alongside the Department of Interior and TVA as a major producer of Government-generated electrical power. This is a crucial question of national policy which must be debated and resolved by this Congress.

3. The power marketing arrangements are contrary to assurances given to Congress when the new production reactor was authorized in 1958. In 1958 during congressional debate on the legislation authorizing the NPR, sponsors of the project unequivocally stated that if electric generating facilities were added to the reactor at some future time the power produced would not and should not be subject to a preference clause. Senator ANDERSON, then Chairman of the Joint Committee, said in the Senate:

"I am happy to note for the record that, so far as I am concerned, when that matter comes to Congress, and I am still a Member of it, I hope we put such restrictions on the power that it will not become public power in the ordinary sense of being subject to a preference clause for the sale of power to cooperatives. It need not be and it should not be. However, in the meantime, the Government should not deprive itself of the tremendous economic advantages of building the convertible plant, which has been recommended by everyone who has studied the subject." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 11, p. 13805.)

Senator PASTORE, also a member of the Joint Committee, assured the Senate this power would not go into the grids of either public or privately owned utilities, saying:

"Therefore, Mr. President, if we invest the additional $25 million, will power which will go into the grid of either private or public utilities in that area be produced? Of course not. Instead, we shall produce only 300 megawatts of electric power which is needed very badly at Hanford; and thus we shall have met our responsibility, because power from auxiliary sources will still be needed if the reactors break down."

Keep in mind that the economic study upon which the requested authorization is being proposed is based upon installing approximately 800,000 kilowatts of generating capacity compared to a current requirement for the Hanford site of approximately 300,000 kilowatts growing to an estimated requirement of approximately 400,000 kilowatts in the next several years.

Senator JACKSON, another Joint Committee member, was equally assuring:

"That is exactly the point. The power would be used at the Hanford reservation. There is no provision in the bill for the sale of power to a private or public utility." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 11, p. 13805.)

In the light of this proposed legislation, the above statements are a record of broken assurances. We are concerned that the assurances given this year relative to this legislation will meet with the same fate. Our concern is based on the following grounds:

(a) Section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, legally requires that initial preference for the energy shall be given to public bodies. Section 110(a) of this bill clearly states that energy produced during the operating life of these electric generating facilities shall be disposed of under the terms prescribed by section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. Section 44 provides a standard preference clause governing the disposition of electric energy produced by the AEC. It states that "preference and priority shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives or to privately owned utilities providing electric utility services to high-cost areas not being served by public bodies or cooperatives."

A careful analysis of section 44 clearly establishes that there is no legal guarantee that electric energy produced at the Hanford plant will be marketed to private utilities. Testimony at the hearings revealed that there were no "high-cost areas not being served by public bodies or cooperatives" in the Pacific Northwest. Thus, we are left with the normal preference clause under section 44. It is true that the Bonneville Power Administrator has stated that the needs of preference customers could be met from hydropower in the Northwest, but the fact remains that section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act requires that preference be given to public and cooperatively owned bodies. There is thus no legal assurance that private utilities will benefit from the introduction of NPR power. Moreover, there is nothing to indicate that the assurances given this year on the marketing of the Hanford power are any more reliable than the assurances which were given in 1958.

(b) Neither section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act nor this majority report gives any clear instructions as to the requirement for a pullback provision. Aside from the problems of the initial preference requirement, one must consider a second aspect of the

preference problem; namely, the so-called pullback provisions usually found in power marketing acts. The Bonneville Power Administrator, Mr. Luce, testified that he would sell power from the Hanford project under the provisions of the Bonneville Project Act of 1937 unless specifically instructed otherwise. At this point, three things must be noted:

1. Section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 is silent on the question of pullback;

2. The Bonneville Project Act (16 U.S.C.A. 832 d.) requires a 5-year pullback provision; and

3. Nowhere in the committee majority report on this bill does the committee express its intent that energy shall be sold to nonpreferred customers on a 10-year contractual basis.

Thus, lacking specific instructions under section 44 as to the requirement for a pullback provision, the Bonneville Power Administrator, by his own testimony, has indicated that he will turn to the Bonneville Project Act for guidance and the Bonneville Act requires a 5-year pullback provision. He has not been instructed to do otherwise by the committee under the terms of this majority report. The report states only that "* * * it is the committee's understanding and expectation that so long as Bonneville can foresee that the needs of its preferred customers could be met from hydropower, it will have the authority to market the Hanford power to nonpreferred customers under firm contracts of approximately a 10-year period."

Thus, there is no firm assurance that private utilities will receive the benefits of firm 10-year contracts for electric power from the NPR. Moreover, even if the BPA Administrator enters into 10-year contracts with nonpreferred customers for the purchase of some portion of the project power, this would represent a relatively short time in the overall life of the project. There are no assurances given as to how the energy will be distributed at the end of such 10-year contracts.

4. It would not, as is alleged, aid national defense. The majority report avers that the addition of electric generating facilities to the NPR would provide the United States with a great deal of flexibility in adjusting its operations to any future changes in the field of international agreements on nuclear weapons. The report states: "It would be relatively easy to convert back to production of weapons plutonium in the event the United States discovered that other nations in the agreement were not complying with the agreement."

At first glance, this might appear to be a reasonable and logical point and would appeal to some Members of Congress as a justification for authorizing this project. However, closer examination of the facts indicates that, rather than aiding in national defense, this project will stand as a major deterrent to an effective international agreement on nuclear weapons.

This Nation has long sought an effective international disarmament agreement as being in the best interests of the peoples of the world. This must continue to be a major goal of the United States. It should be kept in mind, however, that any party to such an international agreement whose interests are opposed to the United States rightly would insist that all U.S. weapons plutonium facilities be shut down and/or dismantled. Certainly the record is clear concerning the primary purpose for which the NPR facility was constructed. This is a point which the majority report has not recognized.

Thus, the addition of electric generating facilities to the NPR would not serve the purposes of national defense, as its mere existence could preclude a workable international arms agreement. Any insistence on the part of the United States that it be permitted to retain this reactor in operation to generate power after such an agreement has been consummated, with its weapons production capability available on short notice, would not go unnoticed in the eyes of the world. Our prestige as a peaceful-minded nation would be certain to suffer to some extent.

There is another point which invalidates this claim in the majority report. AEC Chairman Seaborg informed the Joint Committee that during the power-only phase the mode of operation of the converted NPR could rapidly be modified toward the production of weapons plutonium. It seems highly doubtful that any international agreement for effective arms control would permit the continued operation of such a reactor. As a proponent of strict controls, the United States would hardly want to argue in favor of such a significant avenue of evasion which could be used to advantage by the U.S.S.R.

Therefore it is quite possible that if the electrical plant is constructed and then we are required to shut the plant down to comply with an international arms control agreement, we would lose the value of our $95 million expenditures.

For these reasons, we believe authorization of the addition of electric generating facilities to the NPR could constitute another serious roadblock in the path of effective international arms control or disarmament and therefore, would adversely affect our national defense.

In addition, the bill under consideration places before the Congress the issue of who shall operate the facility if the electrical generating plant is added. The General Electric Co., who presently operates plutonium production reactors for the AEC at Hanford, Wash., in a letter dated February 17, 1961, to the AEC, stated the following:

"The company would not wish to undertake (or, having undertaken, would not wish to continue beyond a reasonable transition period) operation of electrical facilities involving a commitment to generate at capacity or energy levels significantly above the Hanford electrical load."

There is no doubt that these facilities will generate at energy levels greatly above the Hanford electrical load. Thus, the General Electric Co. will not operate the reactor and the issue of obtaining another operator for the operation of the plant is left unresolved. Accordingly, the selection of a new operator for the powerplant may disrupt the production of plutonium for national defense.

5. This project is not needed to meet the power requirements of the Pacific Northwest. The 1960 annual report of the BPA states: "For the first time in nearly 15 years, Bonneville Power Administration finds itself in a period of surplus power instead of power scarcity."

In addition, the report states that "these projects (projects resulting from the Columbia River Treaty) together with those existing or under construction assure the Pacific Northwest of power to meet the estimated normal firm power requirements of the region through 1970."

There is no imminent power shortage in the region. Utilities in the Northwest are building—or seeking authorization to build—hydroelectric plants which will meet the area's power demands for at least 10 years. This program of building to meet anticipated loads will certainly continue in the future. It is not necessary for the Federal Government to build a project with the highly questionable economics of the NPR since its power would merely replace or offset power from other sources.

The BPA Administrator argued during the hearings that NPR power would be needed to meet an area deficiency in 1965–66 in the event streamflows get below certain critical levels. He further stated that NPR power would permit the BPA to sell 400,000 kilowatts direct to industrial customers. Neither of these arguments has merit. In the event there is critically low water in 1965–66 the only utilities which might face a deficiency in power are private electric companies, since their customers are not protected either by preference clauses or contracts. These utilities are building new projects which will meet this anticipated deficiency. Further, there will in 1965–66, be surplus power in the east group of the Northwest Power Pool, which can be made available to west group utilities if it is needed.

The proposal for direct sale to industrial consumers is also of dubious merit. In the first place, if there were any real possibility of a power shortage, the BPA Administrator should reserve power for present utility customers rather than seek to sell power to as yet unknown industries. There are no present demands for industrial power of the magnitude described by the BPA Administrator.

Area power requirements will be met by new power projects already under construction or in the planning stage. These projects meet the test of economics and comprehensive development of our river resources. There is no need for addition of the highly subsidized NPR with its dubious economic justifications.

Certainly, if there were any real possibility of a power shortage in the Pacific Northwest in this period then BPA should never have offered for sale 150,000 kilowatts of firm energy in long-term contracts to industry customers last year. We believe the argument that the power from the NPR may be needed to meet the requirements of the area is not well founded and should be discarded as without merit.

6. It would be used to attract industry from other regions. On March 9, 1961, Charles F. Luce, the BPA Administrator, writing to Senator JACKSON in support of adding power facilities at the Hanford reactor, said approval of the addition of these power facilities will make "possible the early sale of an additional 400 megawatts of firm industrial power." There can be no doubt but that this power will be used to attract new industry to the Bonneville area.

This would be highly subsidized power. There is nothing in the bill or in the record of testimony in hearings regarding it to assure against the eventuality that many costs that are necessary for its production would be excluded in fixing rates. As a result, the Nation's taxpayers who will be contributing this subsidy would be helping one region, the Pacific Northwest, to attract new industry at the expense of other regions—in many instances their own regions. In addition, they would be subsidizing federally produced nuclear power that will be going into a system which already enjoys the benefit of large quantities of Federal hydroelectric power.

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, a cosigner of this report, pointed out to the House of Representatives on May 16, 1961, that the Congress had recently enacted the depressed areas bill, authorizing almost $400 million for loans and grants to revitalize the Nation's depressed areas. He went on to say that the aproval of the $95 million addition of electric generating facilities to NPR "would further aggravate the conditions we are trying to correct," and would be contrary to the best interests of all the American people.

Representative VAN ZANDT further pointed out that this project would have serious adverse effects on other natural resource industries. The addition of approximately 700,000 kilowatts of generating capacity to Hanford would be roughly equal to 2,319,000 tons of coal per year, if the same quantity of elec-

tricity were generated in a modern fossil-fuel steam plant. The impact on the Nation's economy can be indicated by expressing this quantity of coal in terms of man-days of employment for miners in this depressed industry, or in terms of railroad coal cars necessary to transport this vital national resource. An average of 12.12 tons of coal can be mined per man per day, thus meaning that 191,360 man-days of gainful employment could result from generating 700,000 kilowatts of electric power, using a modern coal-fired steamplant. At the present time, the Nation's railroad coal cars haul an average of 61.17 tons of bituminous coal per car. This means that it would require 37,911 coal cars to haul this fuel from mine to point of utilization. Both these factors would have beneficial effects on the national economy.

Therefore, it seems highly illogical to spend $95 million to subsidize electricity to lure potential industry away from depressed areas when at the same time Congress has provided hundreds of millions of dollars in loans and grants to stimulate development of industry in those very same depressed areas. It seems equally illogical to spend this amount of money to add facilities which would further postpone the use of coal-fired stations to firm up much of the Pacific Northwest's nonfirm hydropower.

7. The project would be used to justify the construction of Federal transmission lines, leading to the construction of a giant national electric power grid. There is another basic inconsistency in the arguments put forth by proponents of this project. It is claimed that electric generating capacity is necessary in connection with the NPR in order to eliminate a projected deficit of prime power in the Pacific Northwest in the 1965–66 period before the energy from the Canadian treaty is available. But, on March 9, 1961, Secretary of Interior Udall wrote a letter to a member of the Joint Committee (found on pp. 1 and 2 of the Joint Committee print, entitled "Power Conversion Studies, Hanford New Production Reactor") stating that the value of these facilities—"will be greatly enhanced by the construction of regional interties which will substantially increase the marketability of power produced by the Hanford steamplant."

On the following day, March 10, Secretary Udall appointed a special task force headed by the BPA Administrator, to study the feasibility of an extra-high-voltage intertie between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest to make possible deliveries of surplus Columbia River energy into southern California. Finally, on March 28, Secretary Udall stated that conversion of the Hanford reactor "would make some type of intertie almost essential."

The BPA Administrator, Mr. Luce, also expressed the opinion that the construction of regional interties will substantially increase the market for power from the Hanford steamplant. These statements by the Secretary of Interior and the BPA Administrator would seem to greatly refute the allegation that there is an impending power shortage in the Pacific Northwest and should leave little doubt in any of our minds that power from this project will be used to help justify the construction of another leg of a gigantic Federal power grid at taxpayers' expense.

8. The project would not produce power economically. Despite numerous studies prepared for the Atomic Energy Commission and for this committee, it has not yet been demonstrated that this reactor would produce economic electric power. Actually, the evidence in these studies indicates that this reactor will produce power that will be high cost and uneconomic in the Pacific Northwest.

The two studies made by the FPC really present no information to indicate that Hanford electric power would be comparable in cost to power available from other alternative sources. The reason is that the studies were based on an incomplete premise, namely, whether it would be economically feasible to add power to an already authorized and constructed reactor. They did not analyze the cost of producing power when all economic factors are considered. This is comparable to figuring the costs of coal-fired electric power without the boiler.

The FPC studies did not take into consideration any portion of the cost of the reactor itself ($120 million) or of the facilities already authorized for making it convertible to power production (another $25 million). Obviously, the $25 million investment in facilities for making the reactor capable of power production is absolutely necessary for the production of power. It is difficult to understand why the cost of these facilities was not included in the FPC study, when even the FPC recommends that the costs should be included in the rates set for power from the project.

If the cost of these facilities had been included in the FPC's economic feasibility study the results would have been markedly different. For example, during the power-only period, which represents more than 75 percent of the estimated life of the powerplant, the economics are claimed to be about "breakeven or moderately favorable." Obviously, a far less favorable, if not adverse, conclusion would have been reached if the cost of these facilities ($25 million, or about a 25-percent increase in costs) had been included.

Another omission in the FPC studies is failure to allocate to power any part of the cost of constructing the reactor. Thus, calculated power costs shown in these studies were not sufficient to amortize any part of the reactor's cost or to pay interest on the unamortized portion of its cost. During the dual-purpose period (1964–72) no portion of the cost of maintenance, operations, fuel, and insurance for the reactor were charged to power. In the power-only period (1972–97) only the cost of fuel, maintenance, operation, and insurance for the reactor were charged to power. Neither in the dual-purpose period nor the power-only period, have any part of the reactor's capital cost been charged to power. It would be remarkable indeed if nuclear power could be produced without the reactor. Yet for power cost purposes it, in effect, does not exist.

At the very least, the cost of this power should reflect the 75 percent of the reactor's life during which it would be used exclusively for the production of power. It would also seem to be sound economic prudence to reflect in the costs of power production during the dual-purpose period (1964–72) a portion of the costs of fuel, insurance, maintenance, and operation of the reactor. If not, is it to be assumed that this juggling with figures is to set a new pattern for the operation of Federal powerplants where political expedience dictates power costs?

It should be noted that the 1960 FPC report found that the addition of generating facilities was not economically feasible on the basis of 2.5 or 4 percent financing and published fuel prices. Only by using an arbitrary forecast of future production costs of nuclear fuel, which forecast incidentally has not been made available to municipal, cooperative, and privately owned utility companies which are considering the construction of nuclear plants, was the FPC able to arrive at a finding of feasibility.

The use of this undisclosed reduction in the cost of uranium fuel is unfair to municipal, cooperative, and privately owned electric companies seeking to appraise the feasibility of proposed nuclear powerplants. These groups can only use the published price of uranium. If these non-Federal groups could assume a comparable reduction in the price of uranium, the economic feasibility of their proposals would be greatly enhanced. In fact, it is likely that, under the same conditions these non-Federal groups would be able to develop nuclear powerplants that might be competitive with conventionally fueled plants. At least, they would be more apt to contribute to the advancement of really economical means of producing nuclear power, than would the expenditure of $95 million to add generating facilities to the NPR.

At the hearings on this bill an AEC spokesman claimed that in the period of dual-purpose operation (1964–72), power from this reactor will cost about 3.7 mills per kilowatt-hour. The 1961 FPC study for AEC indicates that for the power-only period 1972–97), the estimated cost of power would be in "the order of 5 mills at 70-percent plant factor * * *" (committee print, March 1961, p. 53).

From the evidence available it appears that Hanford's steamplant, even on the basis of the cost allocations used by the FPC, would produce power at a cost greater than the average revenue being received per kilowatt-hour by the Bonneville Power Administration.

In 1960 the average kilowatt-hour of power sold by BPA cost 1.61 mills as secured from the power supplier. In addition, BPA spent an average of 1.01 mills to transmit that power to load centers or to its large wholesale customers. Thus, the average cost to BPA per kilowatt-hour sold totaled 2.62 mills, yet the average revenue it received from these sales was 2.32 mills. Consequently, BPA lost money. Its annual report showed that the loss totaled $8,486,016 that year. If BPA buys power from the Hanford steamplant that costs from 3.7 to at least 5 mills, and to which it must add its transmission expenses, its deficit is bound to increase as long as it sells this power under its present price schedules.

The contention of BPA's Administrator that in the dual-purpose period power from the reactor will cost 1.36 mills seems to be wishful thinking. For one thing, the claim rests on the assumption that the reactor will have a plant factor of 85 percent. Yet FPC has stated that power could be marketed only 31 percent of the time. (In an additional evaluation, FPC stated that power may be marketed between 45 and 70 percent of the time.)

The Bonneville Power Administration at present supplies AEC the power needed for the operation of existing Hanford reactors. This power costs AEC 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour. AEC intends to continue buying its power from BPA at the existing rates even when the Hanford steamplant is producing higher cost power.

9. It would not enhance international prestige. Another benefit which proponents of this project attempt to claim is that there will be some international prestige value to its construction. This, it seems to us, is as inconsistent as most of the other arguments used in an attempt to justify construction of this unnecessary project. The NPR will yield only low pressure, saturated steam, better suited to the boiler of an old-fashioned locomotive than to a modern turbine generator. As was disclosed in the hearings, this represents retrogressions rather than progress as far as power production is concerned—either nuclear or conventional.

It is difficult to understand in this age of spectacular space explorations how one can claim that international prestige will accrue from building an obsolete type of nuclear powerplant.

The majority report recalled the impact of the Soviet Union's announcement of the completion of a 100-megawatt dual-purpose plant at the 1958 Geneva Conference. Three years is a significant period of time to have

elapsed when scientific and technical advances are taking place as rapidly as they are today. The attempt to impress the rest of the world today by merely saying that now this Nation has a project which is seven or eight times larger than the Soviet Union's 1958 plant, would seem to have little impact.

On the other hand, if international prestige is something the Joint Committee and the Congress is seeking, we maintain that $95 million could be spent more effectively in many other more productive ways.

10. Approval of this project would constitute a precedent for further encroachment of Government in business. The Joint Committee consistently has avoided using the Nation's atomic energy program as a means of encroaching on our traditional business enterprise system. In fact, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 specifically declares it to be the policy of the United States that "the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to * * * strengthen free competition in private enterprise." Now, however, the majority report of the Joint Committee proposes to use this project as an opening wedge in changing this policy.

In conclusion, the Congress should take special note of the fact that the authorization of electric generating facilities for the NPR will mark the first legislative acceptance of Government-constructed steam electric generating plants outside the TVA area. Up to this time, the Congress has been scrupulous to assure that such plants were not constructed outside the rigidly defined TVA area. We submit that the precedent that would be established here is a most dangerous one. The Congress should not be misled by the respectable cloak of necessary plutonium production into permitting this very significant governmental encroachment in private enterprise.

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER.
WALLACE F. BENNETT.
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.
CRAIG HOSMER.
WILLIAM H. BATES.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to point out some of the reasons and conclusions which make us feel that this would be an unwise expenditure of money.

First, we say it would not advance nuclear power technology. That statement has been amply sustained by the absence of any argument on the part of the proponents of the item that it would advance nuclear technology.

Second, we say, it would be contrary to the spirit, intent, and specific language of section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The Atomic Energy Act has for one of its major purposes the stimulation of private enterprise, private exploration, and private development in this field. This item violates that purpose completely.

Third, it would violate assurances given to Congress in 1958 when the new production reactor was authorized.

I call attention to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who is in charge of the measure on the floor, as contained in the report of the minority, found at page 27 of the committee report accompanying the bill:

Senator PASTORE, also a member of the Joint Committee, assured the Senate this power would not go into the grids of either publicly or privately owned utilities.

That is what was said to the Senate in 1958 when the bill was under consideration and when this convertibility feature was being discussed. It was said that this power would not go into the grids of public or private utilities. It would be for the use only of Hanford. The Senator from Rhode Island said:

Therefore, Mr. President, if we invest the additional $25 million, will power which will go into the grid of either private or public utilities in that area be produced? Of course not. Instead, we shall produce only 300 megawatts of electric power which is needed very badly at Hanford; and thus we shall have met our responsibility, because power from auxiliary sources will still be needed if the reactors break down.

That was the statement of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who is in charge of the bill and who advocates the spending of an additional $95 million. The electricity which will be produced will go into the commercial grids. In 1958, when the convertibility feature was under discussion, his own statement was that it will not go into the commercial grids, and that only enough electricity will be produced for Hanford itself.

Fourth, it would not, as is alleged, aid national defense. There is no particular stimulus to national defense in the addition of these electric power facilities—for the production of plutonium, yes, but not power facilities.

Fifth, the power is not needed. There is in fact no practical shortage of electricity in the Pacific Northwest. We can confuse the situation by talking about dump power and firm power, and about everything else. However, there is no practical shortage of electricity in the Pacific Northwest at this time.

Sixth, it would be used to attract industry from other regions.

That is a regional argument, which can be used depending upon individual conditions. A concentration of publicly subsidized power will attract industry to that region as against another region. I will not dwell on that.

Our eighth point is that it would not produce power economically. I submit that the evidence all the way down through the hearings on this subject shows that testimony is utterly fuzzy. The witnesses all hedged their answers, saying that if we calculated certain costs and included those in the production of plutonium, we would bring down the cost of electricity.

If those costs were charged to electrical production, the cost of the electricity would be increased.

I believe it was on May 17, 1961, that Dr. Greninger, of General Electric, the general manager at Hanford, in his statement to the Joint Committee, said:

In other words, the addition of generating facilities to NPR may appear "economically justified" on some sets of assumptions and might be judged questionable on others.

There is no clear-cut statistical, engineering, or electrical calculation to justify the production of electricity by this project, even on a comparable cost with steam or falling water. It sounds attractive to say that all that steam is going to waste; but energy has been wasted at Hanford ever since the beginning of the building of reactors there. From the time the first battery of plutonium reactors was built at Hanford, enough heat has been going into the Columbia River to raise its temperature about 2 degrees. Yet no one has ever claimed that generating capacity could be efficiently hooked up to that heat or to that steam to produce electricity as cheap as it can be produced by falling water or coal.

No, this proposal, in my judgment, would result in a waste of money by the Federal Government. I am not resisting the production of additional electricity in the Northwest. That is not the point. I simply say that if electricity is to be produced, either by public or private money, then let the installations be built which will produce it at the lowest possible modern efficiency costs. Let us not waste public money on the kind of installation proposed to be built with the expenditure of $95 million.

A moment ago, the Senator from Rhode Island said that the Government has already expended $25 million on the convertibility feature, and that that amount would be lost if the other $95 million were not spent. Of course it will be lost. As I tried to discuss it with him at that time, the simple fact that $25 million has been wasted does not justify throwing $95 million more down the waste rathole for the production of an electrical producing plant which will teach us nothing about the atomic art, which will teach us nothing about the generation of electricity that we do not already know. There is nothing new about this plant. There is nothing pioneering about the proposed electrical generating plant. There is nothing about its plutonium production nature that is novel. It is all known. It is standard procedure. To waste an additional $95 million on an inefficient plant is, I believe, unjustified, especially in these days, when many of us are hoping that the Government can save money, rather than spend money with the profligacy of a drunken sailor, simply because it is public money, and because some arguments may sound good, regardless of how suspicious they may be.

One more item, item No. 10. We object to the proposed construction of the facility because it would constitute a precedent for the further encroachment of Government in private business. There is a great temptation always to put the Government into private business or in competition with private business. I again state, Mr. President, that the Atomic Energy Commission, based on the whole concept of the Commission and its purposes, has no business whatsoever going into the production of commercial power for sale. That is exactly what is proposed in this instance, as I said a moment ago, because more than half of the power produced will be sold commercially.

I do not hear anyone saying that because the Civil Aeronautics Board regulates experiments with aviation, it ought to start to run an airline in competition with private airlines. I do not notice anyone arguing that because the Interstate Commerce Commission has jurisdiction of and supervision over railroads

and other transportation systems in this country, it ought to go into the business of operating transportation systems. I do not notice anyone arguing that any of the other regulatory or experimental commissions, simply because they have jurisdiction over certain phases and over the public interest in certain phases in those projects, ought to begin the operation of commercial activities in those fields. I do not notice anyone suggesting that because the Pure Food and Drug Administration has supervision over the purity of the meat we eat, the Administration ought to operate a hotdog stand.

But that is exactly what it is proposed to have the Atomic Energy Commission do in this instance. The AEC was never conceived or created to be a commercial competitive enterprise, to enter into the business of producing electric power for sale commercially.

If commercial power is needed in that region, let the proper facilities for it be built. If the need for it is proved, let it be supported. I am not opposed to increasing the amount of commercial power needed in that area, but it should be provided in the proper way. What is here proposed is comparable to the camel getting its nose into the tent. This is the first step toward putting the Atomic Energy Commission into a business that it never was intended it should be in, in the first place. There has been a misconception of the whole purpose of the Atomic Energy Commission.

As I said a moment ago, an engineer can take his pencil and slide rule, and, depending upon the factors which he applies, or depending on what is charged to the operation of plutonium and its production, or what is failed to be charged, can make the cost of the electricity almost anything he wishes it to be, from nothing to a completely prohibited cost.

I submit that all those who have examined the proposal and who claim that electricity can be produced at a cost that is anywhere nearly competitive have a fuzzy line of cost calculation to which they cannot be pinned down. They all say, as did General Electric, that if certain factors are considered in one way, the cost will be reduced; if they are considered in another way, the cost will be increased. The net result, I am convinced, is that the electricity will cost not less than 3.7 mills, and that it will be sold to Bonneville by the Atomic Energy Commission at somewhere around 2½ mills, because the electricity can be produced and obtained for that price. The result will be a net loss to the Government in this operation which will teach the Government and the public nothing about the production of electricity and nothing about the operation of reactors of any advanced degree, of approximately 1 to 1.2 mills for every kilowatt delivered into the so-called grid or that is used at Hanford.

Again, I get back to what I said a while ago. This proposal is similar to the old story about the bananas. The fellow said he lost money on every banana he sold, but he made a profit because his volume was so big. I think that argument applies here.

So it is said that the Government is going to lose money on every kilowatt it produces, but an 800,000 kilowatt volume is so big that the Government will make a profit. That is about the way the argument adds up, in my opinion.

I do not know how the Senate will vote this afternoon. The attendance of Senators on the floor during this debate has not been large, with the result that not very many Senators have had an opportunity to examine the records or look into this matter.

But, Mr. President, I do know that last Thursday, after exhaustive debate, the other body soundly defeated this proposal. It was soundly defeated there, and these provisions were taken out of this bill. The argument made there was based on the fact that the proposed operation would be inefficient and costly and would result in putting the Atomic Energy Commission into the commercial power production business. And that is exactly what it would do.

As I have said, I do not know what action the Senate will take today on this matter. But I do know that the evidence clearly shows that at this moment there is no burning need for additional power in that area. I do know that in my own mind, after adding up all the evidence, such power will be costly—much more costly than power produced by falling water or even power produced by steam; and let us remember that coal is available adjacent to this area. Furthermore, this project, if put into operation, would not teach us anything new about the art of producing electricity, because there is nothing new about such generators; and this plant would teach us nothing that we do not already know about the basic principles of the production of plutonium.

Mr. President, Senators should bear in mind that one of the prime duties of the Atomic Energy Commission is to advance the art, not to go into the commercial power production business. I do know that if electricity is needed there, it can be provided, and will be provided, by proper bodies, either public or private, and will be produced at low cost, and with modern and efficient production methods, by means other than this one.

The argument that a great deal of steam is being produced there and is being wasted does not in any way justify the hooking up of machinery that would inefficiently use the steam. A moment ago I tried to point out that that argument is just the same as saying that a tremendous volume of water is flowing down the Potomac River, and that we should stop to realize what a great quantity of water is going to waste in that way, and that we should build dams every 15 or 20 feet along the river, and thus make use of the water—without giving any thought to the fact that if that were done, the electricity which would be produced would be so prohibitively expensive and the maintenance cost would be so great that it would be foolish to engage in such projects. And, Mr. President, of course it would be. The mere fact that some such situation exists does not mean that one can wave a magic wand and thus put such sources to efficient use.

A moment ago I said that during recent years enough heat has been turned into the Columbia River to make it possible to raise the temperature two degrees. But no one has ever tried to make steam in that way. Why? Because it would not be efficient. I think the same applies in this case.

When it is said there is an endorsement, I point out that there is an endorsement that under certain conditions dual-purpose reactors might be experimented with. But let us bear in mind that this reactor has been built as a plutonium reactor to produce needed plutonium; and actually, in effect, it has not really been, from the time of its origin and concept, a dual-purpose reactor.

A moment ago much was said about the fact that the Russians have dual-purpose reactors. But let me point out that although with great fanfare, a few years ago, the Russians announced that they were going to produce great quantities of power by means of the use of atomic heat, we find that in the last few years they have been minimizing that, and have been going down, down, and down, and have not been expanding that production; and it will also be noticed that other countries have not been advancing along this line as rapidly as was predicted a few years ago. Why? Because today not one atomic plant can produce power that can compete economically with the power produced from falling water or from coal, with the exception of power produced at certain plants located, let us say, in Antarctica or in Thule, Greenland, or in the middle of the Sahara Desert. I suppose it would be possible to construct an atomic plant in the middle of the Sahara Desert and perhaps produce atomic power there for less than the cost of bringing heat to it from the seaboard. But that reminds me of what Admiral Rickover said, one day, about the efficiency of atomic plants located in far away places. He said:

> The best way to have a railroad built is to decide to build an atomic plant in such a remote spot. Then it is necessary to build a railroad, in order to take supplies to the atomic plant; and that is the way to get the railroad built.

Mr. President, this entire proposal is, to me, unsustainable; and it is indefensible, first, on economic grounds; and, second, it is indefensible when it is compared with the basic purposes of the Atomic Energy Act and the Atomic Energy Commission. This project would, for the first time, definitely put the Atomic Energy Commission—a regulatory body and an experimental body—into the commercial business of the production of electric power. I say that would violate the Atomic Energy Act, and would be the wrong direction for us to take.

Mr. President, that about concludes the arguments I have to make, except I wish to refer Senators to the debate and the record of the House of Representatives, last week. Senators will find the termination of that debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for last Thursday,

July 13; and they will find other references and data supporting the objections to this measure in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27 of this year; and they will find other references to it and other data in the RECORD of June 14, 1961, and other references in the RECORD of June 28, 1961. The last ones refer to the statements and the insertions made by Representative JAMES VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, and Representative WILLIAM BATES, of Massachusetts; and also in those RECORDS will be found the statements made by Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California. They have documented this matter in great detail, and that had a great deal to do with the rejection by the House of Representatives of this proposal.

In closing, Mr. President, I merely wish to repeat that there is no conclusive proof that this project would be at all efficient. There is conclusive proof that it puts the Atomic Energy Commission in the commercial business. There is no conclusive proof that this power is needed, which is another question. And, in my judgment, there is conclusive proof in this record that this represents a waste of public money, that it is unjustified, and that it should be eliminated from the bill, in accordance with the motion to strike which is before the Senate at this time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I rise to voice my opposition to the language of S. 2043 authorizing $95 million for generating facilities at Hanford, Wash.

In 1958, when we approved authorization of the new Hanford production reactor, we were assured that this reactor was urgently needed to bolster our plutonium production capacity and to replace some of the older production reactors at Hanford.

We were told that this reactor provided only a small step toward meeting the minimum plutonium requirements set out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am sure that the Senate agreed to this authorization 3 years ago on this basis.

As it stand now, the new Hanford reactor will be completed late next year, just about on schedule, and after a brief checkout period the production of plutonium in the new facility can be undertaken. There has been no indication as to whether the Atomic Energy Commission will shut down any of the older Hanford reactors which this new facility is to replace but at least the Nation will have a reliable new plant to meet defense needs in the plutonium field.

Now the proponents of the Hanford steamplant project which is contained in S. 2043 come to us with a plan which was foreseen by some Senators in 1958—a plan which disturbs me deeply. The proponents of the project to convert this new Hanford reactor to generation of electric energy seem to have forgotten the very basis on which the reactor was authorized in this Chamber 3 years ago.

I do not pretend to be an atomic energy expert, but I think I understand this conversion proposal well enough to explain what it means. First of all, the reactor would be operated as a standard plutonium production reactor for 2 years, or until late in 1964. Second, by late 1964 the addition of the electric generating facilities would be completed at Hanford, and the AEC would undertake to operate the facility for the next 8 years, or until 1972, as a dual-purpose facility which would produce both plutonium and power. During this 8-year period, however, as I understand it, the Nation would get plutonium from this reactor at a lower rate of production than during the first 2 years. Finally, on or after 1972 the reactor would be further modified to make it primarily an electric power station which would produce plutonium only as a subsidiary byproduct. During the latter period, which would run the remainder of the useful life of the reactor, plutonium would be produced at an even lower rate.

We have been told that the older Hanford reactors have about 2 more years of useful life left in them. This means that they would be useless after 1963, the year after the new Hanford reactor begins producing plutonium. Any attempt, therefore, to reduce plutonium production in the new facility after 1963 or 1964 would serve only to reduce the Nation's overall plutonium production capacity.

We must remember, too, that there are other reactors producing plutonium at Hanford and Savannah River and that these, too, may be approaching the end of their usefulness. It appears to me, as it should appear to every Senator, that it is important to maintain at least the status quo on our plutonium production capacity.

It seems to me, therefore, Mr. President, that when we are asked to authorize addition of generating facilities to this Hanford reactor and to permit plutonium production to be reduced in the bargain, we are being asked to forget why we authorized this reactor in the first place.

Mr. President, there are many convincing arguments for striking this $95 million item from the AEC authorization bill. This item would not advance nuclear power technology, it surely would not aid national defense, it is not needed to meet the power requirements of the Pacific Northwest and, most important of all, it would constitute a precedent for further encroachment by the Federal Government into private business. According to my information, privately owned utility companies in that section of the country are doing at least an adequate job without any interference from the Federal Government.

I see absolutely no sound reason for the Federal Government to spend the taxpayers' money to build and operate tax-exempt commercial electric plants to compete with private industry.

In my judgment, Members of the House acted wisely in striking this $95 million item from the AEC authorization. I believe the Senate should do likewise.

Mr. BENNETT previously said: Mr. President, the pending business is the atomic energy authorization bill. I am a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I should like to be able to take part in the discussion of the bill after it has been properly presented. However, I have the responsibility to attend hearings of one of my other committees this afternoon. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared opposing the erection of the steamplant in connection with the Hanford plutonium reactor be inserted in the RECORD during this afternoon's debate, at an appropriate place, possibly following a similar statement which I understand will be made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

HANFORD STEAMPLANT—A PUBLIC POWER BOONDOGGLE

Mr. President, the general provisions of this bill have been very ably discussed by the distinguished vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the gentleman from Rhode Island. By and large, I think this is a good bill which has resulted from many hours of diligent work by the committee. There is, however, one project included with which I must take strong exception. This proposal—project 62-a-6—would authorize the expenditure of $95 million to add 800,000 kilowatts of electric generating capacity to the new production reactor being constructed at Hanford, Wash.

EXPENDITURE UNJUSTIFIED

Attempts to justify this expenditure of $95 million to finance the addition of electric power generating facilities at Hanford are based largely on three points. The first is that addition of the generating facilities will make use of heat, created in the plutonium production process, which otherwise would go to waste. The second is that power producing facilities of the magnitude proposed for the Hanford plant will provide the United States with an enormous prestige item—to be used presumably in the propaganda war with Soviet Russia. The third is that approximately 800,000 kilowatts of power which Hanford would provide is necessary in order to meet a power shortage which might possibly develop in the Pacific Northwest by 1965–66.

COSTS GREATER THAN BENEFITS

Points one and two can be disposed of with little consideration. In regard to point No. 1, it is true that the reactor process at the proposed new production reactor does create substantial amounts of heat, and without the addition of some equipment to utilize this heat, it is indeed dissipated in the Columbia River. What the proponents do not want to bring up in this discussion is the fact that costs incurred in transforming this heat to electric energy are substantially greater than the value of the energy itself. It is certainly not unusual in the development of this Nation's atomic energy program to use some economic intelligence and forego the attempt to use reactor heat or steam when it does not meet the test of economic feasibility. There are other reactors at Hanford, Wash., Savannah River, S.C., National Reactor Testing Station, Arco, Idaho, and Shippingport Station, Pa., where prudence dictated that it would be cheaper to lose the steam rather than to waste precious Federal dollars in an attempt to use it.

ECONOMIC SLEIGHT OF HAND

Only by the most dubious accounting and economic reasoning can the proposed powerplant at Hanford be considered economical. For example, the $25 million Congress authorized 2 years ago to make the new production reactor convertible—that is to adapt it to possible power production at some

future time—is not considered by the proponents of this bill as a cost of the powerplant. Likewise, none of the cost of the reactor itself is included in calculating the cost of the power to be produced. This kind of economic sleight of hand would be roughly comparable to charging to power only the costs of generators and turbines at a dam, and charging off the entire cost of the dam itself to some other purpose.

MODEL-T LACKS PRESTIGE IN ATOMIC AGE

In regard to point No. 2, the co-called prestige item, it is well known that the Handford powerplant would utilize mechanical and engineering techniques which were obsolete in the early 1930's. Building an 800,000-kilowatt powerplant at Hanford would give this country the same kind of prestige as it would get if we were in 1961 to build the biggest model-T factory in the world.

If indeed this country wishes to continue in its efforts to improve its image before the world, it seems to me that it would be much wiser—much sounder fiscal policy—to spend our money and our talents in areas where accomplishment would indeed be measures of national achievement. Far from enhancing our prestige, the wasteful expenditure of $95 million for an outdated, antiquated, inefficient 800,000 kilowatt teakettle would make us the technological laughingstock of the world.

NO REAL POWER SHORTAGE

Because it is a subject of such technical and engineering complications, the question of Northwest power supplies and anticipated deficiencies requires a little more time to consider. Essentially, the proponents of the Hanford powerplant claim that this project is the only available powerplant which can be built in time to meet a possible power shortage in the Pacific Northwest during the winter of 1965–66. This shortage could only occur if there is at that time a corresponding shortage of water in the Columbia River system. This, I might add, is a most remote possibility. It is, however, a possibility and therefore should be considered because utilities must provide power to meet the most adverse situations, regardless of the fact that such adversity might occur but once in a hundred years.

In the Pacific Northwest at the present time, there is roughly 9.3 million kilowatts of dependable hydroelectric generating capacity. About half of this is owned by the Federal Government, the other half by non-Federal utility organizations, both public and private. According to the engineers who forecast power needs, the amount of power presently installed, coupled with amounts which will be installed over the next few years, will fully satisfy the regional power needs up to the year 1965. In the winter of 1965, if the streams reach critically low levels, there may be a power deficiency in the region. It could amount to somewhere between 100,000 and 200,000 kilowatts.

Proponents of the Hanford powerplant argue that it is to meet this shortage that Hanford must be built—that nothing else can do that job. This argument I submit to you is patently false.

ANY NEW POWER NEEDS CAN BE MET

There is in the western part of the Northwest nearly half a million kilowatts of steam-electric generating capacity which at this moment is on reserve and which could be used in 1965 to meet any deficiency in hydropower. Furthermore, by 1965, there will be in Idaho, Montana and Utah 300,000 to 500,000 kilowatts of surplus power which can be exported to the western area of the Columbia Basin to meet power deficiencies.

Admittedly these sources would provide higher-cost power, but nonetheless, power will be available. Perhaps a better way to solve the problem of 1965–66 would be to permit the region's utilities to proceed with construction of their own powerplants to meet their own deficiencies. Most of us are aware of the effort of a group of Northwest utilities to build the High Mountain Sheep project on the Snake River which would have a capacity in excess of a million kilowatts. Perhaps this Congress would be wiser if it encouraged development of this project by non-Federal utilities rather than to authorize $95 million of the taxpayers' money to build the Hanford powerplant.

OTHER ALTERNATIVES ARE AVAILABLE

If, however, Congress is determined to spend the taxpayers' money in the field of power production and the development of atomic energy, then I suggest we can spend it far wiser than by erecting an antiquated steamplant in central Washington. If we must spend $95 million to help the Northwest meet its power needs, then we should spend it to accelerate development of Federal projects now being built in that region. For instance, we could speed up development of John Day Dam, and thereby add 1.5 million kilowatts to the power pool by 1967, or we might accelerate development of Lower Monumental Dam on the Snake River and get its 200,000 kilowatts on the line by 1966. There are certainly other alternatives which could be done more economically and expeditiously than that contained in the Hanford steamplant proposal.

Over the years I have served in the Senate, I have supported most of the projects submitted to Congress for development of multiple-purpose dams. I have done so on the basis that the beneficial development of our water and power resources is a proper area for Federal assistance. I submit to you that Hanford is not. Certainly, the U.S. Government must develop and build plutonium-producing reactors because they are needed for national defense. But the U.S. Government need not embark on a program of building steam electric generating stations simply to be building steam electric generating stations.

ISSUES ARE CLEAR

The issue in this debate is very clear. When the camouflage of prestige and power requirements and heat conservation is stripped away, the issue is simply, "Will the Congress of the United States authorize the expenditure of $95 million of taxpayers' money to build a steam electric generating plant in the Pacific Northwest or will the Congress encourage full development of the Nation's water power and leave the job of building steamplants up to the utilities in the region?"

OVER 900 COAL MINERS ARE AFFECTED

Mr. President, there is another aspect of this whole picture which I feel it is appropriate to discuss at this time. This is the effect of the Hanford steam plant on other resource development in the United States.

We are particularly concerned, in the State of Utah and other Western States, about the future of our coal industry. This remains a seriously depressed industry in Utah and, consequently, we are vitally concerned about any proposal which would adversely effect the future of this important natural resource.

The proposal to add 800,000 kilowatts of generating capacity to Hanford is roughly equivalent to 2,649,000 tons of coal per year based on an 85-percent load factor. Since it takes less than 1 pound of coal to generate a kilowatt-hour of electricity in the most modern steamplants, the total kilowatt-hours from the Hanford steamplant can be translated into this quantity of coal.

The figure can also be expressed in terms of man-day employment for coal miners in this depressed industry. An average of 12.12 tons of coal can be mined per man per day in this country. This would mean that approximately 217,740 man-days of gainful employment could result from the generation of 800,000 kilowatts of electric power using a modern fossil-fuel steamplant. Therefore, if coal were used to produce this same amount of power, it would provide full-time employment to over 900 coal miners.

It is recognized that there is no proposal to construct an alternative steam facility of this size presently being considered. But we can be assured if the future power needs of the area require such an additional block of power—and it might be pointed out that the Bonneville Power Administration reported in its 1960 annual report that there is a surplus of power in the BPA area—there are other resources that can be developed to meet the need. In fact, some of the power companies in the Pacific Northwest are already planning for the time when steam generating units will be required on their own systems. For this reason, it might be said that adding these electric generating facilities to Hanford would further postpone the use of coal-fired stations to firm up much of the Pacific Northwest's nonfirm hydropower.

GIGANTIC TVA FOR NORTHWEST

Mr. President, it is quite evident that in requesting authorization of the Hanford project the Kennedy administration is attempting to create a gigantic TVA in the Northwest and that this project is but a first link in an ambitious plan to create a nationalized power grid. The tipoff that such a multi-billion-dollar plan would be pushed by the administration was contained in the President's special message on natural resources which was submitted to the Congress on February 23, 1961. I would like to quote from the section of the President's speech dealing with electric power wherein he stated:

"Finally, I have directed the Secretary of the Interior to develop plans for the early interconnection of areas served by that Department's marketing agencies with adequate common carrier transmission lines; to plan for further national pooling of electric power, both public and private; and to enlarge such pooling as now exists."

During the hearings on the AEC authorization bill, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall in a letter to the junior Senator from Washington, urged construction of the Hanford steamplant and in the concluding sentence of his letter revealed the administration's hope to make this project a valuable link in an all-Federal power grid system. He said, "Finally, its value will be greatly enhanced by the construction of regional interties which will substantially increase the marketability of power produced by the Hanford steamplant.

The Washington Post of July 12, 1961, under a caption entitled "Kennedy Asks Greater TVA's" quotes the President as saying that he wanted to see TVA "go forward, not rest on its laurels." The President called for "further development of the TVA" and new efforts to produce cheaper power from atomic energy. Although the President didn't refer by name to the Hanford reactor, I submit that the meaning is crystal clear and that the administration fully intends to launch the Hanford steamplant as the pilot project in a western TVA to strangle all private power producers.

MORE AT STAKE THAN $95 MILLION

Therefore, we are voting today not only on the issue of authorizing one $95 million steamplant, we are deciding whether or not Congress should endorse this major step in establishing a gigantic federally subsidized system of power generating plants and transmission lines for the Northwestern United States, and eventually for the whole country. I hope my colleagues can see through the camouflage which the advocates of this project have created in the hope of disguising its true purpose.

WASTEFUL EXPENDITURE

Thus, Mr. President, we must conclude that it is not necessary to authorize the construction of the Hanford electric generating station. It would be a wasteful expenditure of $95 million of badly needed Federal funds at a time when the National Treasury is going to be strained to the utmost to meet the challenges of this present age. Therefore, I sincerely urge each and every Member of the Senate to vote against project 62-a-6 in the AEC authorization bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the motion to strike made by the Senator from Iowa.

First, I should like to make one brief observation in connection with the point made by the distinguished Senator. Why should we convert the reactor at Hanford to produce power when we did not do so with the earlier Hanford reactors? The answer to that question is, as my colleague knows, that the state of the art had not advanced to the point where, in the beginning, we were able to achieve that particular objective. It is interesting to note, and I repeat it because the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island brought it out earlier in the day, that the former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Lewis Strauss, testified in connection with this project back in 1958—to be exact, on June 24—at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as follows:

Senator BRICKER. Whether it should be a convertible type or whether it should be left to the judgment of the Commission.

Mr. STRAUSS. Without knowing anything about the Johnson testimony.

And that refers to Mr. Johnson, manager of the General Electric facility at Hanford:

I would say this: that had it been possible at the time that the Hanford reactors were built and the Savannah River reactors were built to make them convertible at will, it would have been, I think, the smart thing to do. As far as I know there was not any such possibility available to the Manhattan District originally or to the Commission in the days when it decided on the Savannah River plant.

The words I have just quoted are from the Republican chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Lewis Strauss. He certainly laid to rest the whole contention that this is a foolish thing to undertake by saying that, if he had had his way, all the reactors would have been convertible. I think the statement speaks for itself.

As Members of the Senate know, we are now building at Hanford a plutonium production reactor which will manufacture fissionable material urgently needed for the defense of the free world. This reactor, the new production reactor, will be completed late next year.

Like any other plutonium production reactor, the new production reactor will generate enormous amounts of energy—in the form of heat. Two things can be done with this heat. It can be wasted—thrown away. It can be squandered into the atmosphere or dissipated into the Columbia River. Or else this heat can be used—for constructive purposes. It can be transformed into steam, and thence into electricity for lighting homes and running factories.

The addition of electric generating facilities to the new plutonium production reactor would permit its heat so to be used for peaceful purposes. The reactor, with these generating facilities, could produce some three-quarters of a million kilowatts of useful electricity. The plant would thereby pay a double dividend. It would produce plutonium needed by our Armed Forces. At the same time it would produce useful power needed for the growing demands of the Pacific Northwest. The reactor would become both a plowshare and a sword.

The decision to make this a dual-purpose plant, capable of producing electricity as well as plutonium, was not made on the spur of the moment. It was preceded by years of study by the most competent technical and economic experts in our Nation. The desirability of this step has been examined and reexamined.

Every competent and objective authority who has studied this matter believes that it makes economic, technical, and political sense to add electric generating facilities to the new production reactor.

The Atomic Energy Commission says this is the right thing to do.

The Bureau of the Budget says this is the right thing to do.

The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission is Dr. Glenn Seaborg, a Nobel Prize-winning physicist.

The company that originated this project, and the company which has pursued it with energy, is General Electric. Dr. Cordiner made a statement as to its feasibility back in 1953. I think General Electric Co. has some competency.

The General Electric Co., the AEC operating contractor at Hanford, says this is the right thing to do.

The Federal Power Commission says this is the right thing to do.

The Bonneville Power Administration says this is the right thing to do.

Independent consulting engineers say this is the right thing to do.

And who opposes this step, Mr. President? Two groups only—the private power lobby is fighting it, and the coal mining interests are fighting it.

The private utility lobby is raising the false and nonexistent issue of private versus public power. The real issue is this: Will the American people save money by producing low-cost electricity with the heat generated by this reactor? Or will they waste money by throwing the heat away? The coal mining lobby appears to be making a general argument against all development of atomic power upon the grounds it may interfere with coal production—a proposition most of us are unlikely to accept.

Mr. President, I want to deal in facts. And the facts are these.

Fact No. 1: Making the new production reactor a dual-purpose reactor makes economic sense.

Beyond question, the addition of generating facilities at new production reactor is economically sound. Three Federal agencies—Atomic Energy Commission, Federal Power Commission, and Bonneville Power Administration—have independently reached this conclusion. So also has R. W. Beck & Associates, a nationally known firm of consulting engineers employed by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to study feasibility of the project.

During the dual purpose period, estimated to be the first 8 years of power plant operations, the cost of Hanford atomic power will be $8.70 per kilowatt year at the generators. This cost figure is based on amortizing the full cost of the capital investment in power facilities, plus interest thereon at 4 percent per year, and an allowance for insurance of more than $200,000 per year. This cost of $8.70 per kilowatt year is cheaper than any alternative hydro site left in the Pacific Northwest. For example, John Day power will cost $15.19 per kilowatt year, and Lower Monumental power will cost $21 per kilowatt year. If we compare the cost of Hanford power with John Day and Lower Monumental on a kilowatt-hour basis, Hanford will cost 1.35 mills, John Day 1.56 mills, and Lower Monumental 1.99 mills.

We do not know, of course, that new production reactor will operate as a dual purpose facility for only 8 years. Barring a nuclear disarmament agreement, it is hard to imagine that AEC will completely shut down all of its plutonium production facilities by 1972. If there is merely a curtailment of plutonium production, the new production reactor would probably be the last plant to be closed.

When and if AEC does go completely out of plutonium production, the new production reactor will produce electricity at a cost competitive with the best conventional steamplants that can be built today in the Northwest. The exact cost during the single-purpose period is classified. Load and resource predictions of the utility industry, both public and private, are that by the end of the period of dual-purpose new production reactor operations, the economic hydro sites all will have been developed, and the area will be moving into steam generation. So that in terms of the lowest cost available alternatives, throughout its entire economic life, the Hanford electrical generation will be cheaper than, or as cheap as, other generation.

Fact No. 2: The Pacific Northwest needs this power. Load forecasts of both the public and private agencies confirm the need. Unless generating facilities are added to Hanford, the Pacific Northwest does not have the firm capability to meet its power needs if 1965–66 should be a critical water year. If for any reason Canada would delay ratification of the treaty for joint development of the Columbia River, the power shortage period would be extended until new generation, not presently authorized, was developed. I have heard it said there is a surplus of power in the Pacific Northwest. The facts are that this surplus consists of secondary or dump energy, and not long-term firm power. The Pacific Northwest is in the paradoxical position of having a surplus of secondary energy, or dump energy, but a shortage of long-term firm power. The reactor would produce long-term firm power, and help solve that shortage.

Fact No. 3: This project makes sense on technical grounds.

Today's conventional powerplants—those fired by coal or oil—use high-temperature, high quality steam. But the large atomic powerplants we have built so far—Shippingport, Dresden, and the Yankee plant—produce relatively low-temperature, saturated steam. So would the new production reactor. We do not now know nearly all we ought to know about the problems of designing and operating nuclear powerplants working on low-pressure, low-temperature steam. The NPR, converted into a dual-purpose reactor, would help us amass this needed knowledge.

Yesterday, Chairman Seaborg of the Atomic Energy Commission wrote to Senator ANDERSON and me as follows:

This is in response to your request for my views on the technological benefits that would accrue from the addition of electric energy generating facilities to the new production reactor, now under construction at Hanford, Wash.

In keeping with the original authorization, the new production reactor is well designed and well planned to permit, through the addition of the power equipment, the generation of the planned 700,000 kilowatts of electricity, without impairment of its capabilities for the production of weapons-grade plutonium.

This powerplant would provide valuable operating experience in generating large quantities of power from a single nuclear heat source, and integrating this operation into a large power system. It is becoming increasingly clear that the economics of nuclear power will become more favorable as we proceed to units of higher capability. By firsthand demonstration of the generation of some 700,000 kilowatts from a single reactor, by far the highest in the world, we will be able to provide a more assured basis for industry to extend its nuclear power technology into larger and more economical sizes.

The consistent policy of our Government has been to encourage American industry to maintain world leadership in the field of atomic power. To this end, the Congress has authorized in the last 15 years almost one billion dollars—I repeat, almost one billion dollars—the exact figure is $890 million—to assist the electrical industry in development of atomic power. Little or none of this sum is reimbursable to the Government. So far as I know, the coal producers saw no danger in this program—so long as private utilities were the main beneficiaries. Can we then take seriously arguments against the expenditure of $95 million to convert waste steam into atomic power, when every cent would be repaid the Treasury?

Let there be no question—the Federal Government will recover the $95 million to be invested in new production reactor power-generating facilities. Taken together, the legislative history of this bill and the wording of its section 110 assure that this $95 million investment must be returned to the Federal Government.

First of all, section 110 provides that the costs allocated to power "shall be returned to the Treasury from revenue derived by the Secretary from the disposition of electric energy marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration." Therefore, all costs allocated to power will be returned to the Government.

Section 110 also provides that:

Allocation of costs to the production of such electric energy shall be made jointly by the Commission and the Secretary of Interior.

During extensive hearings on this bill before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, AEC Chairman Seaborg stated clearly that the $95 million capital investment, plus interest, insurance and the cost of operating the powerplant, will be allocated to the cost of power. There were extensive discussions during these hearings concerning the rate of return, but Dr. Seaborg assured that the cost allocations would be determined "so that the $95 million is all recovered over the operating life of the reactor and powerplant for power production." Furthermore, Mr. Charles Luce, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration of the Department of the Interior, the second party to the cost allocation determination as provided in this bill, stated at the same hearings that:

There would be a responsibility on the part of Bonneville to pay it (the $95 million) back whether in a particular year we sold enough power from this installation to do so or not.

Therefore: First, the $95 million will be allocated to power; and second, all costs allocated to power will be returned to the Treasury.

In addition to complete recovery of all of its costs, this project has the great potential of recovering prior Government investments which would be lost should power generation at the Hanford NPR not be undertaken. The NPR, authorized by the Congress under Public Law 59-590, includes an investment of $25 million to make later conversion for power recovery possible. If conversion is not undertaken, all of this $25 million will be lost. On the other hand, if the conversion project is authorized, there exists a great probability of recovery by the Government of the $25 million. In a letter to me of March 9, 1961, Mr. Charles Luce, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, stated:

Such costs (the costs of convertibility) are properly recoverable from power revenues to the extent that revenues are available.

The economics of the project indicate that the revenues will be available.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the expenditures on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission over a period of years both to public and private utilities in the way of subsidies, together with the overall amount expended in research and development for the benefit of the utility industry, both public and private.

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

Cooperative power reactor demonstration program—Amounts committed to private utility companies

Estimate of amounts committed	Waiver of fuel use charges	Operating funds (R. & D.)	Total
1st round:			
Yankee Atomic Electric Co.	$3, 669, 000	$5, 000, 000	$8, 669, 000
Power Reactor Development Co.	3, 703, 000	3, 600, 000	7, 303, 000
3d round:			
Northern States Power Co.	1, 800, 000	8, 500, 000	10, 300, 000
Carolinas-Virginia Nuclear Power Associates	1, 170, 000	13, 905, 000	15, 075, 000
East Central Nuclear Group Inc., and Florida West Coast Nuclear Group	(1)	2, 100, 000	2, 100, 000
Philadelphia Electric Co.	2, 500, 000	14, 500, 000	17, 000, 000
Unsolicited proposals: Consumers Power Co. of Michigan	1, 675, 000	4, 582, 000	6, 257, 000
Total committed	14, 517, 000	52, 187, 000	66, 704, 000
Amounts not committed, but available:			
Unsolicited proposals (R. & D.): [2]			
Fiscal year 1961	5, 000, 000	15, 000, 000	20, 000, 000
Fiscal year 1962	5, 000, 000	7, 000, 000	12, 000, 000
Total	24, 517, 000	74, 187, 000	98, 704, 000

[1] Project terminated.
[2] Available to either public or private utilities, but practically always private.

Civilian reactor development summary through June 30, 1960

	Research and development costs	Construction authorized	Total
Pressurized light water	$125, 000, 000	$75, 000, 000	$200, 000, 000
Boiling light water	39, 800, 000	36, 500, 000	76, 300, 000
Heavy water	36, 400, 000	30, 400, 000	66, 800, 000
Organic moderated	23, 900, 000	15, 000, 000	38, 900, 000
Gas cooled	32, 300, 000	30, 000, 000	62, 300, 000
Sodium cooled	111, 100, 000	62, 200, 000	173, 300, 000
Fluid fuel	102, 900, 000	4, 200, 000	107, 100, 000
Other studies and development	4, 300, 000	6, 500, 000	10, 800, 000
Total	475, 700, 000	259, 800, 000	735, 500, 000

Source: AEC Annual Report to Congress for 1960, p. 516.

NOTE.—The latest AEC estimate of fiscal year 1961 reactor research and development costs for the above programs is $130,000,000. The fiscal year 1961 construction authorization for civilian reactors totals $25,000,000. Therefore, the total AEC funds directed to the civilian reactor program is as follows:

Civilian reactor program through fiscal year 1960	$735, 500, 000
Civilian reactor program for fiscal year 1961	155, 000, 000
Total	890, 500, 000

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, fact four: This project makes sense on the grounds of national security.

I said earlier, Mr. President, that the NPR, as a dual-purpose reactor, would be both a plowshare and a sword. So long as the arms race continues, its operation would be of advantage to both the common defense and our peacetime economy.

But suppose the day finally arrives when we reach an effective agreement on arms control—of a kind which would include halting the production of fissionable materials? The NPR would then stop producing plutonium for weapons. But it would continue to be operated for power, and our investment in it would not go wasted.

Now imagine that the Communist rulers decided to break such an arms agreement? If they did, a dual-purpose NPR could easily, cheaply, and quickly be put back to work producing plutonium for weapons. But the reactor could not be quickly and cheaply reactivated for military use if it is not converted for power production.

I remind Senators that at the present time, America has no dual-purpose reactors. NPR would be its first. Our Soviet rivals do have dual-purpose reactors—and they are building more. This means that they could enter into an arms control scheme, break it, and then quickly resume the production of weapons plutonium.

Are we therefore to concede the Soviets an advantage that we ourselves do not possess? I do not believe we can so gamble with our national security.

Fact five: This is not a pro-public-power and anti-private-power project.

It is ironic that the project to conserve the steam produced by NPR has become embroiled in the private versus public power controversy. In truth, the main beneficiaries of the project, in all likelihood, will be the private utilities of the Pacific Northwest.

Although segments of the utility industry have professed to see dangers in the Hanford project, the private utility companies of the Pacific Northwest, where the plant would be located, do not oppose the project. If there were truly any danger to private utilities in the Hanford project, which of course there is not, would not the private utilities of the Northwest express their opposition? They have never been bashful in the past about opposing projects they regarded as undesirable.

There is not a single telegram here from any of the utilities in the Pacific Northwest which will receive the power from this particular project if present plans go through.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Have any of the utilities advocated building this project?

Mr. JACKSON. They have not. As the Senator knows, the private utility industry has its problems. When people belong to the association, they cannot always speak out.

I trust that answers the question.

Mr. BUSH. It was not a frivolous question.

Mr. JACKSON. No.

Mr. BUSH. I have received telegrams from private utility interests opposing the project. I wondered whether the Senator, who represents a Pacific Northwest State, had received any.

Mr. JACKSON. I have not received any telegram from any utility, to my knowledge, from the Pacific Northwest, opposing the project.

I know the utilities are interested in buying the power. It is contemplated that if the project goes through the Bonneville Power Administration will be able to give private utilities in the area a 10-year contract with no pull-back, a firm 10-year contract to buy all the equivalent power from the project.

Mr. BUSH. Would that be at competitive rates?

Mr. JACKSON. They would buy it at the same rate it would be sold to the Atomic Energy Commission or to Government projects. It is the same rate to private utilities and publicly owned utilities. The rate is $17.50 a kilowatt year.

Mr. BUSH. Is that competitive in that area?

Mr. JACKSON. It is the lowest rate in the entire area.

I am glad to have this opportunity of saying to the Senator that a lot of people have the idea that, because there are these big public power projects in the Pacific Northwest, power is sold only to publicly owned utilities. Over one-half of all the power generated from our public dams is sold directly to private utilities and private industry in the Pacific Northwest. I wish to emphasize that. That power is sold at low rates which are made possible by reason of the wise decisions to construct some of these projects years ago, when costs were lower.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. That statement applies also to the power from the Hanford reactor.

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. The same would apply to that power. It would not be sold only to preference customers.

Mr. JACKSON. The preference customers, as indicated by the testimony in the record, are to be taken care of for the next 10 years. Mr. Luce, the head of the Bonneville Power Administration, has indicated that, based on the present load factors and growth in the Pacific Northwest, if the Canadian Treaty goes through, as we all hope it will—it was approved by the Senate—and if the project is approved, Bonneville will be able to enter into firm contracts for a 10-year period to sell power in the amount equivalent to what would be made available if the facility is authorized.

Mr. President, the record shows that the private utility industry of the Northwest in all probability would be the principal purchasers of power from this project. The Bonneville Act, which governs sale of hydroelectricity by the Bonneville Administrator, requires that all power contracts with private utilities contain a 5-year cancellation clause. The purpose of this clause is to make the hydroelectricity generated at Federal projects available to preference customers at any time upon 5 years' notice.

The committee, in an effort to remove this issue from the arena of private versus public power debate, has recommended legislation which would permit the automatically generated electricity to be marketed by Bonneville to private utilities without a 5-year pull-back clause. The bill now before the Senate empowers the Bonneville Administrator to sell a block of firm atomic power equivalent to the output of Hanford—at least 750,000 kilowatts—to private utilities for such term of years as he can foresee that hydropower will meet the needs of its preference customers. Presently only 37 percent of the federally generated hydropower is going to preference customers. In the hearings on this bill, the Bonneville Power Administrator stated clearly that, with the Canadian Treaty, the needs of preference customers can be met from hydro for at least 10 years. This means that, with Hanford generating facilities, Bonneville can offer 750,000 kilowatts of atomic power, or a block of power equivalent in amount, to private utilities for periods of at least 10 years. Where is the harm to the utility industry in that?

I cannot take seriously the argument of certain opponents of this bill that it would set an appalling precedent for Federal steam-generation plants in other parts of the United States. The addition of generating facilities at Hanford to utilize the by-product steam would not set a precedent for single-purpose Federal steamplants. The question at Hanford is not whether AEC should generate steam energy—AEC must generate steam energy at NPR as part of the manufacture of plutonium for national defense. The real question at Hanford is whether, in the name of false ideology, we are going to waste this steam. I am astounded at the argument that it would be better to waste this steam than to convert it into kilowatts. Our Nation is not so wealthy, and never has been so wealthy, that it can afford intentional waste.

For all of these reasons, Mr. President, I urge that the Senate finish the job that we began 3 years ago when we authorized and appropriated $25 million to make NPR convertible to dual-purpose operation. I urge that we support the President's program and approve the Committee's recommendation to authorize construction of the dual-purpose reactor at Hanford.

While we are on this subject, I think the Members of the Senate should realize that we are subsidizing the private utility industry by making it possible for them to go into the nuclear power business. I have supported that. I am one who believes we should have both public and private distribution of power. I think it is healthy to have both.

As I brought out, over the period of the last 15 years the United States has expended $890 million for research in various programs; some to aid the privately owned utilities and some to aid the publicly owned utilities. There has been a large investment in connection with the broad research program of reactors, with information being made available to the utilities industry. I think Senators should realize that Uncle Sam has been investing heavily, in the form of subsidies, to aid the private utility industry in the nuclear power field.

I do not object to this process, but, on the other hand, I do not think it is proper to have people say that it is a terrible thing we are seeking to do, to capture heat being wasted to make power available to people who can utilize it in the area. I can visualize someone in the General Accounting Office, if we do not approve the project, saying, "The Senate considered this proposal and rejected it. What a foolish thing. The Atomic Energy Commission should have been producing power from the heat being wasted and dumped into the river."

Earlier I read in the RECORD the statement of Admiral Strauss that if he had had his way all of these projects would have been convertible into electric power.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question on that point?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Did Admiral Strauss testify that the power generated by the proposed facility should be used by the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. JACKSON. No, his testimony related solely to the question before the committee at the time, which was whether the new reactor authorized in 1958 should be convertible. He did not advocate that the one being authorized should be converted, but he said that if he had his way, they all would have been convertible from the beginning. We were not then dealing with the question of the production of electric power.

Mr. BUSH. I am trying to get the point clear in my mind. I gather from what the Senator has said that if Admiral Strauss had had an opportunity to testify on the bill, he would have supported it.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not say that he would have supported the pending measure. I cannot make that statement. All I can say is that he did testify in 1958 when we had before the committee the question of the authorization of a reactor, which included the provision to make the reactor convertible to produce electric power. His testimony, which I read into the RECORD, was to the effect that all the production reactors should be convertible.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is my understanding that the statements of Admiral Strauss and others—and I would not necessarily find myself in disagreement with the general principle—support the principle that experiments could well have been carried on with convertibility features in reactors. That point is not the sole point in this question. We are now considering the question of producing excess amounts of power and putting the Atomic Energy Commission into the commercial sale of power. That question is different from experimenting with the convertibility features in reactors.

Mr. JACKSON. In 1954 the Republican Congress passed section 44 of the Atomic Energy Commission Act, which provides for the sale of surplus power produced at the atomic plants. Why did the Congress insert that provision in the act?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will tell the Senator why.

Mr. JACKSON. Why?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As one of the authors of the act, I say that in experimenting in the atomic field it was seen that there might be a slight amount of electricity over and above what was necessary in conducting the experimental development. We provided for the sale of excess power in New England from the first reactor, and about $72 worth of excess power was sold. That was done to comply with the law. Those were not commercial reactors.

I do not have the statute before me, but I think the important language is to the effect that the power was incident to production.

The point before the Senate is whether, when we have heat waste available, we will say, "We will take sufficient of that heat to produce 10 kilowatts of electricity." I think the Government would be in a ridiculous position and could be accused of false economy if it did not take all of the heat available from that particular production facility.

Section 44 of the statute reads:

> SEC. 44. DISPOSITION OF ENERGY.—If energy is produced at production facilities of the Commission or is produced in experimental utilization facilities of the Commission, such energy may be used by the Commission, or transferred to other Government agencies, or sold to publicly, cooperatively, or privately owned utilities or users at reasonable and nondiscriminatory prices. If the energy produced is electric energy, the price shall be subject to regulation by the appropriate agency having jurisdiction. In contracting for the disposal of such energy, the Commission shall give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives or to privately owned utilities providing electric utility services to high cost areas not being served by public bodies or cooperatives. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Commission to engage in the sale or distribution of energy for commercial use except such energy as may be produced by the Commission incident to the operation of research and development facilities of the Commission, or of production facilities of the Commission.

I emphasize the beginning of section 44 of the statute:

> If energy is produced at production facilities of the Commission or is produced in experimental utilization of facilities——

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course, that provision is contained in the law. But the history of that entire legislation is that it was not contemplated that the Commission would go into the commercial production of power, but would produce it only incidentally in experimenting with heat transfer.

Mr. JACKSON. The statute does not use the word "experimenting." It reads, "produced at production facilities." The reactor is a dual purpose plant.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. One cannot experiment without producing. We have several plants that are purely experimental to test out the best methods of heat transfer, to test out the utility of a particular combination, and if, incidentally, extra power is produced, the act provides that it may be sold to whomever the Commission chooses to sell it.

Mr. JACKSON. Dual purpose reactors were proposed at that time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I know, but the proposed project is a commercial operation.

Mr. JACKSON. Would we sell 10 kilowatts to a private utility? The act that was passed in 1954 states clearly:

> If energy is produced at production facilities—

It is obvious that the Government itself is guilty of inefficiency if it does not capitalize and maximize the advantage that is in its favor. I think it is pretty clear.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was present when the act was written. Some members of the committee were in the minority. We got into difficulty over contracts that were made at that time. But at the very time when this problem was under consideration, the General Electric Co. proposed that the facility be made convertible and that power be developed from the resulting heat. We therefore wrote into——

Mr. JACKSON. The president of General Electric, Dr. Cordiner, in a speech in 1953 made the very proposal that has been called a model T project.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to speak of the act of 1954. We put two provisions in that act. One provision was—

> If energy was produced at production facilities.

That provision related to the proposal made by the General Electric Co. I refer now to the last part of the section 44:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Commission to engage in the sale or distribution of energy for commercial use except such energy as may be produced by the Commission incident to the operation of research and development facilities of the Commission or of production facilities of the Commission.

That provision referred directly to the Hanford situation.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct. For the reasons I have indicated, and the other reasons indicated today, I trust the Senate will vote down the motion to eliminate the so-called Hanford production dual purpose reactor facility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a number of editorials on this

subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, Mar. 31, 1961]

IMPRESSIVE HANFORD PROSPECTS

Last November, engineering consultants to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee reported to Congress on the probable economic feasibility of big-scale production of electricity as a byproduct of the giant plutonium reactor at Hanford. Their verdict was favorable.

This was one Government report which was not filed away and forgotten. Senator JACKSON and other members of the Atomic Energy Committee saw to that.

The possible byproduct benefits from the $145 million Hanford plant, still under construction, were forcefully presented to President Kennedy and other key members of the new administration.

The report, prepared by R. W. Beck & Associates, Seattle utility analyst and engineer, had suggested that, while there may be no present shortage of electric power in the Pacific Northwest, an additional 400,000 kilowatts will be needed by 1964.

The report assumed that demand would outstrip supply unless additional power were generated from other sources.

Last week, JACKSON told Mr. Kennedy that spending an additional $95 million on the Hanford project would make the new plutonium plant the biggest nuclear-power producer in the world.

JACKSON said the reactor, due for completion in October 1962, could begin producing electricity by October 1964, if the committee's proposal were approved.

By using heat otherwise wasted, the plant could produce 700,000 kilowatts, one-third the capacity of Grand Coulee Dam.

The President was impressed, and included the proposed additional facilities in his revised budget request to Congress.

This week, the office of Charles F. Luce, new Director of the Bonneville Power Administration, described some of the quickly forthcoming benefits for the Pacific Northwest if Congress approves the request.

The BPA said it will put up to 400,000 kilowatts of firm power for industry on the market immediately if construction of the additional facilities is authorized this year.

The use of this additional power could provide direct employment for 3,400 persons and some 10,000 jobs in electrochemical-processing plants and related operations.

In addition, the BPA said, the new Hanford facilities would mean $12 million in locally purchased supplies, $7 million for power, $10 million in freight, and $1½ million in State and local taxes.

Benefits in international prestige and in enduring regional economic progress are incalculable.

We hope for early congressional approval of this proposed giant forward step in the peaceable use of atomic energy.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, June 16, 1961.]

RICKOVER APPROVES HANFORD REACTOR

A dual-purpose reactor at the Hanford Atomic Works has met approval of Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover, Senator JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, said yesterday.

Rickover told the Joint Atomic Energy Committee yesterday he was in favor of converting the reactor so that it could generate electrical power and plutonium. Waste heat now dumped in the Columbia River would be used to produce power.

Conversion of the reactor would cost $95 million.

[From the Wenatchee (Wash.) Daily World, July 14, 1961]

VOTE FOR HANFORD REACTOR IS VOTE TO END WASTE

The opposition to the plan to use byproduct heat of the Hanford plutonium plant to produce electricity appears to be more a case of sectional jealousy than anything else.

The House Republican Policy Committee this week decided the party would oppose conversion of the reactor as a matter of policy.

It was killed temporarily at least by a House vote yesterday.

Ostensibly the reason was opposition to generation of electric power in competition with private utilities.

This may be true in a general sense. A private power magazine, "Electrical World," opposes the reactor because it would set "an appalling precedent." What it means is that atomic electricity should be set aside as a monopoly of private business.

In this specific instance, however, private utilities have been invited to do the job and have never responded.

The chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee pretty well hit the private-public power nail on the head when, during debate yesterday, he accused private power company officials of taking a "dog-in-the-manger attitude in buttonholing Members of Congress to oppose the project."

The chairman, Representative HOLIFIELD, of California, was quoted by the Associated Press, as saying "They [private power firms] don't want to see this heat used. They want to see it wasted."

The sectionalism cropped up in the stated fear that the Northwest's low-cost electric power would lure industries to the Northwest—industries that an Ohio Congressman noted might otherwise locate in Ohio.

The coal industry got into the act when the representative of coal-producing West Virginia opposed the project as Government subsidization of a fuel competitive with coal. He said, incidentally, that creation of steam to produce electric power is now the biggest single market of the coal industry.

This particular case is one where expenditure of money now will avoid waste. Since the start of the atomic age, heat from plutonium reactors at Hanford has been wasted into the Columbia River. The proposal is to use this wasted heat to generate 900,000 kilowatts of electricity. This would not only supply power to the Northwest, but revenues from sale of that power would lower the costs of producing plutonium.

It's going to be hard for the Congressmen who voted against the authorization to justify their opposition to transforming wastefulness into productiveness.

[From the Tri City Herald, Pasco, Wash., June 19, 1961]

(Reprinted from the Longview Daily News)

HANFORD POWER CONTROVERSY

At Hanford in eastern Washington plutonium is produced in a Government plant in vast quantities. The process generates tremendous amounts of heat which now is dissipated in a cooling system utilizing Columbia River water. This heat, engineers have long realized, could be used to produce a large amount of electricity if it could be harnessed.

So a way to harness it was devised. A dual-purpose reactor was designed which would produce enough heat from atomic energy to generate 700,000 kilowatts of power in an adjacent steamplant. The cost of this reactor is large—$95 million. Only the Federal Government could make such an expenditure. Whether it should make the expenditure is a controversy generating considerable political heat.

The politics involved is an old story—private versus public power. Private power, speaking through the Edison Electric Institute, which represents 192 private utilities, tells Congress the Federal Government could better spend its money elsewhere. Furthermore a Hanford steamplant "would set a dangerous and unnecessary precedent."

Public power, speaking through the American Public Power Association, ridicules the contention that the precedent of atomic-power development at Hanford would be dangerous. It notes that the installation would be the world's largest atomic-power plant and as such would enhance U.S. prestige. It would generate as much power as a Columbia River dam and would provide a block of firm power that Northwest industry is going to need.

Yesterday those fighting for the Hanford project won an important victory. The Joint Atomic Energy subcommittee, of which Senator JACKSON has long been a member, approved the appropriation. The next step is for the committee as a whole to approve it and then for the matter to go to the House and Senate. With administration backing, it should have no great difficulty in getting approval there, although the private-power faction can be expected to continue its fight.

What this group objects to is the Federal Government doing the pioneering in this field rather than private industry. It fears that this would be only the first of a series of giant Federal plants that would put the Government in the power business on a national basis and ultimately perhaps force private utilities out of business altogether.

Similar objections were raised 30 years ago when private power fought Grand Coulee Dam. It is a losing battle.

[From the Columbia Basin News, Pasco, Wash., June 26, 1961]

POWER REACTOR GIVES NORTHWEST A BOOST

Benefits of adding power generating facilities to the new production reactor at Hanford would be tremendous to the Northwest.

Congress, asked to authorize the $95 million for the project, is weighing these factors:

The plant would add 550,000 kilowatts of prime power to Bonneville Power Administration's load-carrying capacity starting in 1964.

This would enable BPA to offer for immediate sale 400,000 kilowatts of firm power for large-scale industrial development and make it possible to add $7 million annually to Bonneville revenues.

It would enable new industries with capital investment of $150 million to be established to expand the economic growth of the region and the Nation.

The reactor would provide important data relative to the operation of a large power reactor and would aid in the conservation of resources.

Additionally, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON has described the reactor as "an ever-present sword producing plutonium economically which can be changed into a plowshare simply by shutting off production of plutonium and producing power only." Should arms control fail, it could immediately be changed back into a sword.

The administration has lined up solidly in favor of the reactor's conversion to dual-purpose status. Opposition mainly is from private power interests which fear that a precedent will be set for Federal development of atomic power.

The ultraconservative Houston Chronicle calls it "the beginning of socialization or nationalization of the power industry in the United States, for any output from Hanford would be heavily subsidized. This is the damning implication seen in the present effort to set a precedent by creating the first large block of Federal thermal power outside the TVA."

Charles F. Luce, administrator of BPA, denies this. Luce said that power from the reactor would be relatively low-cost, about $13 per kilowatt-year, during the first 8 years when the reactor would be producing both plutonium and power. This compares with average firm power sales of about $15.50 per kilowatt-year on BPA's 1960 rates.

Cost of power at the reactor when it begins producing power only will be substantially higher, Luce said. But he added that by 1972 most of the economical hydro in the Northwest will have been developed and the cost of power from the reactor still should compare favorably with estimates of alternative thermal and hydroelectric power that will be available.

Conservatives who fear the precedent-setting aspect of the conversion should take note of the fact that during the Eisenhower administration that $25 million was authorized to build convertibility features into the reactor. The $25 million, Luce and JACKSON warn, will be a total waste unless the steam generating plant is built.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the proposal for development of electric power generating facilities at the Hanford plutonium works is a sound and far-reaching conservation project. Aside from the dollar value of the 700,000 kilowatts it would produce, installation of turbines at Hanford would go a long way toward relieving the pressure for construction of dams on tributaries of the Columbia River where concrete barriers threaten existence of migratory fish runs.

A distinguished Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. William Douglas, recently addressed the City Club in Portland, Oreg. Many members of that club are members of the private utility industry. They are an important adjunct to the business of our community. They found themselves listening carefully to Justice Douglas' remarks when he said:

> Even though we foresee within the next decade a power shortage in the Northwest, we should build no more concrete barriers on our wonderful streams and rivers until the fish problem is solved. If we can supplement our power needs with atomic energy, we are going a long way toward aiding and abetting that area of conservation.

Regardless of what has been said on the floor of the Senate today by some opponents of the Hanford plant, the power requirements of the Pacific Northwest continue to grow at rapid pace. If the power cannot be obtained at Hanford, then we must turn to dam construction at Bruces Eddy and Penny Cliffs on the Clearwater River or at other sites where the toll of fish and wildlife values would be heavy.

An editorial on the Hanford plant in the Oregonian points out:

> Ever since it went into operation during World War II it has been dissipating into the (Columbia) river enough heat to boil enough water to produce enough steam to spin turbines generating enough electricity to rival the output of Bonneville Dam.

Thus, Mr. President, we are wasting tremendous quantities of energy by failure to harness this heat.

Mr. President, regardless of comments which are being made in opposition, it seems to me that we lay people, who are not electrical engineers and not experienced in the great world of nuclear fission, must listen to some of the competent experts who testified before the committee. As I read the report, there is a unanimity in their belief that this is a worthwhile project. I listened also to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] when he said that there is no international prestige connected with our development of the atomic energy plant. I quote from the report:

> The capacity of the plant would far exceed the capacity of any other single reactor plant in the world to generate electrical energy.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I remember listening, from the gallery of the Senate, some time ago when the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] reported on his visit to the Soviet Union. He said that in the Soviet Union there was a great race to develop power facilities in every way. He mentioned hydroelectric power developments specifically. However, if we can augment our power facilities by atomic energy, it seems to me it behooves us to do so.

Moreover, fish biologists have concluded that the increase in water temperature of the Columbia River below Hanford, which results from use of the river water as a coolant in the plutonium works, has been inimical to migratory salmon and steelhead. The experts have found a direct relationship between the incidence of disease in these salmonoids and higher temperature of the river water. Disease is the cause of heavy fish losses in the Columbia in recent years.

It is apparent that installation of generating facilities at Hanford would serve the cause of conservation in many ways. I ask consent to include with my remarks the editorial from the Oregonian of July 13, 1961.

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

LET'S KEEP IT SIMPLE

The House of Representatives probably will vote this week on the administration-backed plan to convert the vast amounts of heat energy now being wasted into the Columbia River at the Hanford plant into some 700,000 kilowatts of electrical energy. And the private utility industry is summoning its energies in a determined effort to kill this portion of the 1962 atomic energy authorization bill.

The motive of the electrical utilities is plain. They simply do not want the Atomic Energy Commission to join the Interior Department, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority in the business of generating power for Uncle Sam to sell in competition with private industry. But there is a large flaw in their argument that placing generators at Hanford would give the Federal Government a new foot in the door of the power business.

Hanford is, and probably will continue to be, essentially a plutonium-producing plant. Ever since it went into operation during World War II it has been dissipating into the river enough heat to boil enough water to produce enough steam to spin turbines generating enough electricity to rival the output of Bonneville Dam. It is wrong to permit this waste to continue, when with a relatively small investment there can be added to the Northwest power pool the equivalent of the electrical energy yield of a major new hydroelectric project.

A number of extraneous arguments are being used by debaters on both sides of the issue, complicating it needlessly. For example, some backers of the proposal have said the Nation needs a dual-purpose, plutonium and power-producing reactor to put the United States on the same footing in disarmament negotiations with Russia, which has a similar facility. Should an agreement be reached, it is said, Hanford's plutonium output could be halted, while power production continued. Then if the Russians welshed on the bargain, a startup of plutonium production at Hanford would be possible in a few days, whereas a shutdown, plutonium-only reactor could not be restarted for some time.

But the Electrical World, spokesman for the industry, argues editorially that the existence of dual purpose reactors hinders rather than aids disarmament negotiations. Unless both nations agree to shut down their plutonium plants completely, says the magazine, neither could be sure the other was not cheating.

The Hanford plan actually is a simple one, and it should not be feared either by the private utilities or the peacemakers. Since the plant is unique, it is not a "foot in the door" for the AEC, which certainly will build no new federally owned and operated atomic powerplants unless Congress wants them. All that the bill will do is to conserve a resource now being wasted, for the benefit of all Pacific Northwest residents, whether served by private or public power utilities. It should be enacted.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the pending motion. During the debate I have listened with intense interest to the knowledgeable Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who presents this measure and who manages it during the floor debate. I have given equal attention to the opposition viewpoint as expressed principally by the well-informed Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. I agree with the latter Member of the Senate, particularly in the point that Members of the Senate should be, insofar as possible, conversant with the subject matter, complex as it may be, which is being considered in this forum this afternoon.

I have studied the report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which accompanied both the House and Senate bills, to authorize the appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission. I have also evaluated the separate views of the competent members of the minority on this subject.

I have had the benefit of reading and rereading the report of the debate in the House on the amendment which was adopted in that body, to delete the $95 million item for the addition of generating facilities to the new production reactor at Hanford, Wash.

I say very frankly that I have some reservations concerning certain aspects of the proposed dual-purpose, convertible-type reactor project which the Atomic Energy Commission requested and which the majority of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee has recommended. However, weighing the arguments for and against, as presented in

the committee report, the separate views of the minority, and the vigorous debate in the House, I cannot embrace the opposition's attacks on the project's economic justification; nor can I join in the minority's views deprecating such valid considerations as national defense, as mentioned by the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the international prestige aspects, and certainly the technological benefits which would accrue. I much prefer to be associated with the committee majority's findings on the point at issue.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I take the opportunity to express appreciation for the objective way in which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has approached the whole problem. It is quite clear that he has spent considerable time in studying the pros and cons of the proposal and has tried to approach the entire question in a judicial frame of mind. I commend him for his attitude of considering the proposal as a national project, one which affects the whole country and, in fact, has a real impact on our foreign policy. I commend him most highly for the statement he is making.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am grateful for the comment of the diligent Senator from Washington. This has been a difficult problem for me.

Certainly I cannot hold with the minority that the installation of power generating facilities in the new production reactor at Hanford would be contrary to the spirit, intent, and specific language of section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

What concerns me more than any other element of this controversy is that the proposal apparently has elicited an argument over whether the installation of power generating facilities at Hanford, Wash., would benefit one region to the detriment of others, and that the whole industry would suffer severe damage.

If, every time we have before us an authorization for a new Government installation or facility, we bring up the question of benefit for the region, and then seek to defeat the proposal on the reasoning that it would benefit that region and thereby create damage to all others, there will be a stalemate, a lack of progress.

It does not necessarily follow that it is improper to assist a given region of the Nation. Ours is a Union of States, an amalgamation of regions. More often than not, that which is good for a region likewise has the capacity to benefit the country as a whole. I believe it is becoming more apparent, as time passes, that many of the problems of our Republic will have to be solved on a region-by-region basis, before the whole of the country can become strong and basically prosperous.

Accordingly, based on regional benefit considerations, I do not view the Hanford proposal with any more alarm than Senators from the Northwest viewed the area development legislation when it was passed by the Senate. I entertain some misgivings, however, concerning the direct sale of power by the Atomic Energy Commission to industrial consumers.

I believe it is most unfortunate that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy minority included in its views the assertion that "this project would have serious adverse effects on other natural resource industries," thereby implying that the generation of 700,000 kilowatts of electric energy would, in essence, deprive the coal industry of markets for the equivalent of 2,300,000 tons of coal production. Expressed in terms of mining employment, the minority seeks to leave the impression that the Hanford generating facility, utilizing waste steam from an atomic reactor, would take 191,360 man-days of gainful employment away from coal miners. No one would wish more than the Senator from West Virginia now addressing the Senate to see a development take place which would increase coal production by 2,300,000 tons and provide 191,360 man-days of gainful employment in the coalfields of not only West Virginia but also of Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and many other States, in both bituminous and anthracite production.

It is a tragic play upon words to imply that if the Hanford reactor heat is wasted, rather than turbinized to generate electric power, there will somehow be created in that region a market for 2,319,000 tons of coal, utilizing 191,360 man-days of employment, to provide 700,000 kilowatts of generating capacity. As was said during the House debate by a Member from a northwestern State:

> The Pacific Northwest buys almost no coal to produce power; and when the time comes that it does, I doubt if much coal will be purchased in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, or Kentucky.

He added—and I reluctantly but forthrightly concur in his comment:

> To argue that disapproval of the Hanford powerplant will help the hard-pressed miners of the Appalachian region is to foster a cruel illusion. The depressed coal mining areas should not be persuaded to seek to solve their problems by blind opposition to any and all power projects which do not employ coal as fuel.

I add, parenthetically, that even the chief private power company proponent of "coal by wire," the Appalachian Electric Power Co., recently changed its power concept. The base product in its electric steamplants still is coal. But recently this splendid and successful firm started construction of a hydroelectric plant on the Roanoke River in Virginia, adjacent to a bituminous coalfield of major proportions.

According to a newspaper account in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, of June 24, 1961:

> In every respect the hydroproject is big. Appalachian will spend $50 million in generating capacity of 440,000 kilowatts. An ingenious concept in waterpower generation will be put to work on Roanoke River. It is called pumped storage, wherein water is released through the generators of the upper dam during daylight peakload periods and pumped back from the lower lake during the night and on weekends when power needs are low. The Roanoke doesn't carry enough water to keep the plant in operation on a sustained year-round basis except through the pumping and reuse process. When completed, the project will be the largest of its type in the world. But its size and modern characteristics in no way mean that Appalachian is divorcing itself from coal. Power engineers say it's much cheaper to operate a hydroplant for 6 hours and close it down than pour coal into the boilers of a steamplant 24 hours a day and let it remain idle 18 hours. Power generation starts instantly when a hydroplant is put in operation, but it would take hours to start making electricity in a coal-fired plant if it were closed down.

Mr. President, I believe that part of the article to be most revealing.

Mr. President, I have cited this new private power project by a company operating in the heart of the bituminous coalfields to demonstrate that even one of coal's biggest customers and advocates, the Appalachian Electric Power Co., finds it advantageous to operate a combination-type plant utilizing both coal and water to generate electricity.

Yet there is private power and some coal industry opposition to the Government's using waste heat from an atomic reactor to generate power.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my energetic friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I am very much interested in the fine speech the Senator from West Virginia is making. I know he has given this matter far greater consideration than I have been able to; and from his speech it is quite clear that he has given careful study to the committee reports and to the testimony which has been taken. All of us know his devotion to the coal industry, by reason of the economy of his own State.

I have a very similar problem—one not quite so critical, but critical enough, as everyone knows—in both the hard coalfields and the soft coalfields of Pennsylvania.

I have had some doubt in my own mind as to whether I should support the committee, and, therefore, should vote against this amendment. But I may say that my doubts have been entirely resolved by the very cogent argument made by the Senator from West Virginia.

I ask him whether it is his considered view that in the greater national interest it is important to permit the Government to move ahead with the full development of this reactor program, in order that we may keep pace with our opponents in the Communist world in the development of atomic energy for both private and public purposes; and whether it is also his view that in serving that national interest, we are not doing any serious damage to the coal industry in either West Virginia or Pennsylvania.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In response to the first part of the question asked by my able colleague, I would say that, frankly, I wish we might not always be concerned with attempting to match the Communist world in any field. Sometimes that is necessary when we are caught short

and have to move more quickly than we ordinarily would have done. But I hope that in the future we shall be able in greater degree to press forward on our own initiative and responsibility, without attempting to meet the so-called challenge from the Soviet Union.

Mr. CLARK. I agree completely with everything the Senator from West Virgina has said. My view is that even if there were no Communists controlling a large part of the Eurasian land mass, we should nonetheless go forward effectively with this program, in our efforts to advance Western civilization. But I believe the Senator from West Virginia will agree that the practical matter of competing with the Russians gives us an additional reason for taking this step, anyway.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Certainly it does. The Senator from Pennsylvania is a realist, and I join him in the approach he makes to this subject.

Furthermore, in my considered conviction—although I do not pose as an expert; and sometimes I think Senators are too much inclined, because of their service on certain committees, to regard themselves too highly as experts; and I may say, facetiously, that an expert is one who is seldom right, but never is in doubt——

Mr. CLARK. And an expert is also said to be one who is removed a considerable distance from his home territory.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

As I have said, I do not assume the role of an expert. But certainly I have had considerable knowledge of the bituminous coal industry, ever since my childhood. But I did serve as chairman of the Coal Subcommittee of the Committee on Mines and Mining, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives. I have been constantly very close to the developments within the coal industry including coal research and synthetic liquid fuels. I say to the Senate, on this authority as a careful student of the subject, that I believe no appreciable damage and likely no damage will be done to the coal industry, either in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield further to me?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his candid answer to my question. I observe that if the Senator from West Virginia is only a student, certainly he is at the very least a postgraduate student.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator very much.

The chief proponent in the House of the deletion of the $95 million for the Hanford generating facility said flatly that such a plant would displace coal, and implied that it would wipe out 191,360 man-days of mining employment or 37,911 coal cars. If this were true, I would be duty bound to vote against the $95 million item. But the gentleman's statement is off target, because coal has not been displaced, and eastern coal and coal-hauling railroads probably never will serve the region which would be serviced by electric power generated at Hanford.

Another paradox developed during House debate when one Member opposing the Hanford power-plant authorization said:

> Seven hundred thousand kilowatts of generating capacity * * * would provide energy equivalent to that produced by 2.3 million tons of coal a year, if the same quantity of electricity were generated in a modern steam plant.

But he revealed that coal really is not in the electric energy picture in that region when he remarked:

> Taxpaying public utilities in the Northwest are building, or seeking authorization to build, hydroelectric plants which will meet the power demands of that area for at least 10 years.

In other words, Mr. President, opponents of the power generating facility for the Hanford project use sympathy for the depressed condition of the coal industry as a crutch, but know full well that the crutch will not be employed to aid the sick coal industry in that region where abundant water resources are utilized primarily to generate electricity.

Representing as I do the leading bituminous coal-producing State, I have an obligation to protect coal's legitimate interests. I have sought consistently to do so, and I will continue that course of action. But I have not and will not be a party to distortion, nor will I associate myself with it.

I note the fact that the committee minority and the opponents of the Hanford power project emphasize the point that "the NPR will yield only low pressure, saturated steam, better suited to the boiler of an old-fashioned locomotive than to a modern turbine generator," and remark that "this represents retrogression rather than progress as far as power production is concerned."

This, to me, is not impressive testimony against the proposed powerplant installation, because I sincerely believe it is more retrogressive to waste the great quantity of heat to be produced by the reactor than to channel it through a system which will generate usable energy in a region where the exploding population consequences and power requirements will doubtless be a significant factor in the future.

Mr. President, in connection with this controversy, I am sure Members of the Senate have read many editorials and have carefully evaluated their contents. Today, an editorial was referred to by the devoted Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. At this time I wish to refer to an editorial which was published in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, a newspaper which I believe is usually very conservative. Certainly it is an excellent newspaper; and, by and large, it covers its news articles from a news viewpoint, and reserves to its editorial page the comments which represent the views and opinions of its editors.

On this controversy, Mr. President, I find that I am generally in agreement with the editors of the usually conservative Evening Star, of Washington, D.C. We do no experience togetherness in many issues; but insofar as relates to this subject, I was much impressed by the Star's arguments for the $95 million item in the authorization for the Hanford facility. I refer to that newspaper's lead editorial of Saturday, July 15, 1961, entitled "The Hanford Issue."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

THE HANFORD ISSUE

The House used poor judgment in rejecting, by a vote of 176 to 140, the proposal to convert the new reactor at Hanford, Wash., into a dual-purpose facility capable of producing not only plutonium for weapons, but also between 700,000 and 800,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for peaceful uses.

Unless the Senate reverses the House action, and the item is then restored in conference, the reactor—which is in the process of being built and which will be completed next year—will serve only a strictly military purpose. Yet, as it produces the plutonium, it will give off a byproduct of great potential economic value. This will be a tremendous quantity of heat that could be so utilized as to make the facility, wholly apart from its weapons role, by far the biggest of the world's present atomic electrical powerplants.

The proposal turned down by the House would create this facility by investing $95 million in equipping the reactor (which would more than pay for itself) to harness the heat and turn the resultant electricity into the Bonneville network for distribution—largely through private utility systems—in the Pacific Northwest. But the private utilities have lobbied vigorously against the idea, and so have coal interests, and it has been defeated primarily on the ground that it would put the Atomic Energy Commission in the public power business and thus constitute another socialistic encroachment on free enterprise.

In the debate on the issue, however, Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, has pretty well demolished these and kindred arguments. He has shown, for example, that the basic law governing the AEC specifically authorizes the sort of power output that the dual-purpose reactor would generate. He has made clear, too, that such a reactor at Hanford could not hurt the coal industry, and would actually make additional electricity available to private utilities "at a very cheap price." And Representative ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, has backed up Mr. HOLIFIELD with this telling point: "* * * the installation of the electric generating facilities at the Hanford reactor is in the best interest of all of the American people. What could be more justified than to convert into electricity—at no cost to the taxpayers—the tremendous amounts of reactor heat which otherwise will be wasted? To blow this steam into the air or use it to heat up the Columbia River surely would be regarded by people everywhere as an incredible extravagance."

Everything considered, the weight of logic and commonsense rests heavily on the side of those who advocate the dual-purpose facility. Accordingly, we hope that the Senate will support the proposal and that the House will reconsider what it has done and enable the project to go forward.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my very genial friend.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to say to the Senator from West Virginia that I appreciate what he has said about the editorial. I had clipped it from that newspaper, and had hoped that I might put it into today's RECORD. I am glad he has done so, because I regard it as an exceptionally fine statement of the situation, by a newspaper which has not in the past taken a position in favor of public power or private power or anything of that nature, but has viewed such matters in the way that any good citizen would—as is demonstrated by the editorial.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I associate myself with the expressions of my courageous colleague from New Mexico. I refer to the editorial, which said in its final paragraph:

> Everything considered, the weight of logic and commonsense rests heavily on the side of those who advocate the dual-purpose facility. Accordingly, we hope that the Senate will support the proposal and that the House will reconsider what it has done and enable the project to go forward.

I, too, believe that, on balance, the merits of the position of the proponents of the dual-purpose facility at Hanford outweigh the arguments of the opponents. It is not my view that this project is the threat to the coal industry—as I said earlier in response to the Senator from Pennsylvania—that some of our friends contend. And if I believed it to be a serious extension of public power into an area which should be reserved exclusively for private enterprise, I would oppose it. This, in my opinion, is not a ground on which to wage a private-versus-public power fight. It is a sensible project predicated on principles of conservation and proper utilization of heat which should not be wasted. To reject this project and not utilize the heat produced by the Hanford reactor is to indulge in unwarranted waste.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. It was with great interest that I heard the discourse of the Senator from West Virginia on this subject. One question occurred to me as he was making his summary, and that has to do with the repetition of the statement of his belief that this item does not affect adversely the coal industry. The question I should like to ask the Senator is this: If this installation were located within 100 miles of the State of West Virginia, would that conclusion be in any way altered?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would take a look at it, just as I have taken a look at this subject. I would say that in my look, I would attempt to be objective, just as I have attempted to be objective in this matter. And I accord to the able Senator who asked the question the same feeling that, if a project were perhaps close to a productive value within his own State, that he would give it a careful survey and appraisal.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am sure I would. I imagine that is so. But is not the subject sufficiently within the knowledge of the Senator from West Virginia that he can answer the question more definitely than by simply saying he would look at it? After all, that kind of answer is usually given to a question involving unknown factors. If the Senator wants some additional factors to make the question more specific and definite, that is fine.

Assuming the exact situation were duplicated, with the presently known components, and the plant were located within 100 miles of West Virginia, what would the conclusion of the Senator from West Virginia be as to whether or not it would adversely affect the coal industry?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from West Virginia will say again—and he is in no wise evasive—he would take a look at the project at the time it was proposed. He would do just as the Senator from Nebraska would do—he would meet each problem as it was considered in this Chamber.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure the Senator realizes that there is a difference between a plant for the production of atomic energy in the middle of a coal belt and one elsewhere. It is a fact that there is unlimited water in the Columbia and other large rivers, but they need some firming up, which makes such an operation economic in that sense, where it might be uneconomic in other areas. Also, great installations for atomic energy are using coal. We do the thing that is desirable in the locality concerned. That is why we did what we did in the Portsmouth plant and other plants that we judged to be wise in those parts of the country. We judge the question by what is wise in a particular area of the country.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is so correct. He has made a valid statement.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Ellensburg Daily Record, of Ellensburg, Wash. It is entitled "Hanford Order Big Help," in which it is indicated that 100,000 tons of coal, under a contract with the Northern Pacific mines at Roslyn by the Hanford Atomic Energy Commission, will keep some 100 miners in that area employed during the coming year.

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

HANFORD ORDER BIG HELP

> The awarding of a 120,000-ton coal contract to the Northern Pacific mines at Roslyn by the Hanford Atomic Energy Commission will keep some 100 of northern Kittitas County miners employed during the coming year. These Hanford orders have really helped over the years. Without them the probabilities are that the Northern Pacific would have completely shut down the mining operation.
>
> With these orders the railroad company is able to keep the mines opened but undoubtedly on a nonprofit basis or a substantial loss. And everyone realizes if all the mines were shut down, some would become water filled and it would be a most difficult task to reopen them, in case the coal-fired steamplant is ever built at Lake Cle Elum. It is known that without that hope, the railroad company would have closed the mines, so everything that can be done to keep the mines operating, is a step in the program for the future.
>
> Congressman Hal Holmes did a fine job in getting the first coal order for the atomic plant, and he kept it up as long as he was in Congress while Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY has kept up the good work since she went to Washington.
>
> Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON have also helped. So once again the mining field looks with some hope for the year ahead.
>
> J.C.K.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think we are having a very important debate here today. When I visited Hanford 2 years ago, the thought that was impressed most upon my mind was, "Why is this tremendous amount of steam energy being allowed to go to waste in a country that is constantly seeking for new sources of power?"

There were, however, many unanswered questions at that time. I did not know whether it could be economically produced or not. I did not know whether there would be a use for it within an economic transmission distance. I did not know what the effect on the economy in that part of the country, or the whole country, might be.

In sitting in on some of the hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, some of these questions have been answered. Some of them have been answered and clarified during the course of the debate on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. President, there has arisen a serious regret in my mind, and that regret is that this great source of power—seven or eight hundred thousand kilowatts of it—is not located in my State or my part of the country, where we could make use of it. We do not have much in the way of large sources of power in the Northeast. We do have the St. Lawrence development now. We have the Niagara development. I am happy to say my State has been able to purchase from New York 150,000 kilowatts of power. This power, purchased at the price of 7½ or 8 mills laid down in Vermont, has been an economic lifesaver in my State. It has been a godsend to the utility companies in the State, if I can judge by the dividends and earnings of those companies. It is fairly divided between private utility companies, municipal plants of the State, and cooperative organizations. We have been able to substantially reduce the cost of electric bills in our State.

So when I say that I regret that this source of power at Hanford is not available to us in the Northeast, I mean what I say.

I might remark to the Senator from Nebraska that if this plant were located within 100 miles of my State, I would just say, "Glory, hallelujah," and ask for our share of it immediately, and hope we would get it.

Mr. President, I cannot get very much worried about the maximum estimate of production cost. The highest cost figure I have heard in connection with this development is 3½ mills per kilowatt-hour. I come from an area in which the lowest cost power, from modern plants, is 7 mills at the bus bar and the wholesale

price to the distribution systems is approximately 14 mills. I cannot become too excited about a cost of 3½ mills. I realize that the 3½ mills is the top estimate.

Mr. President, I think that this country of ours is going through an electrical revolution. So long as the power is not directly available to my State, I have to consider what action I shall take with respect to it in terms of national supply and national requirements. Our national requirements are doubling about every 7 or 8 years. The use of electrical energy in the rural areas is doubling about every 5 years. It is now estimated that by 1970 a trillion kilowatt-hours of electrical energy will be needed to meet the requirements of this country. We have to learn where we shall get the power.

I have said that we are undergoing an electrical revolution in this country. Necessity has forced us into that revolution. No longer can we depend on large numbers of small powerplants generating from 10,000 kilowatts to 30,000 or 50,000 kilowatts. Today the thinking is in terms of electrical plants from 200,000 or 300,000 kilowatts up to a million kilowatts or more. There are several plants in this country today with over 1 million kilowatt capacity. I believe in the future we shall have to depend on those larger sources of electrical energy, which are much more economic and competitive than all the small plants we could possibly build. We could not build enough small plants to meet the demand.

When the large plants are established, they will have to be connected by new types of transmission lines which will carry electricity much longer distances than is today feasible with no more line loss and no more cost than we have today.

We shall need all of the power we are likely to get from any source. It can be said that there is an adequate supply, of course. There is an adequate supply in any area in which the price is so high that the people cannot buy it or use it and remain in competition with people in other parts of the country.

We shall see these new large developments. Possibly they will be farther apart than the small generating plants are today. We shall have to develop the remaining feasible sources of hydropower in this country. We shall have to make nuclear power electric energy generated from the atom competitive, and I believe we are going to be able to do that within the next 6 or 7 years.

I believe, also, that we shall see very large electrical plants located near the coal mines, where they ought to be located, with new transmission systems extending throughout the country.

I noticed the other day an article stating that one of the private utilities is transmitting 1 million volts of power over a line. I am not sure it was not more power than that. This demonstrates the progress we are making. We will need all the power we can get.

Inasmuch as we are considering the proposal today from a position of national requirements and national supply, it seems to me that even if the cost should reach 3 mills it would be an economic proposition.

I understand that 400,000 of the 700,000 or 800,000 kilowatts which would be generated at Hanford would be used in the atomic energy experiment and plant, to supplant the power which now has to be purchased from the Bonneville Power Administration. This will permit the Bonneville Power Administration to sell much larger amounts of firm power to private, public, and cooperative systems in that area.

I realize that most of the private utility companies which say anything at all about the project are in opposition to it. I believe that is a shortsightedness. I believe when these great sources of power are developed the utilities will gain tremendously. Their business will be on a more sound basis. If they are really worried about nationalization of the power industry in the United States, the way to get it is to keep the country on a short supply.

After summing up all of the arguments for and against this proposal, I believe we would be justified in voting to develop the 700,000 or 800,000 kilowatts of power, which will add that much more to a national supply which certainly will have to be doubled within the next few years.

I believe also that all those who are engaged in the distribution of power today—private, public, or cooperative—will gain by increasing the supply of electrical energy in this country even if it may not be, as we say, "in our own backyard."

I reiterate: I wish this plant were within economic transmission distance of my State. It is not. I feel that by adding to the national supply our area is bound to get indirect if not direct benefits from it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I know there is a disposition to vote. I have been over this problem a great many times before, and I do not intend to spend too much time on it now.

I commend the Senator from Vermont for what he has said. It is typical of the analysis the Senator gave in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, when he carefully tried to bring out the facts connected with the project.

It is a fact that if we do not approve this proposal we shall waste 11 million pounds of steam per hour. This persuaded many people the project ought to be approved, in the interest of conservation.

If there were available in many parts of our country 11 million pounds of steam per hour, think of what it might do for industry. That is the answer I intended to give for the Senator from West Virginia a moment ago. It is a question of where it is available. We have the steam now, and it is being wasted. The only use to which it is being put is to be dumped into the Columbia River to warm the waters of the river. A better use can be found for it, and should be found for it.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] put into the RECORD some tables which I intended to have printed, but I am glad he did so, because they point out that the Atomic Energy Commission is spending money for assistance to private industry and has done so for many years. I do not regret that. I am delighted by it.

The Atomic Energy Commission gave to the Yankee Atomic Electric Company $3,669,000 as a waiver of fuel use charges and another $5 million for operating funds.

The Atomic Energy Commission made available for the Power Reactor Development Co. $3,703,000 as a waiver of fuel use charges and $3.6 million of operating funds for research and development.

The Atomic Energy Commission has gone through a whole list, providing almost $100 million of contributions directly to the private utilities. I think that is a fine thing, because from it has come the development in the industry which has been very much worthwhile.

The assistance has not been confined to that alone. The Atomic Energy Commission went to the State of Nebraska, in which State the Consumers Public Power District is a great cooperative which takes care of a great many people. It is building a plant, at a cost of some $28 million. It provided $8 million as a waiver of fuel use charges. It provided $16 million in operating funds. That is the total of over $52 million for that organization alone, in the State of Nebraska.

That is not all. Over the country a tremendous amount of money has been spent for research and development as well as for authorized construction.

In the civilian reactor field, $475 million has been made available for research and develment; $259,800,000 of construction was authorized which, totaled with all other items, brings the total of Federal funds for civilian reactors to $890,500,000.

This proposal is a business venture, and, if I wanted a better witness, I could not find one than John McCone, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I visited with him on Sunday concerning this subject, and I learned that he thought then, as I have known him to think before, that the Hanford reactor should be converted and electricity should be developed. Not wishing to trust my memory, I called Mr. McCone on Monday in New York, and I received the following statement from him:

> I believe that the building of the power unit at Hanford is an important thing to do. It will mean an advance in the art and will give the United States now and for many years to come the largest atomic generating plant in the world. There are two other things that will also advance the art and are important now. One of these is the Stanford Accelerator and the other is the proposal of Pacific Gas & Electric to build a 300,000-killowatt atomic electric generating plant at Bodega Bay.
>
> I support all three.

I regard John McCone as one of the ablest and finest businessmen who have ever been connected with atomic energy work. He brought to the work a rare sense of the proprieties of building reactors, the cost of which runs into huge

sums of money, but which will return to the country a great amount of blessing. So I was happy to have an appraisal of the project from his business standpoint.

Another distinguished Californian now in atomic energy work is Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, present Chairman of the Commission.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has had printed in the RECORD the statement of Dr. Seaborg endorsing the project. In Dr. Seaborg we have a scientist, the winner of a Nobel Prize, who states that this is a good thing to do scientifically. Besides his statement we have the testimony of a businessman who, when he left the Atomic Energy Commission, returned to California and was elected to the board of directors of the Standard Oil Co. of California, Trans World Airlines, and a great bank in that State. He is a man of proved business capacity. I say that the project is a businesslike thing to do.

I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD an analysis of the cost and value of NPR power, because I think the analysis made by the Federal Power Commission was a bit faulty. Even on the basis of the analysis made by the Federal Power Commission, this plant was a good project. But the Federal Power Commission included in its estimates an annual operating cost of $750,000 for liability insurance for the facility. That amount was much higher than in the case of any other atomic powerplant, and would not take into account the fact that in the liability act known as the Price-Anderson Act there is a provision that, after 10 years of operation, the costs will be examined, and if the costs have not been high, the excess money is to be returned.

Therefore I think the $750,000 does not belong in the balance sheet, because we would not be involved in any such expenditure.

The Federal Power Commission assumed a percentage of 4 percent for the cost of financing the project. We are borrowing money at rates lower than 4 percent, and I think we should also do so on this project.

All these points tend to prompt me to believe that the proposal should be undertaken. I am glad that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] had printed in the RECORD the fine editorial from the Washington Evening Star. I read the Washington Star with a great deal of interest. I have carefully read this newspaper through the years. I know it has no bias in favor of the kind of project that is proposed. Yet the newspaper made the appraisal that it thought the House was wrong, and expressed the hope that the Senate would not make the same mistake. The editorial is well worth the attention of Senators.

Month by month I pick up the Forum Memo, which is published by the Atomic Industrial Forum, Inc., in New York City. The publication is not devoted to the interests of either private power or public power. It is a reporting service whose publication I have read with a great deal of interest.

The first article concerns the Pacific Gas & Electric commitment, and points out the things that will be done by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. They will have available a competitive price on the power that will be developed through the use of the reactor. If we wished to be picayunish, we could start by saying we do not believe what the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has announced, that we do not believe the company will get the price of the power as low as is contended.

The Atomic Energy Commision has made an evaluation of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. proposal, which is dated July 18, and points out that while the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has come forth with a total estimated cost of 5.62 mills for the power, the Atomic Energy Commission believes the cost will run to 6.7 mills.

I do not care which figure is accepted. I wish to see these plants built; even if the Atomic Energy Commission must make some special concession to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. on fuel cost or some other point—which apparently it does not plan to do. I hope very much it will do so, because the proposed plant would generate 300,000 or more kilowatts of current at competitive prices. I think it is a great and inspiring forward step.

In the same issue of the Forum Memo appears reference to a project that is being undertaken in Los Angeles by the Southern California Edison Co. This is not the first time I have taken a look at that story, which appears on page 12 of the magazine. It is called the Southern California-Westinghouse proposal. What does the Forum Memo say about it? It states:

> The proposal contains requests for about $11 million for research and development assistance and some $8.5 million in waiver of fuel use charges.

I have discussed that project with officers of Westinghouse, and I have said to them, as I am glad to say on the floor of the Senate now, that if the subject comes before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and an authorization is requested to make research money available for the construction of the plant and for a waiver of fuel use charges, even if the amount runs to $15 million, $17 million, or $18 million, I intend to vote for it, because, according to this memorandum, the plant would recover approximately 375 gross electrical megawatts of current, which is equivalent to 355 net.

If we add together the current generated by the two plants in California—the Bodega Bay plant of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the plant of the Southern California Electric Co., which will be built on Marine Corps land—we have almost the capacity of the Hanford reactor. There would be produced a total of approximately 700,000 kilowatts of energy.

The U.S. Government would be able to point with pride to those two great reactors, which will be larger, I am sure, than anything else in the world, with the exception of the plant at Hanford.

One point made by John McCone over and over again is that if we build the Hanford reactor, it will be now, and for many, many years to come, the largest reactor in the world. It is about time we were getting a few firsts in this field. We were the great developers of atomic energy, and I would be very happy to see this great plant established.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, when the Senator reaches an appropriate point, I should like to ask a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from New York may ask a question at any time he wishes.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall not try to enter into the intricacies of the debate, which my colleagues are very well able to handle, but to those like myself, who do not wish in any way to thwart the aggregate development of resources of our country, no matter where they may be located in our country, a fundamental question is presented by the minority views, for which we must necessarily have great respect, since some of our distinguished colleagues are among the minority. The point to which I refer is contained on the first page of the minority views:

> The expenditure of the proposed $95 million would be far more effective in advancing the art of nuclear power if applied to the development of new techniques and processes than to the addition of 800,000 kilowatts of generating capacity at the Hanford reactor which will contribute little to the goal of competitive nuclear power.

My question of both the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Washington, who is handling the bill, is this: Can we, who wish to contribute to the development of our resources, be given a sound reason, within reasonable compass, why we should support the expenditure of $95 million in this way? What are the alternatives by way of expending the money in some other way, which might or might not be more productive in terms of the aggregate resource development of our country?

Mr. ANDERSON. I say to the able Senator from New York that that was not the point on which Mr. McCone based his recommendation, nor was it the point on which Dr. Seaborg turned his recommendation. If we were to spend $150 million again, we could probably spend it better than we did at Shippingport. However, that is all past. At Hanford we have an opportunity to learn a great deal about what would happen in the operation of large reactors for power. The important thing is that for $95 million we will be able to use 11 million pounds of steam per hour which otherwise would be wasted and the Government will get back the $95 million.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The argument made by the writers of the minority report is that this project would not advance technology. That is not the question. That was not the question before the committee, either. It is admitted that insofar as technological advances are concerned, the expenditure of $95 million would not be a great advantage. We are wasting a great deal of heat in

a part of the country where there is a paucity of electric power. We have almost reached the limit of that development insofar as hydroelectric power is concerned. The serious situation is that we are now using at the Hanford installations 350,000 kilowatts a year. It will be increased to 400,000 kilowatts. This is about half of what the proposed project would produce.

Insofar as this project is concerned, this money would come out of the production cost, not out of research and development cost. I have heard the Senator from New York say many times that we must do all we can in all fields. We are not sacrificing one at the expense of another. We must promote technology. The Federal Government must give assistance in research and development. We must have some money for unspent fuel costs.

The minority report might lead one to believe that because we are conducting this activity, it is being done at the expense of other activities. We are conducting other activities, but we should be doing this, also.

A great deal of heat is going to waste. We are wasting heat that we could tap, and with it we could produce electricity, which is sorely needed in that part of the country.

That is the explanation, Mr. President. What the minority is saying is that it would be better if we took the $95 million and built another ship or another Polaris submarine. We should build as many Polaris submarines as we need. We are not sacrificing that effort because of this. We should be doing both.

Mr. JAVITS. Am I right, therefore, in assuming that the argument as to the most effective use of the $95 million for the production of power, as distinguished from the development of atomic energy at this point, is this opportunity which the Senator discusses?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. What we are trying to do is tap the heat, not sacrifice research and development.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Forum Memo of July 1961 also contains an article entitled "The *Long Beach* Goes to Sea." When the *Long Beach* returned to port I talked to Admiral Rickover, for whom, as Senators know, I have great admiration. He reported on the wonderful results of the *Long Beach* performance. The *Long Beach* has two reactors. Information as to the speed is classified, but I can say that the *Long Beach* has a very satisfactory speed. Those two reactors performed exceedingly well.

We did not create the *Long Beach* in a single impulse. First, there was a reactor prototype in Idaho. Then we built the *Nautilus*. From the plans of the *Nautilus* we developed the *Skipjack*, and from those experiences we put together, as a culmination, the *Long Beach*. These things are done step by step.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. It would be a deception of the Senate if we left the impression that the $95 million was being spent because we hoped to gain some great technological improvement or development from it. That would be a pretense.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is not the purpose. This money is to be spent over a long period of time. As has been pointed out, we will get back the $95 million from the sale of current. The Chairman of the Commission, Dr. Seaborg, a Nobel Prize winner, says this should be done. The former Chairman of the Commission, Mr. McCone, a very able businessman, says that this should be done. That is the testimony, Mr. President. I hope the motion will not prevail, and that this project will go forward.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question either of the manager of the bill or of the Senator from New Mexico. How serious would it be, so far as the electrical power feature is concerned, if the project were delayed for, say, 1 year or 2 years, or 3 years? I ask the question because I note in the report that the electrical production will not start until 3 years after the reactor is scheduled to be completed. Therefore, the two are not phased at the same time.

Mr. PASTORE. The question is, How seriously do we want to be serious? Even if we pump 700,000 or 800,000 kilowatt-hours into the grid of Bonneville Power, there will be a shortage of current in 1965 in that part of the country. If we want further delay, we add another year. If we want to make it worse, we add 2 years. If we want to make it still worse, we add 3 years. If we want to make it impossible, we vote for the amendment this afternoon.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator may have covered this part. However, I should like to inquire how much would be added to the cost if these facilities were not constructed concurrently. I am referring not only to the part which the Senator has just covered, but also to the cost involved.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator knows, as a practical man, that the longer we wait the more the costs increase. It was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] that when we first thought of the project, we figured that it would cost about $75 million. Today the estimates have risen, as far as the cost of construction is concerned, to $95 million. The longer we wait, the greater will be the cost.

The issue is as simple as that. Of course, we can do without it. We can do without this source of power supply, but somehow or other we will have to fill the gap at a later time. I do not believe, for example, that the country will crumble if we do not do this one way or another. However, I say that if we want our country to go ahead and stay ahead we must stop being provincial, and we must look at this problem as Americans, as one country, not as individual States.

Mr. MILLER. I did not hear all of the presentation of the able Senator from Rhode Island. If he has covered this point, I hope he will indulge me in my asking this question. The minority report states:

> We believe the argument that the power from NPR may be needed to meet the requirements of the area is not well founded and should be discarded as without merit.

Mr. PASTORE. Who said that?

Mr. MILLER. It is included in the minority report.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to know whether this proposal is all black and white, or whether it is shaded. It may be that if it were delayed for a year or two we might have a better indication of whether it is right or wrong.

Mr. PASTORE. In my opinion such a view is all wrong. There are 18 members of the Joint Committee, and only 2 Senators signed the minority report. Certain members of the Senator's party will vote against the amendment this afternoon. This gives an indication that the question is not all black and white; it is not a Republican or Democratic issue. It depends on how one looks at it. I believe we have made a proper presentation. The men who voted for the project are frugal businessmen, wise men, and patriotic Americans. That does not affect in any way the sincerity of anyone who may be against the proposal.

As I said before, there is a divergence of views, and it is a sincere divergence. But a few years ago Lewis Strauss thought this project, if constructed, should be convertible. John McCone, former AEC Chairman, says it should be done. Glenn Seaborg says we should do it. The Federal Power Commission says it should be done. The Atomic Energy Commission says it should be done. The Joint Committee of Congress says it should be done. Two Senators now say it should not be done. The Senator from Iowa may read all the minority views he wishes to read. The weight of authority appears to be with the majority.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rather envy our colleagues in the Senate who serve on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. They deal with a transcendently important and an amazingly complex, certainly almost romantic subject, especially to laymen and particularly with respect to what has taken place in the field of nuclear development in this country and around the globe, and which has changed the entire course of mankind. It has vastly affected the lives of free peoples—indeed, of all peoples—who inhabit the earth today.

The members of the Joint Committee, Democratic and Republican, Senate and House, come from all parts of the country. Their conflicting ideologies have accomplished a rather remarkable result. They have brought to the Senate today, in the form of the proposed legislation, a bill authorizing the expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars of the people's money, and are almost entirely in agreement on what they believe should be done. Here is progress, American style.

I observe with the greatest of interest that, involved in the bill now before the Senate, is an authorization for some $22 million to private enterprise in America to proceed with the development of such nuclear research as the Government of the United States might finally approve. In past years, Congress has provided tens of millions of dollars for such joint atomic research between American Government and American industry.

I observe also that, contained in the bill, is an authorization for an almost fantastic undertaking to be located in the State from which I come, and about which I spoke on the floor of the Senate some weeks ago. This is an authorization to provide for the construction of a nuclear accelerator 2 miles long to be located near the campus of Stanford University, in California. In that connection, I was rather interested to read in the report the following:

Justification of this project is related to the growing importance of high energy physics in the United States and on the international front. In Switzerland, England, Italy, Sweden, and Germany, accelerators in the billion electron volt (Bev.) range are either being constructed or are just beginning operations.

In the U.S.S.R. the 10-Bev. proton synchrotron at Dubna has been operating for several years and has made significant contributions. Four other accelerators in the Bev. range including a 70-Bev. proton synchrotron are either under design or in construction.

From the small nuclear accelerator, now located at Stanford, wonderful results have come. New techniques in warning systems have been developed for the security of our people. And new ways of fighting cancer have been discovered in the use of the present Stanford accelerator, and now, urged and recommended by American science and by all relevant Government agencies, a 2-mile-long accelerator will be constructed at Stanford.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that that part of the Senate report beginning on page 12 and ending with the fourth line on page 13 be printed as a part of my comments.

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

PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED ACCELERATOR

Scientists keep building bigger, higher energy particle accelerators primarily because these permit them to explore ever-smaller dimensions of the atom. The higher the energy, the shorter the wavelength of the accelerated particle, the finer is its "microscope" or "seeing" ability to probe the structure of matter. To date about 30 different particles have been identified this way, some of which belong to a strange new world called antimatter.

The diversity of use of the proposed Stanford linear electron accelerator would make it particularly valuable as an advanced research tool. The following items are the major uses to which it will be put:

1. Particle production experiments: Targets of various isotopes will be bombarded by electrons to produce quantities of other kinds of particles for study.

2. Studies of nuclear and fundamental particle structure: Neutrons, protons, and other particles can be "microscopically" probed or "seen" by means of high energy electrons to study their size, shape, etc.

3. Studies of the basic theories of energy and matter: One of many important studies to be performed with this accelerator will be to determine if there is a limiting distance of submicroscopic length, at which point our existing laws of physics break down.

4. Studies of electron induced processes: Many isotopes of the elements have extremely small cross sections of the potentiality to be transformed into other states. By means of a high-intensity electron accelerator, such as this one, many new reactions may be revealed in the future.

5. Special uses such as the search for new fundamental particles of nature: The discovery of about 30 different particles to date leads the scientist to attempt to discover if these existing particles are truly fundamental. It is, therefore, of great importance to determine if the presently known particles as well as any new, yet to be discovered, particles show the real nature of matter.

The total experimental time available for high-energy accelerators today is considered grossly inadequate. This is due in part to the growing importance of experiments utilizing beams of secondary particles which requires high-intensity accelerators such as the proposed Stanford linear electron accelerator. Recent theoretical studies have enhanced the promised yields of high-energy neutrino interactions that may open a new field shedding light on weak coupling forces and other fundamental questions.

The Stanford accelerator would markedly extend the range of possible experiments. It would extend the available electron energies by a factor of 2 or 3 with further potential later. The beam intensity or total number of electrons delivered per unit time will be greater than any other accelerator.

The accelerator facility should be made available as a research tool not only to the staff at Stanford but to qualified scientists throughout the United States and the world. It would offer an unmatched opportunity for international collaboration and cooperation. Since this would represent a national facility, the Joint Committee would expect that it be operated in a manner consistent with the U.S. policy of international cooperation in the peaceful uses of the atom.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the single item in the proposed legislation which has provoked, unfortunately, some controversy is that which would authorize the installation of electric generating equipment in the Hanford project. I regret that there is a difference of opinion with respect to it.

I observe—and I use the committee's report to justify my statement—that in 1958 the Joint Committee, and then Congress, approved and wrote into the law legislation which would provide for the construction at the Atomic Energy Center in Hanford, Wash., of a plutonium production convertible reactor. Plutonium is the stuff of which nuclear warheads are made. At that time, all the members of the Atomic Energy Commission serving under the administration of President Eisenhower testified that if a production reactor were to be built, it should be of the convertible type. So the moneys were authorized, construction of the reactor was begun, and it is being constructed upon principles of convertibility.

Now, by reason of the amendment proposed to the bill, the item for the completion of the reactor with respect to the facilities to generate electricity be entirely deleted. I have read the reports. I have read the debate in the House of Representatives. I have talked to friends of mine in the House of Representatives who do not feel that the generating equipment ought to be purchased. I have talked to some who are on the other side of the question in the House of Representatives, who feel it should be purchased.

I understand full well that the administration approves the project. I understand that the Atomic Energy Commission approves the project. I pursued the subject further.

I asked Dr. Glenn Seaborg, a distinguished constituent of mine, what his specific views might be, in addition to those which he enunciated before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It was said earlier today in the Chamber that Glenn Seaborg is an able man. He is. He was chancellor of the University of California. He is a Nobel Prize winner. He is an outstanding American, a distinguished scientist, and a fine public servant.

His reply to me was:

Senator, I say to you as an American that Congress, in my judgment, ought to approve that which the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has sent to the Senate. The nuclear reactor at Hanford was authorized as a convertible reactor. The waste of heat generated there, the failure to use it for a beneficent purpose, would be completely indefensible.

Mention has been made of another distinguished Californian, John McCone. John McCone is one of the great American citizens of our time. He is a distinguished leader in American business and American industry. He serves on the boards of directors of many great corporations. He heads a farflung industry. He served with distinction, under the administration of Dwight Eisenhower, as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I spoke with John McCone. I said:

Give me your views. I speak as a Member of Congress who is not a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and to whom many of these problems are extremely difficult to understand. Where does the public interest lie?

Former Atomic Energy Commission Chairman John McCone replied:

Senator, in my judgment, it would be a mistake for Congress to eliminate the nuclear production reactor item from the bill. To waste the great amount of heat produced at Hanford, to fail to utilize it, would be a vast disservice to the people.

As I recall Mr. McCone's words, he said, first, that here was an opportunity for the free people of the United States to construct the largest dual-purpose nuclear reactor in all the globe. America might point to leadership in this field. Prestige—or respect—is an important item in the life of nations today, Mr. President.

The former chairman of the Joint Committee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and

others have stated in the debate that each hour 11 million pounds of steam go to waste, every hour, mind you, at the Hanford reactor. There is no way in which we can justify permitting that waste to continue, I have concluded; but what is infinitely more important in the debate, it cannot be justified in the judgment of the previous Chairman of the Commission, John McCone, or the present Chairman of the Commission, Dr. Glenn Seaborg.

I discussed with Mr. McCone the ideological dispute between public and private power advocates in the United States. In the opinion of Mr. McCone, the action taken by Congress, if the bill shall be approved as it came from the committee, will be a precedent for nothing with respect to that ideological dispute. And the committee report, I observe, says the same thing.

As I have listened to the debate, with many others of us on this side of the aisle and of the other side of the aisle, who are not on the committee, we struggle to determine where the public interest lies.

For myself, I conclude that the bill as it came from the committee should bear the stamp of approval of the U.S. Senate. I shall vote against the pending amendment.

PROGRESS IN ATOMIC POWER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in view of today's debate on the Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill, I believe it is an especially appropriate moment to make a few comments on the development of power through atomic energy by several alert, investor-owned utilities in New York State.

On December 6, 1960, an intensive program looking toward the development, design, and construction of a large nuclear generating station which would crack the atom power cost barrier was announced by seven investor-owned electric utility companies serving New York State.

The program was the second major step in a planned approach by the companies to the production of electricity from atomic energy at a lower cost than from coal, oil, and gas throughout the Empire State. Studies conducted in 1960 indicated that advanced concepts of two types of atomic powerplants show marked promise of achieving this breakthrough in the cost of atomic power.

Mr. President, I understand that the seven utilities have formed a nonprofit corporation to be known as Empire State Atomic Development Associates, Inc.—ESADA. ESADA has contracted separately with General Electric Co. and General Atomic Division of General Dynamics Corp. to conduct an initial two-pronged development program totaling more than $20 million toward which the utilities, through ESADA, will contribute more than $10 million.

General Electric will design and construct a reactor of about 15,000 thermal-kilowatt capacity—5,000 electrical—at its Vallecitos Atomic Laboratory. This test facility will be operated to demonstrate technical feasibility of nuclear superheat, which it is believed will improve on the most economical reactors, and will allow the utility industry to use today's steam technology and equipment.

As in the case of most reactor types, the limiting considerations in nuclear superheat are reliable fuel and long-lived fuel materials. The ESADA Vallecitos experimental superheat reactor will be a tool which will develop information necessary for the design and operation of large central station nuclear plants incorporating nuclear superheat.

Mr. President, design work and site preparation are apparently moving ahead on schedule. Another milestone of progress for the ESADA Vallecitos experimental superheat reactor was a step completed June 29, leading to the issuance of a construction permit for the nuclear superheat facility. This was an open hearing by the AEC's hearing examiner at the Commission's Germantown headquarters.

The seven members of ESADA include: Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Long Island Lighting Co., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Niagara Mohawk, Orange & Rockland Utilities, and Rochester Gas & Electric Corp.

Mr. President, these New York utilities have stepped up to assume a large fraction of this multi-million-dollar program for solving problems jointly faced by the nuclear industry, the utility industry, and the Atomic Energy Commission. In fact, the ESADA projects are in addition to an already substantial investment by New York State utility companies in other atomic projects which employ various reactor types.

Consolidated Edison is completing a $100 million atomic plant at Indian Point, N.Y., which is expected to go critical late next year.

Niagara Mohawk, New York State Electric & Gas, and Rochester Gas & Electric are among the 53 member companies of the High Temperature Reactor Development Associates, Inc., which are building the Peach Bottom prototype plant.

The Rochester company, Long Island Lighting, and Central Hudson are members of Power Reactor Development Corp. which is building a fast breeder nuclear electric-generating station at Monroe, Mich. All of the ESADA companies except Orange and Rockland, are members of Atomic Power Development Associates, Inc., engaged in engineering design and research for the Monroe reactor.

Concurrent with its atomic energy activities, ESADA maintains a power pool committee which is making studies for the long-range statewide planning to meet future electrical needs of the State at the lowest possible cost. Generating plants and transmission facilities now planned or under construction, including the Niagara project of the State power authority, will provide more than an adequate capacity of electrical power within the State for the next several years.

My personal congratulations go to ESADA for its progressive leadership as it assumes a major role in the task of developing economic atomic electric power. The continued efforts of private enterprise to provide abundant low-cost power to the consumers of the Empire State is a dedicated public service that will keep New York a good place in which to work and live in the best American tradition.

Mr. President, so long as the private, investor-owned utilities of our Nation move with such vigor and initiative to meet the Nation's expanding need for power, there is no purpose to be served by increasing Government activities in the field. The effort of the Atomic Energy Commission, for instance, to build a dual purpose reactor at Hanford, Wash., is such a case. I believe it to be unjustified economically and unwise politically for the Government to enter into power projects like this, projects which can be developed as well or better by private enterprise. I am hopeful that Congress will defeat this attempt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Chair restate the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] to strike out certain portions of the bill.

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. BEALL (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If the Senator from New Mexico were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]. If the Senator from Rhode Island were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If the Senator from Illinois were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] is absent due to a death in his family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are absent because of illness. The pair of the Senator from Illinois has previously been announced.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 100]

YEAS—36

Allott	Curtis	Morton
Bennett	Ervin	Mundt
Boggs	Fong	Robertson
Bridges	Goldwater	Russell
Bush	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler	Holland	Schoeppel
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Scott
Capehart	Jordan	Smathers
Carlson	Keating	Talmadge
Case, N.J.	Long, La.	Thurmond
Case, S. Dak.	McClellan	Tower
Cotton	Miller	Williams, Del.

NAYS—54

Aiken	Hart	Metcalf
Anderson	Hartke	Monroney
Bartlett	Hayden	Morse
Bible	Hickey	Moss
Burdick	Hill	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Neuberger
Cannon	Jackson	Pastore
Carroll	Javits	Proxmire
Church	Johnston	Randolph
Clark	Kefauver	Smith, Mass.
Dodd	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lausche	Stennis
Eastland	Long, Mo.	Symington
Engle	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McCarthy	Yarborough
Gore	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	McNamara	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—10

Beall	Ellender	Pell
Chavez	Long, Hawaii	Prouty
Cooper	Mansfield	Wiley
Dirksen		

So Mr. HICKENLOOPER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

INDEXING AND MICROFILMING OF CERTAIN RECORDS

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, I ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 1644.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1644) to provide for the indexing and microfilming of certain records of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in Alaska in the collections of the Library of Congress, which was, on page 2, strike out all after "copies." in line 9 down through and including "States." in line 11.

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alaska.

The motion was agreed to.

MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, the question of the extension of the Mexican farm labor program—Public Law 78—will come before the Senate in this session.

There are those who advocate the elimination of the program and others who want it continued undisturbed for 2 more years as provided in the bill already approved by the House of Representatives—H.R. 2010.

The administration bill, S. 1945, takes a middle position. It extends the program for 2 more years but it incorporates safeguards recommended by the administration to prevent the program from having an adverse effect on the wages and working conditions of domestic migratory workers.

One of the important amendments provides that growers, to be eligible to contract for Mexican nationals, must offer them wages at least equivalent to the average hourly farm wage in the State, or the national farm wage average, whichever is the lesser. In no case would an employer be required in the first year to offer more than 10 cents per hour above the highest wage prevailing during the last previous season under which Mexican nationals were employed in the area and in the activity involved.

In my judgment, this provides an objective and reasonable criterion. It takes into account differences which now exist between the States. It provides for orderly adjustment.

I should like to emphasize, also, that this amendment does not impose any regulation on any grower. No grower is required to pay any worker any rate, unless he wishes to use his Government as an agency to import Mexican nationals for agricultural work. If he does wish to use this service, then he must, of course, meet certain minimum standards to guarantee that domestic workers will not be adversely affected in their wages and working conditions.

The need for this amendment rests on a question of fact: whether there is evidence that wages and working conditions of domestic workers have been lowered or have failed to advance in some proportion to those in the rest of the economy.

Hearings on the extension of the Mexican farm labor program have been held by the Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, of which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] is chairman.

At the hearings the Secretary of Labor Goldberg stated that the Mexican farm labor program has had an adverse effect on domestic migratory workers and that the administration is opposed to extension of the program without amendments. He stated that in some areas Mexican nationals are still receiving the 50 cents per hour minimum allowed by the Republic of Mexico. Other testimony was given which indicated that in some places domestic workers received even lower wages. I wrote to Secretary Goldberg and asked him to check on this matter. In his reply he listed areas in which domestic workers this year have been receiving as low as 30 cents per hour.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter and his reply be printed in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 30, 1961.

The Honorable ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: When you testified concerning the extension of Public Law 78 before the Subcommittee on General Legislation of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, you included a statement that in a few States the Mexican workers brought in under the Mexican farm labor program were receiving hourly wages of only 50 cents per hour in 1960 and that this wage had remained unchanged for 10 years.

Other testimony before the committee indicated that some U.S. farm workers are paid less than 50 cents per hour for some specific activities in areas where Mexican workers are employed at 50 cents per hour.

I would appreciate your comment on the accuracy of the statement that some U.S. workers are receiving less than 50 cents per hour in these areas. Does the Department have a list of areas and activities in which Mexican workers are employed and in which U.S. workers are paid less than 50 cents per hour? I would also appreciate your judgment as to whether the wage rates paid to U.S. workers in such areas are showing signs of the increase which should be expected in such low wage situations.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE J. McCARTHY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1961.

Hon. EUGENE J. McCARTHY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARTHY: I am presenting herewith the information requested by your letter of June 30 with respect to areas in which Mexican nationals are being employed despite wage levels lower than 50 cents per hour among U.S. workers.

The areas and activities of Mexican employment in which a wage of less than 50 cents per hour has been found to prevail among domestic workers thus far in 1961 are as follows:

State, area, and activity	Date of wage finding	Prevailing wage rate
ARKANSAS		
Crittenden County: Cotton chopping	June 9	$0.30
Mississippi County: Cotton chopping	do	.40
Phillips County: Cotton chopping	June 7	.30

State, area, and activity	Date of wage finding	Prevailing wage rate
TEXAS		
Lower Rio Grande Valley:		
All crops, hoeing	Apr. 27	$0.40-.45
Cucumber, picked bulk	May 3	.45
Maverick County: Cauliflower, cut and pack in field	Feb. 14	.40

There may, of course, be other areas in which wages paid on a piece-rate basis are yielding less than 50 cents per hour to average U.S. workers.

I am also enclosing the full list of areas and activities of Mexican employment in which the prevailing wage rate among U.S. workers is 50 cents per hour or less.

With regard to your final question, we are unable to conclude that wages in the very low-wage Mexican-employing areas are showing marked improvement. So far this year 18 area wage surveys have revealed prevailing wage rates lower than on the comparable date a year ago. All but four of these wage declines were in States where the typical hourly rate is 50 cents or less. Furthermore, in three out of the six exceptionally low-wage areas listed above (including both of the 30-cent per hour areas), the latest wage finding represents a decline from the prevailing wage rate in the preceding year. In short, it appears that wage-depressive tendencies in areas using Mexican labor are strongest and most harmful in the areas in which wages are already exceptionally low.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor.

Farm wage rates of 50 cents per hour or less in 1961 in activities employing Mexican contract workers, by State and area [1]

State, area, and activity	Date of wage finding	Prevailing wage rate
ARKANSAS		
Craighead County: Cotton chopping	June 9	$0.50
Crittenden County: Cotton chopping	do	[1].30
Mississippi County: Cotton chopping	do	[1].40
Phillips County: Cotton chopping	June 7	[1].30
Poinsett County: Cotton chopping	June 19	.50
TENNESSEE		
Lake County multicrop: Cotton and soybean chopping	June 6	.50
TEXAS		
Lower Rio Grande multicrop:		
All crops, hoeing	Apr. 27	[1].40-.45
Asparagus, cut, bulk	Mar. 10	.50
	Mar. 22	.50
	Apr. 7	.50
Cabbage, cut, bulk	Jan. 26	.50
	Feb. 9	.50
	Feb. 24	.50
	Mar. 10	.50
Cauliflower, cut, bulk	Jan. 26	.50
	Feb. 9	.50
	Feb. 24	.50
Celery, cut and pack in field	Feb. 9	.50
	Mar. 10	.50
Cucumber, picked, bulk	May 3	[1].45
	May 17	.50
	May 31	.50
Lettuce:		
Cut, pack, and load	Feb. 24	.50
Cut, pack, seal, and load	Jan. 12	.50
	Jan. 26	.50
	Feb. 24	.50
	Mar. 10	.50
Onions, dry, pull only	Mar. 22	.50
	Apr. 7	.50
	Apr. 20	.50

Footnote at end of table.

Farm wage rates of 50 cents per hour or less in 1961 in activities employing Mexican contract workers, by State and area [1]—**Continued**

State, area, and activity	Date of wage finding	Prevailing wage rate
TEXAS—continued		
Lower Rio Grande—Con.		
Peppers, bell, cut, bulk	May 3	$0.50
Squash, bulk	May 17	.50
Maverick County multicrop:		
All crops, hoeing	June 14	.50
Cauliflower:		
Cut, bulk	Jan. 17	.50
	Feb. 14	.50
Cut and pack	Jan. 17	.50
Cut and pack in field	Feb. 14	[1].40
	Mar. 1	.50
Winter garden multicrop:		
All crops, hoeing	May 24	.50
Broccoli, cut, bulk	Feb. 21	.50
Cabbage, cut and pack in field	Jan. 10	.50
	Jan. 25	.50
	Mar. 29	.50
Cauliflower:		
Cut, bulk	Jan. 25	.50
Cut and pack	Jan. 10	.50
Lettuce, cut, bulk	Mar. 29	.50
Onions:		
Dry, pull only	Apr. 27	.50
	May 11	.50
Dry (medium), pull only	Apr. 12	.50
Green, pull, bulk	Feb. 21	.50

[1] Hourly wage rates paid Mexican nationals cannot be lower than 50 cents per hour.

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, the question of low-wage rates in some areas where Mexican nationals are used is also treated in a special report by Donald Janson, appearing in the New York Times, July 16, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Janson's report be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I hope that this information will be of assistance to Senators in determining whether the Mexican farm labor program should be amended to prevent adverse effect on the wages and working conditions of domestic migratory workers.

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

ARKANSAS FIELD PAY FALLS TO 30 CENTS AN HOUR

(By Donald Janson)

HEAFER, ARK., July 13.—John Morrison, 38-year-old migrant laborer from southeastern Missouri, dropped his hoe after 10 hours of chopping cotton on the J. E. Pollard farm here yesterday and collected $3 for another day's work.

"Some places around here in eastern Arkansas are paying only $2," the ex-soldier said. "Who can support a family by chopping cotton? We're leaving tonight for Michigan to see if we can find work in the cherry orchards."

His wife and their flushed 11-year-old daughter, who had weeded cotton under the hot sun all day alongside them, piled into their 1946 Buick along with the Morrisons' 8-month-old baby and 9-year-old daughter.

The Missourian is one of nearly half a million American farm laborers who migrate each year to earn a living.

They come to Arkansas to thin and weed cotton in May, June, and July only if they can find no other work. The prevailing wage rates posted in employment offices in the area, range from 30 cents an hour in some counties to 50 cents in others. Actual pay during most of the chopping season has been 30 cents this year.

MIGRANT FAMILIES COMPETE

The migrant families compete for these jobs with sharecroppers living on the cotton plantations, with field hands living in nearby small towns and urban centers such as Memphis, and with Mexican nationals brought in when there is a labor "shortage."

Because of the seasonal nature of the work, cottongrowers need greatly fluctuating numbers of workers during the chopping season and for harvesting in August and September. Many more choppers are needed, for example in June than in July. Thousands can be recruited in day-haul buses from Memphis.

Mexicans have been imported under contract for the last decade to insure a stable labor force throughout Arkansas' deltaland. The program stems from labor shortages that existed in World War II.

Eastern Arkansas growers hired 31,300 braceros last year, more than any State except Texas and California. They paid them the legal minimum of 50 cents an hour for chopping cotton.

The House of Representatives recently passed a 2-year extension of the bracero law, which expires December 31. It permits importation of Mexicans only to relieve farm labor shortages.

The bill is now before the Senate Agriculture Committee. The administration is seeking to amend the law to limit imported labor sufficiently to assure active competition for domestic workers. Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg believes the importation program is at least partly responsible for keeping domestic wages in the cottonfields at near-starvation levels.

GOLDBERG GIVES VIEWS

"The nature and size of the Mexican labor program substantially interferes with the normal operations of the law of supply and demand in the labor market," he testified before a Senate subcommittee. "The inexorable result is to stabilize or depress the wages of our own farmworkers in areas where Mexican braceros are employed."

The adverse-effect charge was restated in Memphis today by Frank E. Johnson, Assistant Director of the Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security. He was in Memphis to meet with Arkansas and Tennessee employment service officials to see if the situation could be improved. Opponents of the Mexican labor program contend that cottongrowers are deliberately using it to keep domestic pay low.

About 315,000 Mexicans were brought to the United States last year. More were used in the cottonfields than for any other crop. Less than 2 percent of Nation's 4 million farms use braceros and most of the users are large operators.

Cottongrowers and other users of Mexicans vigorously oppose any change in the present law. One Administration-backed proposal would provide that employers using Mexicans must pay them the statewide or national average rate for hourly paid farm labor, whichever is less, with a maximum increase in any one year of 10 cents an hour. The Arkansas statewide average, among the lowest in the Nation, is 73 cents an hour.

The effect would be to bring domestic rates up accordingly.

BUSINESS LOSSES FEARED

"We just couldn't do it and stay in business," said James F. Reeves, Jr., manager of the 11,000-acre Kuhn Cotton Plantation near here.

He cited the high cost of machinery and the unreliability of the weather in producing a crop. Workers, on the other hand, expressed doubt that the plantation would go into the red if they were paid more than the current 30 cents an hour.

Whether or not the Mexican program is amended, the Department of Labor intends

to insist on wages for domestic cotton choppers that match the 50-cent minimum guaranteed Mexican workers.

The law authorizing importation of braceros provides that employers first make reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers at comparable wages.

An interpretation of this provision issued in May by Mr. Goldberg's office defined the domestic workers as able-bodied persons 14 years of age or over with the skill to do the job concerned. Cotton chopping is unskilled labor.

Mr. Johnson said he had come to Memphis to make it clear that this ruling would be enforced next year. But Arkansans were not convinced.

"It's a nonenforceable regulation," James L. Bland, administrator of the Arkansas Department of Labor's Employment Security Division, said in an interview. "We can't tell a man what he must pay."

Most growers prefer Mexican to American labor, he said, because only able-bodied adult males in fine physical condition are imported. Crews assembled locally include old men, women, and children.

A survey made by Mr. Bland's office showed that only 24 percent of the workers recruited in the Memphis day-haul operation were 18 to 45 year-old men who could keep up with Mexicans in weeding cotton.

"The Americans willing to do this stoop labor for 30 cents an hour are the dregs of humanity," said Lloyd E. Curtis, manager of the State Employment Service Office for Crittenden County in West Memphis. He said they included derelicts as well as women and children.

FEW SEEK FIELDWORK

He remarked that, although unemployment was high in Arkansas and Memphis and all claimants for unemployment insurance were offered cotton-chopping jobs, few would take work in the fields. Those who do go, he said, are agricultural workers not covered by unemployment insurance, laborers who depend entirely on fieldwork and odd jobs for a living.

"You can't afford to pay for something you don't get," Mr. Reeves said. "You can't pay a $3-worker $5 a day and stay in business very long. It would benefit us to expand the Mexican program and eliminate the day-haul."

Opponents of the present bracero program contend that growers would get a better job from domestic workers if pay and working conditions were improved.

They cite California, where wages paid by users of Mexicans rose to $1 an hour last year in some crops.

This helped to attract a domestic farm-labor force that State officials called "the best in years." Peak employment of braceros dropped by about 10,000.

PRACTICE IN OTHER STATES

Other States, including Washington and Oregon, that formerly relied heavily on braceros, no longer use them, having found they could attract all the farm labor they needed by offering better wages and employment conditions for domestic workers.

Robert E. Brewington, a cotton grower here, stopped using Mexicans 2 years ago. He said that with adequate supervision domestic crews performed well.

Nor has he been troubled with shortages of labor for his 680-acre farm.

"I can always get enough day-haul labor anytime I want it," he said.

Mr. Bland expressed the viewpoint that if wages were raised to 50 cents an hour farmers would have to be selective in hiring domestics and "we would create a great deal more unemployment and have to have more Mexicans."

BERLIN CRISIS POINTS NEED FOR COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, the Berlin crisis has started the cold war smoking and smoldering in recent weeks. Rising above the smoke caused by this latest and potentially very dangerous situation is the pressing need for a cold war GI educational bill.

At this very moment our Chief Executive has under consideration a proposal to mobilize our Ready Reserves in the face of the Soviet Union's warning that it intends to sign a separate peace treaty with Communist East Germany before the end of the year.

A great portion of the U.S. Ready Reserve strength consists of cold war veterans, the 45 percent of our military-age population who have served an average of 2 years or more each on active duty since January 31, 1955, and are then required to serve in some instances for a 2-year period with a Ready Reserve unit.

The cold war veteran has already had his life materially affected by military service and it now appears that many of them may be called upon again to lay aside their civil pursuits and act as a deterrent to Communist aggression.

In the light of recent events and in the prospect of what may develop, it is high time this Congress recognized the vital necessity of a readjustment program for cold war veterans. No other segment of our population lives a more uncertain existence than our cold war veterans and no other group is forced to plan for the future surrounded by as many possibilities that those plans will be disrupted and interrupted.

If the Nation is going to turn to its cold war veterans for help in these crisis-filled days, then the very least the Nation can do in return is offer the cold war veterans assistance with their readjustment problems, which are difficult now, and which threaten to become increasingly difficult in the dangerous period which lies ahead.

Because of recent events and since the possibility has increased that our cold war veterans will once again have to leave families, jobs, and ambitions behind and return to active military duty, I strongly urge that the Congress enact into public law this session S. 349, the cold war GI bill introduced in January by 37 Senators, including the distinguished senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. I congratulate the Senator for his strong support of the cold war GI education bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON S. 1392, RELATING TO THE INDIAN HEIRSHIP LAND PROBLEM

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, I announce for the information of the Senate that beginning on Wednesday, August 9, at 10 a.m., in room 3110 New Senate Office Building, the Indian Affairs Subcommittee will hold hearings on S. 1392, a bill relating to the Indian heirship land problem.

The Department of the Interior has submitted its report on S. 1392, which is in the nature of a substitute, and it is my intention, as chairman of the subcommittee, to consider both bills at that time.

I hope that all interested parties who may wish to appear before the committee or submit statements in connection with the proposed legislation will contact the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs so that an appropriate witness list may be prepared.

ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE CO.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, in the hearing before the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives on the Public Works Appropriation bill for 1962 a statement was made during the course of the testimony to the effect that the Arizona Public Service Co. of Arizona is controlled by the Electric Bond & Share Co. of New York.

This is patently wrong. The directors of the Arizona Public Service Co. have very rightly taken umbrage at these remarks and have addressed a letter to the Member of this body who made those remarks before the committee of the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, addressed to the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE CO.,
Phoenix, Ariz., June 22, 1961.

Senator FRANK E. MOSS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: As directors of Arizona Public Service Co., we are shocked at your implication that Arizona Public Service Co. is under the control or strong influence of Ebasco Services.

Such irresponsible charges as you made June 7, 1961, before the House of Representatives subcommittee on appropriations reveal, at best, a lack of information and a gross misunderstanding of the corporate structure and policies of this company.

To set the record straight and to discourage any future distortions of the truth, we are stating these facts:

Central Arizona Light & Power Co., a predecessor company of Arizona Public Service Co., was reorganized in 1945. At that time it became an independent company, divesting itself of any connection with Electric Bond & Share Co. It is true that Arizona Public Service, as well as many other companies, have since taken advantage of the highly specialized talents of Ebasco Services, especially in the construction of powerplants. There is nothing wrong or illegal in these services, as your statements seem to imply; on the contrary, it has been to the advantage of our customers that the company is able to utilize the expert services of this firm to lower construction and operating costs.

Arizona Public Service Co. today is an independent and locally managed company whose policies are governed by a board of directors composed of 22 members. Twenty-one of the directors are Arizonians, and the other one is from Colorado. All are promi-

nent business people who have a vital interest in the future of this State. We are guided—in our own businesses and in our public service directorship—by one simple rule: The policies we set must be in the best interest of the State of Arizona.

To imply that we directors have acted or will act illegally in a collusion with Ebasco Services is a serious charge against our personal honesty and integrity, and for this reason we are individually signing this letter.

We call upon you as a responsible citizen and U.S. Senator either to offer evidence to prove your charges or to retract your statements and apologize for damaging the reputation of Arizona Public Service Co. and its board of directors.

Yours truly,

John M. Jacobs, Chairman; Fred J. Joyce, James B. Rolle, Jr., Ralph M. Bilby, Donald N. Soldwedel, Lloyd E. Eisele, C. W. Bond, Newton S. Cooper, E. Ray Cowden, Victor H. Lytle, J. H. Deaderick, A. H. Forman, E. V. O'Malley, Frank Snell, Walter Lucking, John L. Liecty.

P.S.—Our six other directors were not available at the time this letter was signed, but all are in accord with the content of the letter.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a list of the directors, together with their addresses.

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

ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE CO. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND HOME ADDRESS

Ralph M. Bilby, vice president, Babbitt Bros. Trading Co., Flagstaff, Ariz.; 318 North Agassiz, Flagstaff, Ariz.

C. W. Bond, president, the Valley National Co., insurance, Post Office Box 31, Phoenix, Ariz., 1620 Palmcroft Way SW., Phoenix, Ariz.

Newton S. Cooper, Ranch, Stanfield, Post Office Box 607, Casa Grande, Ariz., 1021 North Gilbert, Post Office Box 607, Casa Grande, Ariz.

E. Ray Cowden, president, Cowden Livestock Co., Post Office Box 1550, Phoenix, Ariz., 6645 North 7th Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

J. H. Deaderick, president, Deaderick Investment Co., 2420 West Bethany Home Road, Phoenix, Ariz., 330 West Berridge Lane, Phoenix, Ariz.

Lloyd E. Eisele, president, Holsum Bakery, Inc., Post Office Box 6674, Phoenix, Ariz., 1822 Palmcroft Way NE., Phoenix, Ariz.

Del W. Fisher, president, Fisher Contracting Co., 2201 South 19th Avenue, Post Office Box 6537, Phoenix, Ariz., 7002 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. H. Forman, executive vice president, Arizona Public Service Co., Post Office Box 2591, Phoenix, Ariz., 501 West Encanto Boulevard, Phoenix, Ariz.

Arleen W. Hughes, E. W. Hughes & Co., investments, 516 Exchange National Bank Building, Post Office Box 198, Colorado Springs, Colo., 1225 Wood Avenue, Colorado Springs, Colo.

George E. Jackson, personal investments, Post Office Box 1141, Douglas, Ariz., 1057 "D" Avenue, apartment 2, Post Office Box 1141, Douglas, Ariz.

John M. Jacobs, John Jacobs Farms, 2040 West McDowell Road, Phoenix, Ariz., No. 3 Moon Mountain Trail, 14245 North 19th Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

Fred J. Joyce, counselor, Mutual Life Insurance Co., of New York, 1111 North First Street, Phoenix, Ariz., 107 East Ninth Street, Tempe, Ariz.

John L. Liecty, treasurer and assistant secretary, Arizona Public Service Co., Post Office Box 2591, Phoenix, Ariz., 7700 North 14th Street, Phoenix, Ariz.

Walter T. Lucking, president, Arizona Public Service Co., Post Office Box 2591, Phoenix, Ariz., 32 West Linger Lane, Phoenix, Ariz.

Victor H. Lytle, Pritchard & Lytle, insurance brokers, 144 North Montezuma Street, Post Office Box 870, Prescott, Ariz., 1130 Smoki Avenue, Prescott, Ariz.

A. Lee Moore, A. L. Moore & Sons, 333 West Adams Street, Phoenix, Ariz., 54 North Country Club Drive, Phoenix, Ariz.

E. V. O'Malley, president and general manager, Affiliated O'Malley Cos., suite A-100, 4747 North 16th Street, Post Office Box 3558, Phoenix, Ariz., Phoenix Towers, 2201 North Central Avenue, apartment 12-D, Phoenix, Ariz.

W. C. Quebedeaux, president, Quebedeaux Investment Co., 2901 East Manor Drive, Phoenix, Ariz., same, except summer: 2977 Ocean Street, Carlsbad, Calif.

James B. Rolle, Jr., member, law firm of Rolle, Jones & Miller, 301 Second Avenue, Post Office Box 70, Yuma, Ariz., 1920 Fifth Avenue, Yuma, Ariz.

J. B. Ryan, chairman of the board, Ryan-Evans Drug Co., Post Office Box 5128, Phoenix, Ariz., 126 East Country Club Drive, Phoenix, Ariz.

Frank L. Snell, general counsel, Public Service, Snell & Wilmer, 400 Security Building, Phoenix, Ariz., 5201 Arroyo Road, Phoenix, Ariz.

Donald N. Soldwedel, publisher-manager, Yuma Daily Sun, 300 Madison Avenue, Yuma, Ariz., 1505 Eighth Avenue, Yuma, Ariz.

TRANSMISSION LINES FOR COLORADO RIVER POWER

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a telegram from the American National Cattlemen's Association, supporting the position of those of us who think that the transmission lines required to transmit Colorado River storage power should be built by private capital.

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

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The advisory council of the American National Cattlemens Association, representing about 140 affiliated local and State cattlemen's organizations and thousands of individual members, respectfully and forcefully request your understanding and support of the following resolution:

"The advisory council to the president of the American National Cattlemens Association in continuing its effort to perpetuate the private enterprise system in America; and

"Whereas free enterprise is best demonstrated and most effective when it is permitted to make its contribution to society unhindered by government interference and competition, recommends the acceptance of the utilities combination proposal to furnish transmission lines required to transmit Colorado River storage power."

This council, composed of presidents of State cattle affiliated associations particularly opposes an expenditure of $136 million for duplicating transmission lines. Irrigation assistance would not be enhanced by adoption of an all-Federal system and future State and national taxes would be lost.

FRED H. DRESSLER,
Chairman, Advisory Council.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2043) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, for myself and my esteemed colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

Project 62-e-4, study, development, and design for nuclear processes which have application for improving and utilizing coal and coal products, $5,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senators from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, the amendment is explanatory of its purpose. It would provide for the study, development, and design for nuclear processes which have application for improving and utilizing coal and coal products, $5 million.

Madam President, a comparatively small amount of money has been spent by the Atomic Energy Commission in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Mines in the use of high-temperature nuclear heat for the gasification of coal.

There is a high-temperature facility at Morgantown, W. Va., which has been the site of some experimentation. This Bureau of Mines experimental station was successor to the laboratory operated at Morgantown in connection with work done under the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act sponsored as a wartime measure by former Senator O'Mahoney, of Wyoming and me in 1945 when I was a Member of the House of Representatives.

Compared with the tremendous sums of money being spent on other programs in the atomic energy field, the efforts currently being put forth by the Atomic Energy Commission to further coal research are inadequate. I am informed that there is much additional research and development activity in which the AEC can participate cooperatively with the Office of Coal Research and the Bureau of Mines of the Department of Interior to improve and utilize coal products through nuclear energy.

We are told by experts in the field of coal research and by the AEC that nuclear processes offer at least two conditions which may be of particular benefit to the coal industry and the Nation in terms of developing broader use of coal and coal products. These conditions are first, very high temperature; and, second, intense radiation.

The AEC and the Bureau of Mines have been working together for about 8 years on some of the possible uses of these special conditions of nuclear energy for coal processing. This work has

been directed largely toward the development of processes which would gasify coal, including work on very high temperature reactor materials and reactor design, and study of high temperature helium systems.

It is proposed that research and development be broadened and accelerated in certain directions to include, first, a thorough analysis of ways in which nuclear energy can be applied to improvement of the coal industry; second, expanded research and development on effects of radiation and temperature on processes applicable to coal; third, preliminary designs of nuclear systems sufficient to evaluate the problems and promises of these systems to the coal industry and to coal utilization; and fourth, use of radioisotopes in the coal industry.

But, Madam President, more specifically in the area of research and development it is noted that the effect of ionizing radiation on coal has received but limited study. I am informed by experts that evidence indicates that under static conditions some interesting changes occur. However, as yet no dynamic studies have been undertaken. It is time that a beginning be made on these dynamic investigations.

There is hope that under conditions of temperature, pressure and radiation, coal—with suitable additives of oxygen and/or hydrogen—can be converted to products of great utility. Under this program experimental work would be undertaken to explore the possibility and to determine the effects of radiation on the nature of the product and the rate of the reaction during first, carbonization; second, conventional hydrogenation; third, high temperature hydrogenation; fourth, reaction of dry coal and steam under moderate temperatures and high pressures; fifth, interaction of coal with oxygen or with steam alone; and, sixth, reaction of coal with other gases and with liquids.

An additional area of development which would likewise be investigated, I am told, is the effect of radiation on coal expended in organic liquid.

It has come to my attention that a study made by Bituminous Research, Inc., for the Atomic Energy Commission has pointed out many possibilities for the application of radioisotopes and nuclear measurements techniques in the production, handling, and utilization of coal. The most promising of these could be explored, and, if our amendment is adopted they will be explored. Engineering research should be undertaken in this connection to establish the technical possibilities.

Madam President, our Nation needs a healthy coal industry for economic reasons and for national security reasons. We know that currently it is an industry incapable of adequately advancing research on its own initiative and exclusively with its own resources. The Congress has recognized this by creating the Office of Coal Research within the Department of the Interior. But that agency needs much technological assistance of the nature which the Atomic Energy Commission alone is capable of providing.

I have long been convinced that the coal industry will hold its own in the battle for the expanding electric energy markets, but I hold that its real future in the generations to follow us will depend very largely upon progress through research and development which will bring forth new uses and new products derived from this great natural resource.

We must act now to strengthen research and development and I urge the adoption of the amendment which we have submitted to the measure now under consideration.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my persuasive friend.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand the amendment has been drafted in collaboration with the Atomic Energy Commission, and that the Commission has prepared a backup statement as to the amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Nuclear processes offer at least two conditions which may be of particular benefit to the coal industry in terms of developing broader use of coal and coal products. These conditions are (1) very high temperature, and (2) intense radiation.

The AEC and the Bureau of Mines have been working together for about 8 years on some of the possible uses of these special conditions of nuclear energy for coal processing. This work has been directed largely toward the development of processes which would gasify coal, including work on very high temperature reactor materials and reactor design and work on high temperature helium systems.

It is proposed that work be broadened and accelerated in certain directions to include: (1) A thorough analysis of ways in which nuclear energy can be applied to improvement of the coal industry; (2) expanded research and development on effects of radiation and temperature on processes applicable to coal; (3) preliminary designs of nuclear systems sufficient to evaluate the problems and promises of these systems to coal industry; and, (4) use of radioisotopes in the coal industry.

More specifically in the area of research and development, it is noted that the effect of ionizing radiation on coal has received but limited study. Evidence indicates that under static conditions some interesting changes occur. However, as yet no dynamic studies have been made. There is hope that under suitable conditions of temperature, pressure and radiation coal with suitable additives of oxygen and/or hydrogen can be converted to products of great utility. Under this program experimental work would be undertaken to explore the possibility and to determine the effects of radiation of the nature of the product and the rate of the reaction during (1) carbonization, (2) conventional hydrogenation, (3) high temperature hydrogenation, (4) reaction of dry coal and steam and moderate temperatures and high pressures, (5) interaction of coal with oxygen or with steam alone, and (6) reaction of coal with other gases and with liquids.

An additional area of development which would be investigated is the effect of radiation on coal expended in organic liquid.

A study made by Bituminous Research, Inc., for the AEC has pointed out many possibilities for the application of radioisotopes and nuclear measurements techniques in the production, handling, and utilization of coal. The most promising of these will be explored, and engineering research would be undertaken to establish the technical possibilities.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, I am perfectly willing to take the amendment to conference for study and scrutiny by the conferees.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I would be most grateful to my friend from West Virginia if he would permit me to be a cosponsor of the amendment. I have a keen interest in the coal industry in my State, as the Senator has in the coal industry in his State.

I express my gratitude to the Senator from Rhode Island for his willingness to accept the amendment, and I express the hope that the amendment will be approved by the Senate without the necessity for elaborate debate.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] be included as a cosponsor of the pending amendment.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2043) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

REDUCTION OF RATES TO CUSTOMERS BY TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, on July 11 the Tennessee Valley Authority announced that it was permitting the some 150 municipal and cooperative distributors of its electric power to reduce rates by 8 percent to their customers in the seven Valley States. The new rate schedule was proclaimed at a White House ceremony marking the 100th birthday anniversary of the late Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, who sat on the other side of the aisle and who was the father of TVA.

In those days when a price cut on any commodity is about as rare as a July blizzard in Washington, such a move by this great Federal agency ought to be cause for widespread rejoicing both inside and outside the valley. Very probably there is rejoicing by the farmers, the housewives and the operators of smaller industrial plants served by TVA power; we do not know for certain because the consumers of this country, as a group, are relatively voiceless.

Some of the private utilities of this Nation and their spokesmen, however, do not appear to share this joy. Hardly had the new rate schedule been announced than it was being loudly ridiculed by private utility interests in the news columns of the New York Times and by the usually accurate Wall Street Journal in its editorial columns. They simply trotted out all of the old distortions and falsehoods which have dogged TVA since its founding in 1933 and which have been discredited time and again by those who prefer the facts.

For example, an editorial in the July 13 issue of the Wall Street Journal took note of the new Norris rate schedule in this context:

> Now, it's certainly nice that a sentimental observance can be made the occasion of a price cut, and we wonder why every private utility company in the country can't afford to do the same homage to its founder. But, then, TVA isn't bound by crass consideration of profit and loss. It pays no taxes, borrows at bargain rates from the Treausry, and doesn't have to worry about operating in the red because the taxpayers everywhere own it.

It is obvious that the writer of this editorial did not bother to check the facts about TVA that were as accessible as his own newspaper morgue. Otherwise, he would have known that TVA does, indeed, make payments in lieu of taxes to State and local governments and that these annual payments since 1933 have totaled more than $70 million. Moreover, the publicly owned systems distributing TVA power likewise pay taxes—many of them on full book value, not on a fractional assessment—and in some cases have voluntarily raised their tax payments to their local governments. Their total is even greater—nearly $102 million.

Had this editorial writer been just slightly conversant with TVA operations, he would have known that this agency has been and is bound, both morally and legally, by considerations of profit and loss. Over the years, TVA has earned a return on the investment in its power operations averaging about 4 percent. Not only that, but TVA has been required to pay back the appropriated investment in its power operations and has been doing so ahead of schedule. In addition, TVA now pays to the Treasury dividends on the appropriated investment at a rate equal to the going cost of money to the Government. Two such paybacks were made during the fiscal year just ended; they totaled $51.4 million, all but $10 million of which represented dividends.

But after every dime which the American people have invested in TVA's power system has been repaid, with interest, the American people—all of them—will still own it. That is more than can be said for any private utility in this Nation, many of which have been favored by fast tax writeoffs and other gilt-edged "gimmicks" amounting to a tax reduction.

Contrary to what the Wall Street Journal may think, TVA does not "borrow at bargain rates from the Treasury." Surely this newspaper must have forgotten that twice in the past fiscal year TVA has gone to Wall Street to sell a total of $100 million in bonds which are secured solely by TVA power revenues and not by the Treasury. I am certain that these bonds would not have been sold at rates so favorable to TVA had Wall Street regarded them as an unsound investment.

Yet, TVA's authority to market power revenue bonds was not easily won, though it was initially proposed by those very interests who now so loudly complain. The Members of the Senate vividly recall, I am sure, that although a TVA self-financing bill has been proposed every year since 1955 by the previous administration and supported by many of us from the valley, it took 4 years to get this legislation enacted.

Many Senators recall, too, what a fight TVA had to make to retain its ability to use its power revenues to add badly needed generating units to its steamplants, instead of coming back to the Congress for appropriations for this purpose. But fortunately for the users of TVA power—then facing a "brownout" throughout the valley—and for the taxpayers of this Nation, TVA's position was ultimately upheld. And TVA has been paying its way in this respect as well ever since.

I think it is highly significant that many of the protests against the new Norris rate schedule have come from the officers of private utility systems in sections surrounding the TVA power service area. A study a few years ago showed that the nearer a private utility is to the TVA area, the lower its rates and the higher its earnings are likely to be. Thus, the TVA yardstick has operated as a competitive factor benefiting both private utilities and their customers everywhere.

According to the New York Times of July 14, one of those who saw fit to belittle the Norris rate schedule was Edgar H. Dixon, president of Middle South Utilities, Inc. This is no surprise. Mr. Dixon is well remembered for the part he played in the infamous Dixon-Yates deal, which, had it succeeded, would have destroyed the Tennessee Valley Authority power system.

One statement attributed by this same article in the Times to a "spokesman for one major—private—power system" is, I think, ironic and downright amusing. This spokesman said the new Norris rate schedule "smacked of Madison Avenue at its worst."

It was only a few years ago that the big private power companies of the country were using Madison Avenue, through huge advertisements in the slick-paper magazines, to condemn TVA as "socialistic" or worse. The Internal Revenue Service, at least, thought so little of this type of campaigning that it ruled these companies could no longer write off the cost of such ads as a legitimate business expense.

There is one expression of sentiment in the Wall Street Journal editorial with which seriously I can agree. When this newspaper wonders why every private utility company in the country cannot afford to cut its rates, so do I. The history of TVA teaches that an expanding power supply encourages greater use of electricity; and this, in turn, means greater revenues. As its revenues have increased, TVA has given the consumer a break by lowering rates. The private utilities can do no better than to follow the TVA example.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2043) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 515, the companion House bill H.R. 7576.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7576) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, I move that the bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause, and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill, S. 2043, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H.R. 7576) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, I move that Senate bill 2043 be indefinitely postponed.

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

The motion was agreed to.

THE FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, there is a standard joke about the farmer who went to the city and bought the Brooklyn Bridge, but at least there was a bridge.

Secretary Freeman is in an even greater dilemma. He has paid over $150 million to take out of corn production 4½ million phantom acres of land which in reality was never intended to be put into corn production in 1961.

Under the 1961 Feed Grains Act he has paid $680 million to farmers in return for an agreement that they will reduce their 1961 crop acreage by 20,090,511 acres below their average 1959 and 1960 acreage, but based upon the

Department of Agriculture's crop report just released this week, while the Secretary has paid for the retirement of over 20 million acres of corn-producing land from this year's production, he has actually obtained a reduction of only 15,379,000 acres.

Thus we find that the Secretary of Agriculture has paid approximately $150 million to retire from the production of corn about 4½ million acres of cropland which either did not exist or never would have been planted in corn anyway.

The Department of Agriculture's crop report showed that in 1959 and 1960 the planted corn acreage for all purposes in those years was 82,742,000 acres for 1959 and 81,434,000 acres in 1960, or an average for the 2 years of 82,088,000.

Under the Feed Grains Act of 1961, the Department has approved contracts under which direct payments to the farmers will aggregate $680 million in return for their agreement to reduce their corn acreage below their average 1959 and 1960 crops by 20,090,511 acres.

This should have brought the July 1961 crop estimates of planted corn acreage down to approximately 62 million acres. Instead, however, the official crop report released July 7, 1961, by the Department of Agriculture gives the estimate of the planted acreage of corn for 1961 as only being reduced to 66,619,000 acres.

The Department has a very plausible explanation of this variation. To justify its figures, it merely released under date of June 21, 1961, a revised estimate for 1961 planted acreage showing an estimated base corn acreage of 87,047,500, or about 5 million acres higher than their other report.

This may make the figures balance, but it does not change the fact that in 1959 and 1960 the planted corn acreage was 82 million and 81,400,000, respectively. The Government paid $680 million to get a reduction of 20 million acres in this production of corn for 1961, but, based upon its most recent report, the Department still estimates the 1961 corn production to be 66,619,000 acres.

The Government paid for a 20-million-acre reduction and got a reduction of a little over 15 million acres. No matter how the reports are juggled, the answer is the same.

Approximately $150 million has been paid to retire 4½ million phantom acres from 1961 corn production.

To show the magnitude of this $150 million blunder I point out that these 4½ million of phantom acres represent an area larger than the combined total of all of the harvested cropland—corn acreage as well as acreage of all other types of crops—in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, and West Virginia.

Not only does the Feed Grains Act of 1961 represent a multi-million-dollar waste of the taxpayers' money but also it has created a speculators' paradise. Furthermore, it has actually hurt the American farmers as the Secretary attempted first to bribe the farmers to reduce their plantings and then to force the American farmers under the bureaucratic umbrella by manipulating the grain markets in such a manner as to break the market.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD two reports: The first, USDA Bulletin No. 2141-61, in which are listed both the planted and the harvested acreage for corn along with the yield and the total production for each of the years 1950 through 1960. It will be noted from this chart that the 1959 and 1960 planted acreage of corn for all purposes in the United States was 82,742,000 and 81,434,000, respectively, while the harvested acreage in each of those 2 years was actually lower.

The second report, dated July 1961, gives the planted acreage for all corn in 1961 as being 66,619,000 acres as compared to 81,434,000 acres for 1960.

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

All corn and corn for grain: Acreage, yield and production, United States, 1950–60

Year	For all purposes				For grain		
	Acreage		Yield per acre	Production	Acreage harvested	Yield per acre	Production
	Planted	Harvested					
	Thousand acres	*Thousand acres*	*Bushels*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand acres*	*Bushels*	*Thousand bushels*
1950	82,859	81,818	37.1	3,074,914	72,398	38.2	2,764,071
1951	83,275	80,729	35.1	2,925,758	71,191	36.9	2,628,937
1952	82,230	80,940	40.0	3,291,994	71,353	41.8	2,980,793
1953	81,574	80,459	39.3	3,209,896	70,738	40.7	2,881,801
1954	82,185	80,186	38.1	3,057,891	68,668	39.4	2,707,913
1955	80,932	79,367	40.6	3,219,546	68,462	42.0	2,872,959
1956	77,828	75,247	45.8	3,445,029	64,877	47.4	3,075,336
1957	73,180	71,864	47.3	3,399,649	63,065	48.3	3,045,355
1958	73,351	72,224	51.6	3,724,969	63,549	52.8	3,356,205
1959	82,742	81,902	51.2	4,197,398	72,091	53.1	3,824,598
1960	81,434	80,691	53.3	4,304,484	71,443	54.5	3,891,212

Crop production, July 1961—Planted acreage of crops, 1960 and 1961

State	Corn, all		State	Corn, all	
	1960	1961		1960	1961
	Thousand acres	*Thousand acres*		*Thousand acres*	*Thousand acres*
Maine	10	10	North Carolina	1,912	1,530
New Hampshire	10	10	South Carolina	781	648
Vermont	47	44	Georgia	2,571	2,237
Massachusetts	25	24	Florida	517	481
Rhode Island	5	5	Kentucky	1,643	1,199
Connecticut	34	32	Tennessee	1,446	1,099
New York	653	516	Alabama	1,868	1,494
New Jersey	152	122	Mississippi	1,142	971
Pennsylvania	1,202	1,142	Arkansas	326	228
Ohio	3,588	2,727	Louisiana	392	302
Indiana	5,283	4,121	Oklahoma	231	173
Illinois	10,323	8,671	Texas	1,391	1,043
Michigan	2,076	1,806	Montana	108	76
Wisconsin	2,889	2,629	Idaho	81	80
Minnesota	6,824	5,800	Wyoming	61	61
Iowa	12,658	10,506	Colorado	470	352
Missouri	4,315	3,323	New Mexico	37	33
North Dakota	1,335	961	Arizona	32	30
South Dakota	4,238	3,475	Utah	47	46
Nebraska	6,817	5,658	Nevada	5	3
Kansas	2,016	1,331	Washington	87	70
Delaware	159	137	Oregon	62	49
Maryland	489	440	California	211	175
Virginia	741	637			
West Virginia	124	112	United States	81,434	66,619

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Next I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a second report released by the Department of Agriculture under date of June 21, 1961, entitled "1961 Feed Grain Program."

This report boosts the planned corn acreage for 1961 up to 87,047,500, or about 5 million acres higher than their regular report shows as having been planted in either of the years 1959 or 1960.

Obviously this later report was compiled in an effort to reconcile their own figures and cover up the blunder.

The chart inserted in the RECORD immediately above shows that at no time between 1950 and 1960 was the planted corn acreage in the United States—based upon the Department of Agriculture's own estimates—ever anywhere near the 87 million acres reported here.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that this second chart be printed as a part of my remarks.

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

TABLE 2.—*1961 feed grain program—Corn—Total base acres, base acres on participating farms, and diverted acres, by States* [1]

State	Total base acres	Base acres on participating farms	Intended diverted acres	Percent base on participating farm is of total	Acres diverted as percent— Of total base	Acres diverted as percent— Of base on participating farms
	Thousand acres	*Thousand acres*	*Thousand acres*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Maine	11.0	0.5	0.4	4.5	3.6	80.0
New Hampshire	11.5					
Vermont	59.5	1.3	.9	2.2	1.5	69.2
Massachusetts	31.5	.2	.2	.6	.6	100.0
Rhode Island	6.0	(2)	(2)			
Connecticut	41.0	1.7	1.0	4.1	2.4	58.8
New York	662.8	315.6	190.3	47.6	28.7	60.3
New Jersey	188.2	68.8	38.8	36.6	20.6	56.4
Pennsylvania	1,286.7	271.4	167.4	21.1	13.0	61.7
Ohio	4,115.4	1,968.1	1,031.4	47.8	25.1	52.4
Indiana	5,481.2	2,994.5	1,377.9	54.6	24.4	46.0
Illinois	10,823.0	6,346.3	2,286.4	58.6	21.1	36.0
Michigan	2,315.4	984.6	550.2	42.5	23.8	55.9
Wisconsin	2,989.5	1,228.3	603.4	41.1	20.2	49.1
Minnesota	7,131.2	4,390.4	1,553.1	61.6	21.8	35.4
Iowa	13,118.3	8,592.5	2,921.4	65.5	22.3	34.0
Missouri	4,483.5	3,610.5	1,833.7	80.5	40.9	50.8
North Dakota	1,389.2	1,046.5	414.7	75.3	29.8	39.6
South Dakota	4,497.4	2,520.6	848.5	56.0	18.9	33.7
Nebraska	7,248.4	5,570.8	1,698.3	76.8	23.4	30.5
Kansas	2,142.4	1,532.9	654.8	71.6	30.6	42.7
Delaware	157.2	75.0	38.5	47.7	24.5	51.3
Maryland	522.7	161.0	79.1	30.8	15.1	49.1
Virginia	814.1	237.0	134.8	29.1	16.5	56.9
West Virginia	147.9	14.9	9.5	10.1	6.4	63.7
North Carolina	2,054.4	948.4	514.6	46.2	25.0	54.2
South Carolina	967.1	397.4	205.1	41.1	21.2	51.6
Georgia	2,880.0	756.5	322.2	26.3	11.2	42.6
Florida	632.3	275.9	120.8	43.6	19.1	43.8
Kentucky	1,860.9	941.6	577.5	50.6	31.0	61.3
Tennessee	1,663.4	716.0	446.2	43.0	26.8	62.3
Alabama	2,024.9	791.3	432.7	39.1	21.4	54.7
Mississippi	1,386.4	442.6	237.2	31.9	17.1	53.6
Arkansas	398.2	122.9	78.0	30.9	19.6	63.5
Louisiana	550.0	135.6	76.0	24.6	13.8	56.0
Oklahoma	276.7	92.7	58.7	33.5	21.2	63.3
Texas	1,514.2	783.7	342.6	51.7	22.6	43.7
Montana	110.4	83.8	39.8	75.9	36.0	47.5
Idaho	81.0	10.2	6.4	12.6	7.9	62.7
Wyoming	62.5	25.7	12.0	41.1	19.2	46.7
Colorado	481.4	247.1	103.8	51.3	21.6	42.0
New Mexico	46.0	8.6	4.5	18.7	9.8	52.3
Arizona	33.6	4.3	1.7	12.9	5.0	39.5
Utah	50.8	10.9	7.5	21.4	14.8	68.8
Nevada	4.5	1.0	.8	22.2	17.8	80.0
Washington	87.2	37.0	18.3	42.4	21.0	49.4
Oregon	65.0	25.8	15.4	39.7	23.7	59.7
California	141.6	77.9	34.1	55.0	24.1	43.8
U.S. total	87,047.5	48,870.3	20,090.6	56.1	23.1	41.1

[1] Preliminary. [2] Less than 50 acres.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, for the benefit of Senators, I expect to speak from 20 minutes to half an hour. I shall be glad to yield briefly for insertions to any Senator who wishes to do so, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. HART. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

TY COBB

Mr. HART. Madam President, today we mourn the passing from the American sports scene of the great Tyrus Raymond Cobb. Ty Cobb determined to achieve professional perfection, and he did so. Standing at the top of the list of memorable baseball figures of all time is Ty Cobb, the "Georgia Peach."

In his 22-year career with the Detroit Tigers this colorful outfielder became a legend and an inspiration to all followers of American sports. The story is dramatically told in a mere recital of his record. He holds the highest lifetime batting average in baseball, .367; he won more batting championships, 12, and stole more bases, 892, than any other player in organized baseball.

Ty Cobb played in more major league games than did any other man. He went to bat more times than any other man, scored the most runs, made the most hits, the most singles, the most triples, the greatest number of total bases, and scored the most runs.

His record goes on: the most years with 200 or more hits, the most years leading the league in hits, most stolen bases in one season, most years batting .300 or more, most consecutive years leading the league in batting, and most times with five or more hits in a game.

During his lifetime Ty Cobb was singularly honored by being selected the "No. 1 immortal" in modern baseball's Hall of Fame. He also, and belatedly, received the Player of the Year Award for 1911.

In viewing Ty Cobb's career his greatness seems to stem not from his speed, throwing arm or any other specific athletic skill, but rather, from his unquestionable desire and will to win. He practiced all the great forms of the game until mastery was his, yet he never tired of self-improvement. He approached baseball as an art, demanding artistic performance at all times. His competitive spirit will stand as an inspiration and example to all players from the sandlot to the big leagues. I extend my sympathy to his immediate family—and

the millions of members of his "baseball family" would have me add their word as well. Ty Cobb stayed on top during all his long baseball career; Ty Cobb will remain at the head of the list of America's sporting memorables.

THE BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to say a word on the Senate floor with respect to the message which the President sent to Khrushchev on Berlin today, joined in in the same tone by the French and the British. The event is portentous, and is of such concern to so many people, that I believe it is desirable to say a word about it in the Senate.

The message was blunt and serious. I support it fully. I believe it reflects the mood of the American people that we will not back down on the fundamentals with respect to Berlin. The message shows that we are ready to negotiate until the cows come home upon subjects which do not go to the preservation of the freedom of 2 million Berliners, Berlin as a symbol of freedom for the entire free world, or the right of self-determination, which is as basic a policy as we can have in all our activities throughout the world, whether it be in respect of the unification of Germany or the unification of Berlin.

No one wishes for a minute to take the position that we are shutting the door, that we are afraid to talk, that we do not want to talk, or that there are not things upon which we can agree which might represent some yielding of our position. What is not negotiable is pushing the United States, Great Britain, and France out of Berlin or making it some kind of hybrid free city, or in some other way gobbling it up for communism. Our President has so said, and I think the people will back him.

Madam President, the policy is not without risk. No great policy is without risk. The signal to give up Berlin would be clear evidence to all of Europe that we would not oppose the Communists having a free hand. Such a course would be unthinkable to us or to our allies throughout the world. This is the one position, if there is one position, on which we must stand. It is Berlin. I think that our President has undertaken a most sober responsibility. He made the statement clearly, bluntly, and seriously, and he is entitled to know from people who also have something to lose, like those of us in this Chamber, that he has our support, and that we agree with him that his action represents the serious mood of the American people on this issue.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

CHESTER BOWLES

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, this morning the newspapers carried the good news that the distinguished American, Chester Bowles, is to remain as Under Secretary of State. I rise to congratulate the President on having made the decision that Mr. Bowles will conttinue to represent his country in the future with that same high level of ability with which he has represented it in the past.

In my judgment, the President has wisely beaten back the effort to assassinate by newspaper this fine public servant. Faceless men who anonymously spread vicious and largely untrue attacks on Mr. Bowles' ability and usefulness have been denied their target. A fine public servant having these special qualities, so badly needed to reorganize the State Department, so as to enable the Department to perform these critical duties in a rapidly changing world, will continue at his post.

Again I congratulate the President for his sound decision.

Madam President, many of us in public life have suffered the ordeal of newspaper. We are used to it. We take it in our stride. Our skins are thick. We do not resent it. The Bowles incident over the last 48 hours is merely one of many efforts made by little men without political courage to destroy valued public servants through their contacts with newspapermen. I have no criticism of the reporters who wrote the stories. This is their job. My criticism is of those men—and I again use the phrase faceless men, because they do not have the courage to identify themselves—who snipe in the dark against men of Mr. Bowles' stature.

I should like briefly to review a few of the newspaper accounts and to comment on some of the rumors and accusations—never proved—which have been made against this fine American and, incidentally, this distinguished Democrat.

On Monday, July 17, the New York Times carried an article on its front page entitled "Kennedy Expected To Ask Bowles To Resign Today." Unlike most New York Times articles, this one does not carry a byline. I do not know who wrote it. However, whoever did must have a very red face indeed this morning, because in that article it was stated, among other things, that "there is a major conflict of personality and policy developing here between the White House and Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, former Governor of Connecticut and U.S. Ambassador to India."

If there was such a conflict, it did not last very long, because as of this morning it is all over. The President, after having had a friendly lunch with Mr. Bowles, directed Mr. Salinger, his press secretary, to announce that Mr. Bowles would continue in his position, would make his trip to the Far East, as he intended, and was to stay in his job.

Nevertheless, the New York Times, 24 hours earlier had made the definite statement, based on someone's authority—I wonder whose authority—that the President was about to ask Mr. Bowles to resign. The Times said it was understood that this was to take place. The article states:

> There is reason to believe that the President will ask Mr. Bowles to resign and accept an ambassadorship in Latin America.

I wonder who understood it. I wonder who planted that story. In the Senate we are accustomed to planted stories. This occurs to me to be a peculiarly inept effort to plant something, which turned out to be not true. The article states that Mr. Bowles' "primary interest lies in the field, not of administration, but of policy."

That is not true. When Mr. Bowles accepted the position of Under Secretary of State early this year he advised the President that his interest was due to the fact that he would be the principal administrator in the Department and would have an opportunity in that position to clean out the deadwood, to get rid of the older and more conservative rightwing permanent Foreign Service officers who were committed to the sterile policies in the world which got us into such trouble during the Eisenhower administration.

The article goes on to say that Mr. Bowles is being criticized in certain circles within the Department and in the White House for his position on Cuba. His position on Cuba was right. I have no doubt that this was one of the motivating causes which persuaded the President to reject this effort to assassinate Mr. Bowles' usefulness, and to keep him in his position.

Mr. Bowles—

Says the article—

> has not argued for the admission of Communist China into the United Nations, or for the recognition of that regime, but has insisted that the opinion of the allied world demanded that this question be faced and debated vigorously within the Kennedy administration.

What is wrong with that? One of our best allies in Asia, Pakistan, recently sent its President over here. He visited us and he has just now left us. President Mohammad Ayub Khan has taken the same view on Communist China. On the "Meet the Press" program last Sunday he said in no uncertain terms that this was a matter on which the United States should make up its mind as to what it is going to do. In our country we make up our minds as the result of vigorous debate, not by pushing matters under the rug, as is done in totalitarian countries.

The article states that Mr. Bowles' position in wanting to reopen the China policy "has not endeared him to powerful Senators on Capitol Hill."

I wonder who they are. They have never been identified, and they certainly have not made their position clear on the floor of the Senate since Mr. Bowles took office in January.

The article states:

> One other factor has envenomed Mr. Bowles' relations with the party.

He has been so brash as to recommend Ambassadors who are not in the tradition of being either permanent Foreign Service officers or political hacks. This is a reason that is given why he will not retain his present position.

One of the best things Mr. Bowles has done since he came to the State Department has been to invigorate our ambassadorial service by insisting on the appointment of men who know what they

are doing, who are not career Foreign Service officers, and who have no political preference which would enable them to be appointed. Among those individuals, it is clear enough, are men like Edwin O. Reischauer, Ambassador to Tokyo; Kenneth Young, Ambassador to Thailand, and J. Kenneth Galbraith, Ambassador to India.

Mr. Bowles pressed these appointments through not only the State Department and the White House, but also the Senate.

No mean achievement, I suggest, Madam President.

I should have added to that list William Atwood, a former associate of Adlai E. Stevenson.

Madam President, Mr. Bowles is criticized for having influenced the judgment of the United States in the United Nations to reject the position of Portugal in connection with Angola and to place our country on the side of anticolonialism in that strife-torn colony on the southwest coast of Africa. In that regard, I believe, again, that Mr. Bowles is entitled to commendation for his leadership, for his administrative ability, if you will, in persuading the State Department, the President, and the U.S. delegation at the United Nations to move along those lines.

It is said that there has been some annoyance in the State Department because of the inability to get a decision on the Berlin question from that Department and from our North Atlantic Treaty allies. With this irritation one can have sympathy. It has taken a long time to hammer out our policy on the anvil of discussion, but I suggest it is a little unfair for the anonymous attackers of Mr. Bowles to blame this on him. It occurs to me that the reason goes far deeper in the State Department than that.

One can hope that, as a result of this incident, perhaps we shall be able to formulate a more clear-cut policy on Berlin, and perhaps in a shorter length of time than would otherwise have been the case.

It is suggested that one reason why it is necessary to get rid of Mr. Bowles is that he is alleged to be a devotee of a planned economy and the welfare state. If Mr. Bowles is to be indicted for such views, it will be necessary to indict about three-fourths of the Senators on this side of the aisle and about one-fourth of the Senators on the other side of the aisle. If we do not get more planning into our economy and go forward with the welfare measures advocated by the President of the United States, the country will be in a far worse condition than it otherwise would be.

I should say that a majority of the Senate would wholeheartedly support the well-known views of Mr. Bowles on domestic policy. Furthermore, I am confident that one reason why the President of the United States has made his decision to retain Mr. Bowles is that, by and large, across the board, the President of the United States himself shares those views.

It is said that Mr. Bowles is unpopular with the conservative wing of the Democratic Party. So are 45 other Democrats who serve in this body. I suspect their number is not confined to the Senate and the House of Representatives, but I assert also that the views of Mr. Bowles and of other Members of this body in that regard are shared also by the President of the United States.

It is said the President may be embarrassed politically by the frankness with which Mr. Bowles states his views. The candor of Mr. Bowles has been well known for many a long year. It is shared by a number of the President's associates who have served with him in this body for a long while. Certainly the President of the United States, as well as others in high authority, must have known when Mr. Bowles assumed his position that he does not pull punches. The fact that he does not pull punches is, in my opinion, a very good reason why the President was eminently sound in making his decision to retain Mr. Bowles.

Mr. Bowles, it is said, has a number of important opponents who have been openly demanding his resignation. Who are they? Where are they? Why do they operate like faceless men in the dark? I remember an old story of my youth, in which it was thought there was a thief in the chickenyard. When the owner went there to see if he could find the thief in the dark, a voice came out of the chickenyard saying, "There ain't nobody here but us chickens."

I wonder who are the people who are attacking Mr. Bowles anonymously; if they are in such high positions, why do they not have the political courage to come forward and identify themselves?

It is said that a battle is taking place within the White House between two groups. One group wants the President to keep Mr. Bowles; the other group wants Mr. Bowles to be dismissed at once. I suggest that the second group has now lost the battle.

I turn now to an article entitled "Bowles Expected To Reject Any New Government Post," published in the Washington Evening Star of July 17, 1961. The article was written by Earl H. Voss, a Star staff writer. The article is candid and clear. It reads, in part:

> The President reportedly has expressed great displeasure with the State Department bureaucracy and suggested that Mr. Bowles' talents have been wasted in bucking it.

I wonder who made the report. Who is the author of the report? I certainly agree with the President. I presume he said what he is quoted to have said; namely, that he "has expressed great displeasure with the State Department bureaucracy." I do, too. I think it is time a new group of people were brought into the State Department to operate the bureaucracy, new ideas and more imagination, rather than to copy the Russians by saying "Nyet, nyet, nyet" every time someone suggests a new idea.

I commend Mr. Bowles for putting his considerable talents to work in attacking that attitude of mind which defends the status quo. I suggest that his talents, far from being wasted, are well on the way to overcoming the difficulties. I am confident that Mr. Bowles will overcome the difficulties, now that the President has given him his support.

The Evening Star article continues:

> The old guard of the Foreign Service, which has resisted Mr. Bowles' suggested policy changes, are believed to have joined with Mr. Bundy of the White House staff as the principal instigators of the move to oust him.

I have a very high regard for and confidence in McGeorge Bundy. I do not believe—and I would be most interested in getting his reaction—he has participated in the effort to "get" Mr. Bowles, in the colloquialism which we are accustomed to use. I think it would be interesting, indeed, if Mr. Bundy were prepared to make a statement of what part, if any, he played in the matter, and whether this quotation published in the Evening Star is correct or not.

As one of Mr. Bowles' supporters is quoted in the Evening Star as saying:

> It will be a curious result if the first head to roll after the Cuban affair is the head of the man who opposed it, and the man who replaces him is one of the White House accomplices.

I now turn to an article entitled "White House Says Bowles Is Staying," written by Murrey Marder and Warren Unna, and published in the Washington Post of July 17, 1961. The first paragraph reads:

> The White House officially denied yesterday that Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles is about to resign, while informed sources reported that a decision only has been postponed.

What informed sources? Who said that? Is whoever said it free to identify himself? Does not the country have a right to know whether Mr. Salinger was correct when he indicated, as clearly as words can, that Mr. Bowles is to continue in office for as long as he desires to continue, so far as the present situation is concerned? Who undertook to go behind Mr. Salinger's statement? What "informed sources report that a decision only has been postponed"? I suggest we are entitled to an answer to that question in view of the categorical statement by Mr. Salinger, "It is obvious that he is staying."

It is a sad fact that an administration source—who would that be?—says Mr. Bowles' resignation "is not currently expected."

Later in the article we read:

> Other sources maintain that the actual position is that attempts to resolve the Bowles affair will be studied while he is out of town, but the end result is likely to be either a shift in jobs or Bowles' resignation from the administration.

What "other sources"? Do they, too, insist on remaining anonymous? It occurs to me that some of our friends in the press might be interested in tracking this statement down. Let us find out who these faceless men are. The Washington Post article continues:

> Around the President, the dominant view among the men in the White House, however, is that Bowles is "miscast" for the No. 2 job in the State Department, and that the issue is one of personality, not policy.

Who are those men? Are we not entitled to know? The criticism is made

of Mr. Bowles that he is not a good administrator.

Who says that? What kind of administrators are they? Did any one of his critics make a private fortune in building up a large advertising business? Was any one of his critics ever elected to the office of Governor of a complicated State such as Connecticut, where in 2 short years Gov. Chester Bowles reorganized the State government in a way that has stood the test of time. Did any one of his faceless critics serve during a critical period in our country's history as Administrator of the Office of Price Administration—in charge of an office which required as high administrative talents as any ever to be found in the Federal Government? The idea that Chester Bowles has not proven himself time after time to be a first-class administrator is, I suggest, not worthy of belief.

I wonder whether the Washington Post article comes closer to the truth when it says that those who oppose Mr. Bowles—and now I am paraphrasing, Madam President, not quoting directly—object because of the fact that he is a voluble liberal of the evangelical school. And is it not true that—as the President has wisely decided—if Mr. Bowles were to be squeezed out of the State Department or significantly downgraded in the administration, the rightwing of the Republican Party and the conservative Democrats undoubtedly would regard that as an indication that the first scalp in the administration had fallen to their cause.

Madam President, again I commend the President of the United States for resisting that attack, because unquestionably it is true that otherwise it would have been said across the country that those faceless accusers had been successful.

Madam President, I shall not continue to discuss in detail the article to which I have referred, other than to make two more points:

The article reiterates what the New York Times said; namely, that the President is unhappy over the way the State Department has failed to measure up as an executive organization. I contend again that is true. I contend again that Mr. Bowles has made a greater effort, and has had a greater success in 6 short months, to remedy that situation than has been accomplished by any other Under Secretary of State in recent history.

I have no doubt that there are aspects of the old Augean stables in the permanent bureaucracy in the State Department, and I have no doubt that a certain amount of housecleaning there is in order. But, Madam President, I have no doubt, either, that the man to do that job is the one who has been given the job; and he should be given a wider area of authority in which to complete the personnel reorganization which he has so brilliantly begun.

The only other point I wish to make in connection with the article is that efforts have been made to stir up trouble between the Secretary of State and Mr. Bowles. Those efforts also have resulted in complete failure. The Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, in his press conference in the last 24 hours has spoken in the warmest and the highest terms of Mr. Bowles as his principal assistant. No breach has been driven between them. Again the faceless accusers were unable to make their accusations stick.

Madam President, at this point I should like to comment briefly on two other matters.

In this morning's edition of the Washington Post is to be found an editorial entitled "The Bowles Affair." In the editorial, the writer points out that Mr. Bowles' role has been a difficult one, that he must be both a policymaker and a detail man, that he must be a man of principle, and that his devotion to principle needs to be strong enough to win friends, but not strong enough to make significant and powerful enemies.

The editorial also points out that—

> Mr. Bowles brought to his job the experience of an administrator gained as a Governor and in earlier Federal posts. He has worked hard at making his own personality complementary to that of his chief; and this has not been easy for one who who has been the top man in most of the places he has hitherto served.
>
> On the detailed kind of work involved in straightening out the administrative jungle of the State Department he seems to have done well. The Department will be better off—

And, Madam President, note especially this part of the editorial—

> for his handling of personnel, his recruitment of new people, his influence on ambassadorial appointments, his impact on the Foreign Service, his contributions to the Cultural Affairs Office, his management of protocol, responsibilities to new nations. He has supervised the establishment of the new operations center. He helped put through needed amendments to the Foreign Service Act. The International Labor Office has been given a better setup. He has lent his sympathetic help to subordinates who have cut out needless reports, eliminated departmental committees and otherwise simplified procedures. He has skillfully handled the program to give ambassadors more control over all U.S. operations in their countries of assignment.

Madam President, the gentleman referred to in the editorial should not be discharged from his position. Instead, the country will be fortunate if he is continued in his post. I am glad the President has so decided, and again I congratulate the President.

Madam President, in conclusion, let me say that perhaps the most eloquent newspaper statement in support of Mr. Bowles appeared this morning in the New York Times. It is a short one, and I shall read it in full:

THE BOWLES AFFAIR

If the man who opposed the invasion of Cuba, who believes that Communist China cannot be swept under the rug, who recognizes the revolution of rising expectations through the underdeveloped world and the need of an American policy to lead it; if the man whose restless, imaginative mind ceaselessly sparks off ideas (not all of them good but most of them stimulating)—if that man is in danger of being fired from a top-ranking position in the Department of State, then we say so much worse for the administration and the country. The man is, of course, Under Secretary Chester Bowles, whose reprieve yesterday is gratifying for the very reason that—whatever his faults—he possesses some freshness, courage, and idealism in an area of government where these qualities are as necessary as they are rare.

Madam President, in the last analysis, what all this boils down to is that those who object to Mr. Bowles and who attempted to have him replaced, but did not have the courage to come out into the open and let the country know who they were, are simply angry at Mr. Bowles because he insists on being Chester Bowles. But, Madam President, for my money, Chester Bowles is a fine American, a fine Democrat, and a great Under Secretary of State; and again I commend the President of the United States and congratulate him heartily on being able to resist that attack against this man of great ability, and for retaining him as our Under Secretary of State.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD various newspaper articles and editorials from which I have quoted.

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

[From the Evening Star, July 17, 1961]

BOWLES EXPECTED TO REJECT ANY NEW GOVERNMENT POST

(By Earl H. Voss)

Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles is ready to get out of the administration completely if President Kennedy presses efforts to ease him out of the State Department, informed sources said today.

McGeorge Bundy, the President's national security adviser, is mentioned as Mr. Bowles' most likely successor if he leaves the Department.

Mr. Bowles, who was Mr. Kennedy's foreign policy adviser during the election campaign last year and did not seek reelection to the House in order to participate in the campaign, was reported ready to resign in a public display of disappointment.

The administration reportedly is offering him the posts of Ambassador to Brazil or roving Ambassador. It is understood the President would give him any other ambassadorship Mr. Bowles preferred.

Mr. Kennedy already has talked to Mr. Bowles in affirmative ways about a new job, informants reported. The President reportedly has expressed great displeasure with the State Department bureaucracy and suggested that Mr. Bowles' talents have been wasted in bucking it.

Mr. Bowles, it is understood, has been told he ought to be serving the administration out in the open rather than behind the scenes in the Under Secretary's job.

The old guard of the Foreign Service, which has resisted Mr. Bowles' suggested policy changes, are believed to have joined with Mr. Bundy of the White House staff as the principal instigators of the move to oust him.

"It will be a curious result," one of the Undersecretary's supporters commented, "if the first head to roll after the Cuban affair is the head of the man who opposed it and the man who replaces him is one of the White House accomplices."

Secretary of State Rusk is said to be keeping out of the whole affair.

Mr. Bowles' friends consider it a major miscalculation of the forces seeking to remove him that the Under Secretary would be prepared to "go quietly."

Instead, Mr. Bowles, they say, is prepared to force the issue into the open and oblige President Kennedy, in effect, to fire him.

President Kennedy reportedly has made no decision and Mr. Bowles has not offered his resignation. If he does, he "won't say he's happy," his friends are convinced.

It was considered a possibility that Mr. Rusk might decide Mr. Bundy could not fit in the Under Secretary's role. He made a similar decision when Mr. Kennedy sought to place Walt W. Rostow in the State Department as chief of policy planning and Mr. Rostow wound up on the White House staff.

STEVENSON REACTION EXPECTED

Informants said United Nations Ambassador Stevenson, now in Europe, is expected to react very strongly to the moves against Mr. Bowles.

Mr. Bowles, mentioned briefly as a potential candidate for the Democratic nomination for President last year, withdrew from consideration to work with other Connecticut politicians, including Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff and Democratic National Chairman John Bailey, for Mr. Kennedy's nomination.

Mr. Bowles also headed the committee that drafted the Democratic platform and was backed by liberal elements of the party for the post of Secretary of State. In addition to having served in the House, he is a former Governor of Connecticut and Ambassador to India.

Mr. Bundy, also mentioned for a time as a possible Secretary of State, was a Harvard dean and is a Republican.

[From the Washington Post, July 17, 1961]

NEW JOB FOR BOWLES IS REPORTED IMMINENT

(By Murrey Marder)

President Kennedy has discussed with Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles the desirability of shifting Bowles out of the Department into another post, and a decision is imminent.

Bowles was expected to have a meeting with the President at the White House today, but sources last night said the meeting had been postponed, apparently to avoid any indication that pressure was being put on Bowles to resign.

There have been rumors around Washington for some time that Bowles would be shifted from his No. 2 post in the State Department. In recent days, this has been accompanied by speculation that McGeorge Bundy, Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, who was among those originally considered for the post of Secretary of State, would be shifted from the White House to replace Bowles.

Bowles, according to informed sources, will be offered a post as roving ambassador, or some other ambassadorial post.

Removal of Bowles from the State Department would undoubtedly trigger a wide political controversy. One of Bowles' supporters said last night that this would undoubtedly be "a symbolic issue to the liberals in the country."

Bowles, former Governor of Connecticut, later Ambassador to India, and then a Member of Congress from Connecticut, did not run for reelection again in 1960, thus leaving himself free to take a major role in the Kennedy election campaign. He was Kennedy's chief adviser on foreign policy as well as chairman of the Democratic Platform Committee.

Regarded in the Nation as an outstanding member of the liberal wing of the Democratic Party, Bowles was himself a leading candidate for Secretary of State.

RIFT IN STATE DEPARTMENT

In the past few months major controversy has built up in the State Department and in the White House over Bowles' operating style as Under Secretary. Critics assailed him for impractical, free-wheeling reform ideas, lack of attention to the operating details of policy, and general failure to perform the staff director functions of the Department.

Supporters countered that there was a clear understanding when Bowles joined the Department that he would not be restricted to the normal administrative function of a staff director but would specifically have free reign to stimulate ideas and reexamine basic policy premises.

Instead, his supporters claim, Bowles found himself boxed in on all sides, both by opponents inside the State Department and by the men around the President.

It was learned last night that the President met secretly with Bowles at the White House one day last week for a fairly lengthy conversation.

PRESIDENT DISAPPOINTED

The President reportedly told Bowles that he knew Bowles must be experiencing a feeling of frustration in the State Department, and the President said he was disappointed with the way the operation of the State Department has been developing.

The President said he was particularly disappointed, it was said, that the Department has not been generating new policy ideas. The President, it was reported, expressed great puzzlement as to why ideas produced by Bowles never reached him.

The President's conversation with Bowles was conducted in a manner of considerable friendliness by the President, it was said, and the President expressed his belief in Bowles' abilities. The implication, at least, was, however, that Bowles' abilities could be better fulfilled in some other post, it was reported.

Bowles' associates say he has had no real personal contact with the President for many months prior to the meeting last week. They note that while he was cut off from participation in preparations for the abortive Cuban landing, he learned about the landing before it took place and submitted an opposing memorandum to Secretary of State Rusk.

Before the President left for Hyannis Port, Mass., he scheduled another meeting with Bowles at the White House today. It was learned last night that Secretary of State Dean Rusk also has a meeting scheduled with the President today. Last night sources here said, however, that the Kennedy-Bowles Monday meeting was off.

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1961]

BOWLES RETAINED AS AID TO RUSK—KENNEDY POSTPONES CHANGE REGARDED AS INEVITABLE

(By Wallace Carroll)

WASHINGTON, July 17.—President Kennedy retained Chester Bowles today as his Under Secretary of State.

The President thus put off a change in the high command of the State Department that important administration sources believe to be inevitable.

Pierre Salinger, the White House Press Secretary, cleared up the question of Mr. Bowles' immediate future after the Under Secretary had lunched with President Kennedy at the White House.

Mr. Salinger told reporters that Mr. Bowles would stay as Under Secretary. Earlier, he refused to discuss published reports that Mr. Bowles would either resign or be dismissed.

According to these reports, criticism of Mr. Bowles within the White House, in Congress, and in the State Department—was coming to a head.

President Kennedy himself was said to be dissatisfied with the policymaking performance of the State Department and to hold Mr. Bowles, as the Under Secretary for Political Affairs, largely responsible.

Accordingly, he suggested to Mr. Bowles last week that he give up the job of Under Secretary and go abroad as an Ambassador. He was to talk to Mr. Bowles again this week, the reports said, and offer him the choice between the ambassadorship and dismissal.

These reports were privately accepted as true by members of the White House staff and by associates of Mr. Bowles. Indeed, friends who had talked to Mr. Bowles over the weekend expressed indignation over the pressure that was being put on him and predicted that he would choose to be fired rather than resign.

In view of this, it was widely believed here tonight that Mr. Bowles had been saved by the weekend publicity.

As one well-informed Democrat put it, President Kennedy, being a practical politician, had followed one of the basic maxims of political leadership: Don't fire a man when he's under public attack.

If this is indeed what happened, the removal of Mr. Bowles from the Under Secretary's post appeared to be merely a matter of time. The President's relations with the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, are cordial, but Mr. Kennedy and some of his closest advisers are said to feel that the better functioning of the Department is now an urgent necessity.

At his daily staff meeting this morning, Mr. Rusk regretted the newspaper reports and expressed his warm confidence in Mr. Bowles.

BOWLES IS GOING AHEAD

At the White House, Mr. Salinger waited until the afternoon to comment. Then he announced that Mr. Rusk had seen the President at 11 a.m., that the President had called Mr. Bowles at about 12:30 and invited him to lunch, and that the two had been together from 1:15 to 2.30.

"Mr. Bowles is going ahead with his duties as Under Secretary of State," Mr. Salinger said, "and with his previously planned trip to Africa, the Middle East, and Asia."

The Under Secretary is scheduled to preside over a meeting of chiefs of U.S. missions in Africa. It will open in Lagos, Nigeria, on July 26. Then he will go to similar meetings in the Middle East and Asia.

Private criticism of Mr. Bowles among some congressional leaders and in the State Department has been mounting for several months and a number of Republican Members of Congress have publicly accused him of being "soft" on Communist China.

He also came into disfavor with President Kennedy and some of his closest advisers at the time of the unsuccessful intervention in Cuba in mid-April.

Mr. Bowles had opposed the Cuban expedition within the Government. Perhaps because of this, the White House suspected him of "leaking" to the press some of the reports of confusion and mismanagement that were published after the expedition collapsed.

More important than this, President Kennedy was told recently by one or more of his advisers that Mr. Bowles was the greatest obstacle to the efficient functioning of the State Department.

Within the Department itself, many of the professional Foreign Service officers had become privately critical of the Under Secretary.

One reason, perhaps, was that Mr. Bowles, an advertising man turned politician, took a post that the Foreign Service had hoped might be filled by a career officer. The two previous Under Secretaries for Political Affairs, Robert D. Murphy and Livingston Merchant, had risen to the post from the Foreign Service.

In addition, some of the professionals found some of Mr. Bowles' ideas and proposals disconcerting.

At staff meetings, it was alleged, he urged his subordinates to "think big." When some of the French generals in Algeria mutinied last spring, one official said, Mr. Bowles proposed to take the problem to the United Nations, though it was clearly a French internal matter.

But Mr. Bowles also had his supporters, even among President Kennedy's aids in the White House.

Some of these supporters said today that Mr. Bowles had not been permitted to do the job he was hired for. When he was appointed Under Secretary, they said, he was supposed to be one of the principal makers of policy and an "idea man" for the Department, not an administrative hack.

Instead, they went on, he had been excluded from many of the important policymaking meetings. He had never been able to sit down, for example, with Secretary Rusk and Adlai E. Stevenson, the delegate to the United Nations, and work out policies for United Nations meetings.

He had also had very little contact with President Kennedy, these sources said.

As for his policymaking qualifications, they pointed to his opposition to the Cuban fiasco. And they said he had helped to avert a similar fiasco in Laos by opposing proposals to put United States and Allied troops into the jungles of that remote landlocked country.

[From the New York Times, July 17, 1961]

KENNEDY EXPECTED TO ASK BOWLES TO RESIGN TODAY—PLANS SHAKEUP IN CLASH ON PERSONALITY AND POLICY; DULLES DUE TO LEAVE

WASHINGTON, July 16.—President Kennedy has decided on the first revision of his 6-month-old administration.

It is understood that he will not only change the top officials of the Central Intelligence Agency but also decide tomorrow on the future direction of the Department of State.

There is a major conflict of personality and policy developing here between the White House and Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, former Governor of Connecticut and U.S. Ambassador to India.

For the last several days, rumors have circulated in the Capital about this conflict and it is understood that there was a preliminary discussion on the matter between President Kennedy and Mr. Bowles at the White House last Thursday.

At that time, it was decided that the President and Mr. Bowles should discuss their problem here tomorrow. And there is reason to believe that the President will ask Mr. Bowles to resign and accept an ambassadorship in Latin America.

There are a number of reasons for the controversy, including the following:

The White House has been highly critical of the administration of the State Department in the last 6 months. Traditionally, the Under Secretary of State is responsible for seeing that the machinery of this vast bureaucracy works efficiently, and while Mr. Bowles has administered other important Federal agencies, such as the Office of Price Administration during the war, his primary interest lies in the field, not of administration, but of policy.

Mr. Bowles differed with the administration policy on the adventure in Cuba, said so at the time, but was not brought into the major discussions on the decision to attack the Castro regime.

ASKS RED CHINA DEBATE

He has not argued for the admission of Communist China into the United Nations, or for the recognition of that regime, but has insisted that the opinion of the Allied world demanded that this question be faced and debated vigorously within the Kennedy administration.

This has not endeared him to powerful Senators on Capitol Hill and has embroiled him in the controversy over what policy the United States is going to follow on this issue in the September session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York.

One other factor has envenomed Mr. Bowles' relations with the party. He was assigned the task early in this administration of recommending to President Kennedy Ambassadors to the American Embassies abroad. As a result of this assignment he came up with a number of untraditional proposals—untraditional in the sense that they were neither members of the professional Foreign Service of the United States nor influential contributors to the Democratic Party.

SUGGESTED GALBRAITH

Among his suggestions were J. Kenneth Galbraith and Edwin O. Reischauer, Harvard professors, as Ambassadors, respectively, to India and Japan; and William Attwood, former associate of Adlai E. Stevenson and an editor of Look magazine, as Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea.

This did not endear Mr. Bowles either to the Democratic faithful or to the Foreign Service officers who coveted these posts, so that for all these reasons, but particularly because he had developed into the "No" man of the administration's foreign policy, he built up a powerful coalition of opponents.

Mr. Bowles has also been one of the leading backers of the policy of supporting such African areas as Angola against such nations as Portugal, and this has brought him into conflict with officials of the State Department, who wish to give first priority to maintenance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization rather than to the members' African colonies.

President Kennedy's reaction to all this is widely known in Washington. He is understood to have been irritated with Mr. Bowles because the Under Secretary opposed the policy of supporting the Cuban refugees in their attack on the Castro regime.

PRESIDENT ANNOYED

He is also known to be extremely annoyed by the repeated delays in getting decisions on the Berlin question out of the Department of State, and from the North Atlantic Treaty allies.

As a result, he has tended to blame Mr. Bowles for these delays, since the Under Secretary's office is presumed to be responsible for the administration of the Department of State.

The President has decided to replace Allen W. Dulles as Director of the CIA and also his Deputy Director, Richard Bissell. One report circulating in the Capital tonight was that Clark M. Clifford, former assistant to President Truman, would replace Mr. Dulles, but it can be stated that this is entirely false.

It is understood that the President has made three decisions about the CIA:

1. The top direction of the Agency should be changed.

2. Despite reports to the contrary, the intelligence-gathering function of the CIA, and its military operations, such as direction of the Cuban invasion, should not be split, but placed under the direction of a new CIA officer who would report directly to the President's new military adviser, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor.

PERSONAL CONFLICT

3. All U.S. diplomatic and intelligence operations overseas should be the responsibility in each capital of the American Ambassador there, and that each Ambassador should be instructed that CIA officials in his territory must report directly to him.

All this has produced the first major quarrel in the administration. Part of it is personal. Mr. Bowles has always beeen a controversial figure within the Democratic Party, regarded by the conservatives and the southerners as a devotee of a planned economy and the welfare state.

He has been a supporter of issues that are unpopular with the conservative wing of the Democratic Party, such as price fixing during the war, foreign aid and discussion of the problem of the admission of the Chinese Communists into the U.N.

What makes this a particularly sharp debate within the Democratic Party here is that President Kennedy himself is understood to favor many of the controversial positions Mr. Bowles takes, but is embarrassed politically by the frankness with which Mr. Bowles states his views

All this was discussed between Mr. Bowles and the President last Thursday. They came to no resolution of the problem at that time, and since then Mr. Bowles' opponents have been openly demanding his resignation.

CONFLICT IN WHITE HOUSE

It is known that within the White House there is a difference of opinion on what should be done about the Under Secretary of State. Some officials there regard Mr. Bowles as an outspoken advocate of the President's own ideas and others as a political embarrassment. Accordingly, the first group wants the President to keep him on and the latter to dismiss him at once.

One suggestion has been that he be sent to Chile as Ambassador and another that he should be given the post as envoy to Brazil, although this has already been promised to Lincoln Gordon, a Harvard University professor and a former official of the International Cooperation Administration.

If, however, the issue of policy and administration cannot be resolved between the President and Mr. Bowles, it is highly unlikely that he will remain in the administration in any capacity.

[From the Washington Post, July 18, 1961]

THE BOWLES AFFAIR

The first full-scale internal political hurricane of the Kennedy administration has broken about Chester Bowles, Under Secretary of State, with a display of thunder, lightning, wind and rain reminiscent of New Deal days.

The role of the Under Secretary always has been a difficult one. The job requires the talents of the policymaker and those of the detail man. He must be the Secretary's alter ego. He must be a man of principle, but his devotion to principle needs to be strong enough to win friends and not strong enough to make enemies.

Mr. Bowles brought to his job the experience of an administrator gained as a Governor and in earlier Federal posts. He has worked hard at making his own personality complementary to that of his chief; and this has not been easy for one who has been the top man in most of the places he has hitherto served.

On the detailed kind of work involved, in straightening out the administrative jungle of the State Department he seems to have done well. The Department will be better off for his handling of personnel, his recruitment of new people, his influence on ambassadorial appointments, his impact on the Foreign Service, his contributions to the cultural affairs office, his management of protocol responsibilities to new nations. He has supervised the establishment of the new operations center. He helped put through needed amendments to the Foreign Service Act. The International Labor Office has been given a better setup. He has lent his sympathetic help to subordinates who have cut out needless reports, eliminated departmental committees and otherwise simplified procedures. He has skillfully handled the program to give Ambassadors more control over all U.S. operations in their countries of assignment.

Administrative achievements of this sort are not criticized. Mr. Bowles is faulted by

some administration critics for failing to achieve rapport with his chief, for not dealing effectively with policy execution, for not coping successfully with Congress, for inept handling of interdepartmental liaison.

Yet, the impression made by most of the criticism of Mr. Bowles is that his most grievous offense is that he is still Chester Bowles. It is pretty hard for him not to be that. He is, as he always has been, a "white knight" in public affairs. His critics are unkind enough to say that a "white knight" at the particular political intersection where he serves is distracting to traffic.

The Under Secretary now goes about his duties. It is no secret that the administration is not yet happy with the operations in the State Department, certainly not as happy as it is with those in the Defense Establishment. It remains to be seen what changes will have to be made to satisfy the White House that everything is in proper order in the most important department of the Government.

[From the Washington Post, July 18, 1961]

WHITE HOUSE SAYS BOWLES IS STAYING—RESIGNATION "NOT CURRENTLY EXPECTED"

(By Murrey Marder and Warren Unna)

The White House officially denied yesterday that Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles is about to resign, while informed sources reported that a decision only has been postponed.

Bowles met with President Kennedy for a talk over lunch. White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger announced afterward: "Mr. Bowles is going ahead with his duties as Under Secretary of State and the trip which he has planned for some time." Bowles is due to leave Monday on an 18-day trip to Africa, the Middle East, and Asia.

OBVIOUS HE'S STAYING

"It's obvious he's staying," added Salinger.

This, however, was amplified by an administration source with the comment that: "Mr. Bowles has neither resigned nor has his resignation been asked for, and his resignation is not currently expected."

The phrasing "currently expected" carried its own implication.

Bowles himself is taking the position that reports of his probable resignation represent only a storm of gossip which will blow over. He regards the White House meeting yesterday as having settled the matter.

Other sources maintain that the actual position is that attempts to resolve the Bowles affair will be studied while he is out of town, but the end result is likely to be either a shift in jobs or Bowles' resignation from the administration.

POLITICS AND POLICY

The President is understood to be seeking a solution which will avoid creating the impression that Bowles, an ardent liberal, is being forced out of the State Department in a split over policy. This could carry considerable implications, in both domestic politics and foreign policy.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who was also at the White House yesterday, has indicated through associates that he likes Bowles, believes the talk of Bowles' resignation will blow over.

Around the President, the dominant view among the men in the White House, however, is that Bowles is "miscast" for the No. 2 job in the State Department, and that the issue is one of personality, not policy.

Bowles is 60. His extensive service in public life includes posts as head of the Office of Price Administration during the war, Governor of Connecticut, Ambassador to India and a Member of Congress, before becoming Mr. Kennedy's foreign policy adviser during the campaign and chairman of the Democratic Platform Committee for the 1960 election.

VIEWED AS VOLUBLE LIBERAL

Bowles is publicly regarded here and abroad as a vigorous liberal, of the voluble, or as some put it, the "evangelical" school. He is particularly identified with the causes of aid to underdeveloped countries and greater foreign policy emphasis on the growing role of the neutral nations as a potent force affecting the East-West struggle.

If he were squeezed out of the State Department, or significantly downgraded in the administration, the Republican Party's right-wing and the conservative Democrats undoubtedly would regard it as the first scalp in the administration to fall to their cause.

This is one of the many factors weighing in the President's decision.

While criticism of Bowles has centered on his lack of effective administrative ability in translating foreign policies into action programs, it is possible the President may decide against any major move. Recently, Alexis U. Johnson, who was Ambassador to Thailand, became Deputy Under Secretary for Political Affairs, with the understanding that he would fill the Department's staff director function. The President may decide to proceed on this basis, and let Bowles remain where he is.

POSSIBLE SUCCESSORS NOTED

Numerous sources, however, maintain that this is only an interim possibility. Names of several possibilities to succeed Bowles were circulating in speculation yesterday. Among them, Assistant Secretary for International Affairs Harlan Cleveland, Budget Bureau Director David E. Bell, and Charles E. Bohlen, special assistant to the Secretary of State. McGeorge Bundy, special assistant to the President, and previously mentioned as a possible successor for Bowles, is said to be an unlikely replacement if Bowles goes.

What are the problems underlying the Bowles controversy?

ADMINISTRATION

The President is unhappy over the way the State Department has failed to measure up as an executive organization. Bowles, in accepting the job of Under Secretary, never conceived his job as essentially an administrative one, and still does not.

He looks upon himself as a creative political thinker and, in an administrative way, has primarily concerned himself with procuring new and bright people to serve as Ambassadors and in key Department slots.

Yet somebody must see that the huge Department operates effectively; that it is not weighed down by its own bureaucracy in carrying out foreign policy.

RUSK PRESSED FOR TIME

Secretary Rusk, concerned with all the top policy decisions, has not the time. George W. Ball, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, has taken the view that his office should concern itself with trade primarily and not foreign aid.

Roger W. Jones, the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, is concerned primarily with the "nuts and bolts" daily operation of a large bureaucracy here and overseas. His is not the job to see that the proper papers surface to the right hands, that Policy Planning Council recommendations funnel into the geographic desks, that U.S. foreign aid and intelligence operations are coordinated with the overall policy procedure.

These high-level administrative tasks have not and are not being done satisfactorily. Bowles doesn't look upon them as his responsibility. The White House has decided that by process of elimination these responsibilities come with Bowles' office, and therefore Bowles might be the right man but for the wrong job.

LIBERAL VIEWS

Bowles has become a byword for outspoken Democratic Party liberalism. President Kennedy, and most of his White House staff, hold many of the same views Bowles does. But the President feels the more effective way of implementing these views is through men with less flamboyant reputations acting in a less publicized manner.

This is particularly true on Capitol Hill where the President considers politics the art of the possible. Bowles, on the other hand, has failed to convince the White House that he enjoys effective congressional support.

LIBERAL VIEW ENCOURAGED

Should Bowles go, the administration says it intends to take great pains to encourage liberal thinking in the Department by maintaining many of Bowles' positions. The White House does not want any Bowles departure to be used as a rallying cry for, "See what happens to men with ideas."

FOREIGN SERVICE

Bowles sees himself as a target of the State Department Foreign Service officers he has pushed into retirement to make way for new people of his choice with fresher ideas. He has heard reports that some 20 of the 55-and-over group gather regularly at the Metropolitan Club to undo the man who "undid" them.

On the other hand, Bowles also has been criticized for not being more ruthless with the Foreign Service in turning out the deadwood at a faster pace.

Within the Department personnel officials credit Bowles with doing an excellent pruning job and bringing in a far better selection of new officials than Secretary Rusk himself.

SECRETARY RUSK

Bowles and Rusk began work in the State Department without any sense of mutual confidence or understanding, and they are poles apart in personality and operating style. From all accounts, Rusk and Bowles have maintained both cordial and correct relations, however, with Rusk giving Bowles somewhat more operating authority.

Rusk was handicapped from the outset in the Department by the fact that he had few men around him who were his own selection, for many departmental posts were earmarked by the President before Rusk took office. However, the fact that Rusk's chief assistant should become a matter of controversy outside the Department inevitably reflects on the Secretary himself and the Department.

BETTER UNDERSTANDING SOUGHT

At least until recently, there were many indications that Rusk had not obtained sufficient indoctrination in the working methods of the President and was reluctant to be too assertive about his own ideas with a Chief Executive who is extremely active in foreign affairs. The White House, reportedly, is now taking steps to see that Rusk gets a better understanding of what the President wants.

POLICY

Despite the insistence that policy views do not enter into the differences involved in the Bowles affair, there are undoubtedly differences of policy emphasis and priority at issue among some of those with strong views on either side of Bowles.

There are especially inside the State Department what might be called the traditionalist minded on foreign policy, and the experimentalists.

Some officials believe that the core of America's foreign policy interests are in the Atlantic Community and Western Europe; others argue—as Rusk himself has done publicly, that if the periphery of world affairs—the outlying areas—is neglected, the periphery soon will become the center.

Bowles' stress on the world's underdeveloped areas and the global impact of the uncommitted nations, puts him in natural collision with the more traditionalist minded.

Similarly, on issues such as the Berlin crisis and China, the school of thought to which Bowles belongs favors exploring new approaches. Even some of Bowles' strongest critics, however, agree it is unfair to characterize the opposing views on these subjects as either "hard" or "soft." White House policy often cuts across such lines.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I yield the floor.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY, AT NOON

Mr. ALLOTT obtained the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, will the able Senator from Colorado yield, so that I may ask a question of the majority leader?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, I wish to inquire of our genial friend, the able majority leader, what he proposes to place before the Senate during the remainder of the week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question asked by the distinguished acting minority leader, at this time I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session tonight, it adjourn until Thursday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, it is anticipated that on Thursday the Senate will take up the legislative appropriation bill, and also Reorganization Plan No. 5, which has to do with the National Labor Relations Board.

It is anticipated that on Friday or Saturday the Senate will take up the independent offices appropriation bill; and also—either before or after taking up that appropriation bill—the unobjected-to measures on the calendar.

On Monday, the Senate will take up the farm bill.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committees be authorized to file reports during the adjournment of the Senate following the session tonight.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the able Senator. If the Chair noticed, a slight grimace passed across my countenance when my able friend suggested a Saturday session. I trust, in the expeditious manner in which he is able to take care of the Senate's business, we may avoid that catastrophic occurrence.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that a Saturday session is not my idea.

REMARKS ON DEVELOPMENT OF BRAZILIAN OIL SHALE

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, last March, in a letter to the President and in a speech on the floor of the Senate, I proposed that the United States take positive action immediately to assist Brazil in constructing a prototype plant to extract oil from shale. This was no partisan proposal. It was made in a different manner, also in March, by the Governor of Colorado. It has been endorsed by the senior Senator from Oregon and by my colleague from California, as well as by the distinguished chairman of the House Interior Committee, himself a recognized authority on shale.

Here is a sensible, down-to-earth approach to help Brazil help itself; to help a potential U.S. industry obtain technological know-how, and to stave off a threatened penetration of our hemisphere by Soviet communism. I do not wish now to reiterate all of the details.

We were delighted last week to receive written assurances finally from the Department of State that it feels the project is meritorious. As my colleague from Colorado reported to the Senate, the Department also stated that the Export-Import Bank "would give most sympathetic consideration to an application for the plant." It is my understanding that the International Cooperation Administration informally has adopted the same stand.

Frankly, I do not know if the Export-Import Bank is the proper source for such funds. As I have stated before, it seems ICA or development loan funds would be more appropriate. Brazil's officials know full well the requirements of export-import loans. They know full well our other sources of funding. They may feel it would be useless—a waste of additional precious time—to make formal application for an export-import loan, or one with similar requirements from ICA, because on detailed study such a loan could not be granted.

The important requirement is to move ahead at once on this project in a manner which will prove to Brazil that we genuinely want to help her help herself. It is to our national interest to do so, not just to use Brazil as a testing ground for techniques which may advance our own shale development but to prevent a threatened Soviet penetration of the Western Hemisphere.

Two months ago a report by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee warned that oil is fast becoming a Soviet device for "undermining and destroying the United States." The Soviet bloc, through conquest and industrial expansion, has developed its oil resources to the point where it feels free to use oil as an economic weapon in the cold war. Soviet oil has penetrated Western European markets. It provides virtually all of Iceland's oil requirements, 95 percent of Finland's, 40 percent of Norway's. It is the principal supplier of industrial fuel to Denmark. Italy is now an important Russian consumer.

One important factor in Communist strategy is not to allow the less developed nations to find mutually profitable areas of cooperation with the West, the subcommittee warned. Oil is an excellent instrumentality here, clearly drawing the line between the "have" and the "have-not" nations. And price is no object to the Soviets, as we have seen, time and again. In 1958, the Soviet was selling oil in Argentina at $1.60 a barrel and selling it in Poland at $2.87. Last year it agreed to deliver oil to Italy at $1 a barrel. Additionally, the Soviet bloc will make not only cash deals but barter deals, or accept payment in local "soft" currencies.

An article in the Oil and Gas Journal of June 26, 1961, was headlined "Soviet Aid May Be Greater Menace Than Cheap Crude." The journal reported on a six-man team of Russians in Karachi to sign detailed contracts for a $35 million Soviet-financed and Soviet-directed search for oil in Pakistan. Eight Western oil companies, American and British, have poured millions of dollars into exploration for oil with little success. Soviet geologists can draw on at least some of this information, improving their chances of success. If they find oil, it will be Pakistan's oil in toto, rather than just 25 percent Pakistani as under the Western concessions.

As the journal stated:

> The Russian we-don't-want-your-oil-but we'll-help-you-find-it approach has a pleasing sound in a great many areas of the world where people have been sold the idea that Western oil companies are "exploiters." It works even better in Pakistan and India where the private Western companies have not been too successful in finding crude for the oil-hungry nations.
>
> In the long run, the Russian approach on "aid" may be far more dangerous to the oil industry as we know it today than any mass invasion of Soviet crude oil. It is not being confined to exploration. The Russians are moving into refining and petrochemicals almost as strongly.

Like Pakistan, and, yes, like Brazil, India has been a "have-not" oil nation and carries a heavy burden of foreign exchange to buy the oil it uses. Extensive exploration in India by Western companies over a period of many years brought only a meager supply. Recently, deep drilling by the British in one Indian field added significantly to those reserves but the Russians were already there. The additional crude will go to Rusisan-built refineries owned by India. Let me quote again from the June 26 article in Oil and Gas Journal:

> American companies have poured millions of dollars into exploration efforts in India without any success. This has nurtured the myth in India that Western companies don't want to find oil because they would rather depend on Middle East holdings to supply the Indian market.
>
> The Russians walked gleefully into this situation, offering long-term, low-interest credits and technical help in an effort to help the Indians find their own oil.

The Russian-Rumanian effort apparently has been successful. The extent of the oil found so far by Russian rigs and crews, drilling with a few trained Indian personnel, is difficult to assess. Everything that comes out of India regarding the program is clouded.

Apparent success of the public sector effort on India's part has prompted the Government to set up a $44 million budget for the 1961–62 period to increase its own oil finds. The country could never bear the burden of such a cash outlay without the help of $52 million in credits offered by the Russians.

The Russian-Rumanian rigs and crews apparently have found sizable reserves in the Cambay-Ankleshwar region of India about 300 miles north of Bombay. At Cambay at least a dozen of the wells have been completed as commercial. At Ankleshwar, about 100 miles to the south, at least eight producers have been drilled.

Neither of the fields has been produced because there are no pipeline outlets.

India is now making plans to move at least a part of the initial output of these fields by rail to the Bombay area, where private refineries are operated by Western companies.

The Government of India hasn't completely frozen out private oil companies, but the heavy emphasis is aimed at making use of Russian help and financing. Western companies have to give terms most of them regard as highly unsuitable. In contrast, the Russians offer help and money for long periods at low interest.

India and Pakistan are not the only nations wooed by Communist petrologists. Relations may have cooled between Russia and the United Arab Republic, but Soviet drilling rigs are at work in both Egypt and Syria. And oil finally has given the Reds a real foot in the middle eastern doorway between Europe and Asia. In Iraq, which now is producing about 4,000 barrels daily from former British concessions, Russian seismic crews report to the Iraqi that surveys prove far greater reserves than previously believed. One result: an Iraq-Czech agreement to build a refinery and two petrochemical plants.

Here, my colleagues, is a pattern as plain as that on a garmentmaker's cutting board: Russian "aid" to freeze out the West, taking advantage of Western failures and Western information, offered to proud but underdeveloped nations hard pressed to meet foreign exchange needs for fuels and still buy the other items necessary to their growth.

In Ceylon, the conversion is almost complete. One can trace it from news reports over a period of less than 2 months.

First was an article from Oil and Gas Journal last May 15 on a Russian commercial coup shaping up at the expense of Western oil companies. Attracted by the lure of cut-rate Russian products and technical aid, Ceylon then was passing legislation establishing a state corporation for the import and sale of oil products. The bill gives the Ceylonese Government power to take over facilities of private companies, with compensation. It also could set minimum and maximum gasoline prices in that share of the retail market left to private firms. As the journal reported:

The Government corporation was proposed after Russian offers of products at a laid-down price below that of imports by existing marketers.

Russia also offered a barter package that would include oil, sugar, heavy machinery, and other equipment. These items would be traded for rubber, tea, and coconut oil.

A trade delegation from Ceylon is expected to visit Moscow and the Middle East in June to negotiate product purchases. Consumption on the island, including bunkers, is about 12,500 barrels daily.

The Washington Post on June 30 printed this dispatch, for which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks.

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

CEYLON PLANS TO TAKE OVER OIL FIRMS

LONDON, June 29.—The Shell Oil Co. said today Ceylon has demanded the nationalization of part of the facilities of the three oil companies—two of them American—that produce all Ceylon's oil.

The companies are Shell, which has 60 percent of Ceylon's oil trade, and Caltex and Standard Vacuum Oil Co., each handling 20 percent.

The spokesman said he was approached by the Ceylonese Government this week. The demand, he said, came under the new Ceylonese Petroleum Corporation Act for state control of tankerage, distribution, and retailing.

A Commonwealth relations spokesman said today the British Government was not opposed to nationalization but wanted fairplay and adequate compensation.

The nationalization bill was made law last May. During a debate in the legislature, Commerce Minister T. B. Ilangaratne said "the country cannot tolerate the continued exploitation of our economy as the price for inducing foreign capital to come in. It is too high a price to pay."

Mr. ALLOTT. Just 6 days later, Ceylon moved to take over certain private pipelines, storage facilities, and retail outlets as reported in the Washington Post, July 6; and for which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks.

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

CEYLON ASKS TO "BORROW" WESTERN OIL FACILITIES

COLOMBO, CEYLON, July 5.—Commerce Minister T. B. Ilangaratne said here today he has asked Western oil companies operating in Ceylon for certain storage and pipeline facilities needed by the newly formed Government petroleum corporation.

The corporation, which plans to market its own oil in competition with American and British firms, has the power to requisition privately owned oil installations and equipment as needed.

The Minister, speaking at a press conference, said the corporation planned as a first step to market about 20 percent of Ceylon's oil requirements.

He said he believed the takeover of certain installations would take about 2 months. As well as bulk storage facilities, the Government would need 175 filling stations now also owned by private companies.

Mr. ALLOTT. Now we find something of the same pattern being cut in Brazil, in part by our own Government. Along that line, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a discerning article by Mr. Gene Wortman which appeared in the Rocky Mountain News July 1.

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

[From the Rocky Mountain News, July 1, 1961]

RUSSIANS THREATEN BRAZILIAN OIL SHALE

(By Gene Wortman)

WASHINGTON, June 30.—Soviet Russia appears to be moving on Brazil's oil industry for failure of the United States to provide $7 million as oil shale exploration money.

Reliable sources advised the Rocky Mountain News Friday that Brazil has been seeking help from the United States, but, failing that, may accept Russian aid.

Colorado's Governor McNichols, Senators John Carroll, Democrat, of Colorado, and Gordon Allott, Republican, of Colorado, and Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, Democrat, of Colorado, all have urged the United States to move.

Because of the oil shale in Colorado, these Colorado officials realize that oil shale experiments anywhere in the free world could be helpful to the United States.

Free world experiments which fall into Communist hands, however, would be costly to this Nation.

A Colorado firm, Cameron & Jones, Inc., has a contract with the Brazilian Government's oil industry, Petrobras, to develop the country's oil shale even if money and machinery is provided by Russia.

CAN'T PINPOINT BLAME

No one can pinpoint the exact spot in the Kennedy administration where the program has bogged down. But several persons have pointed at Richard Goodwin, 29, assistant special counsel to the President.

Now the President's expert on Latin America, Goodwin had no experience in that area until he attended a meeting of the Inter-American Development Bank in Rio de Janeiro last April. Before that, he had been Mr. Kennedy's representative in dealing with the Cuban exiles.

During the West Virginia primary, Goodwin was Kennedy's expert on coal. He could not be contacted for comments on the Brazilian oil shale problem.

Governor McNichols first brought the matter to public attention in late 1960 when he realized Brazil's oil shale potential while touring that country.

It later developed that earlier in 1960 a team of six Russian oil shale experts was in Brazil to make initial investigations for a private company which wished to produce gas from shale. The Russians, who have been making fuel from shale commercially for years, also talked with technicians of Petrobras while in Brazil.

It was learned that technicians from Petrobras were to leave for a trip behind the Iron Curtain on June 20.

COMPLAINTS PLENTIFUL

They were going to Rumania and, perhaps later, to Russia.

Letters from Congressmen and others to the President and to the State Department have produced few results.

There has been considerable complaining, however, over the administration's talk but lack of action.

When the oil shale experimental work at Rifle, Colo., was gutted, it was with the undenied backing of the U.S. oil industry which opposed a potential commercial competitor. In a message to President Kennedy, Representative ASPINALL said Russian intervention in Brazil's oil shale program is all but guaranteed if we fail to act.

Senator ALLOTT declared the Russians will go into Brazil unless we move, and move fast in a matter of hours, or days, not weeks.

So far there has been no action.

Mr. ALLOTT. As Mr. Wortman reports, Russian intervention in Brazil's oil shale program is all but guaranteed if we fail to act. Russian shale experts have been in Brazil as much as 18 months ago, sponsored by a private Brazilian company, CIRB. The Brazilian Trade News of March 18, 1960, reported that some shale from this privately owned deposit was shipped to Russia for testing. On September 23, 1960, Tass News Agency reported from Moscow that a plant would be built near the city of São Paulo to produce 1 million cubic meters of gas per day from this shale in the Paraiba Valley. This dispatch received wide publication in Brazil. On October 16, 1960, a morning paper in Brazil front paged a story that CIRB and a Soviet entity had executed a contract for a pilot plant valued at approximately $500,000 to produce gas and byproducts from this shale.

It was not long after this that the Government-owned oil industry, Petrobras, transferred its real interest to the Irati oil shale deposits, larger and more suitable to the extraction of oil. Soviet representatives immediately invited Petrobras representatives to inspect the oil shale installations of the U.S.S.R. and China, primitive but producing. In May, Moscow announced that it would start its CIRB gas-from-shale plant construction late this year and added that U.S.S.R. technicians soon would be in the area. A Washington Post story of May 8 reported Rumania had granted Brazil a $50 million loan for the development of oil and chemical industries and concluded a separate 5-year, $320 million barter agreement in other fields. Last month there were unconfirmed reports of at least one shale engineer from Petrobras going to visit the Soviet bloc.

And on July 6 a Rio de Janeiro newspaper reported the arrival of six members of a Russian trade mission which is installing itself in Brazil on a permanent basis.

Now, the Communist bloc, as we have seen elsewhere, is well aware that one way to at least neutralize a developing nation is to move into a position of being helpful in meeting that Nation's rapidly expanding need for energy.

There has been a great deal of talk about a world oil surplus. This is not a general problem but a local problem in oil exporting countries. Oil importing countries, like Brazil, are anxious to develop reserves of their own because oil usually is a major debit item in their foreign exchange accounts. The recent concern about finding markets for the oil produced in the Middle East and Latin America is that Soviet oil, as a political weapon as well as an economic tool, has partially displaced free world oil in more than 30 countries.

The Communist bloc is aware that in Brazil there is little petroleum production—about 80,000 barrels per day with an apparent limit right now of around 100,000 barrels. It is aware that American oil interests have just completed a largely unsuccessful $300 million oil exploration program. The Communist bloc has a foot in the door through reported agreements with CIRB, to produce gas from shale. It is in the same position from which we have seen it make gains in Pakistan, India, Ceylon, the mid-East.

U.S.S.R. propagandists are quietly asking, "Why should American oil companies want to find oil in Brazil when they want to sell you their oil?" They are saying that the United States is all talk and no action. They are saying that our inaction leaves Brazil no choice but to turn to Russia, a nation willing to help Brazil help herself.

If any in our Government who have been studying this proposal week after week and month after month believe that they are aiding American business by delaying action, or by putting any loan on a basis unacceptable to Brazil, they are badly misinformed. Let them look at the pattern throughout the world. Let them look again at Brazil which is not now Communist-inclined but which is in need of help.

Brazil, with its apparent limit of 100,000 barrels per day of petroleum, last year used about 250,000 barrels per day. Next year it will be close to 300,000; up to more than 400,000 by 1966 and nearly 600,000 by 1970. Naturally Brazil is turning to shale, but even there the most optimistic estimates of her current program are that she will be able to make up only about 160,000 barrels per day from shale by 1970. So by 1970, unless she has any substantial petroleum discoveries, she still will be required to double her petroleum imports to meet her energy needs.

We hope, of course, that these imports will be supplied by Western companies, as most of her oil is supplied today. But let us remember the pattern in other parts of the world where Soviet-bloc experts have gained a foothold. Remember what is happening in Ceylon, particularly.

Remember, too, that it is American engineers, American know-how, American technical advances that Brazil to date has put to work on its greatest oil shale deposits. Brazil has been proceeding in an orderly fashion. It is investing, I am told, some $8 million of its own in a large, prototype plant and equipment to prove out these techniques. It needs $7 million in credits, largely to buy the equipment required—$7 million which can be spent largely with U.S. companies learning more about advanced machinery which we in turn can utilize in our own great shale beds in the West.

This is the step which many of us have urged upon our Government. I do not urge a greatly expanded loan or credit for a full-blown, commercial shale plant because Brazil is not ready for it. That is a later step for Brazil to take, in the field of public or private credit, only when it is ready.

I sincerely believe that a loan to Brazil for this prototype project would start Brazil on the road out of its foreign exchange difficulties. But the most important aspect of this matter, I think, is the loss the United States will sustain if it does not offer its assistance on this project, on which the Brazilians are determined to proceed. The United States needs the benefit of oil shale technology just as badly as does Brazil. This country faces the prospect of a gradually dwindling supply of domestic crude oil. And it too has vast oil shale deposits that could become an important source of energy for the future.

I feel sure that the benefit of being able to participate in the technological development of Brazil's oil shale would, in itself, be a good reason for underwriting a loan to our good neighbor to the south. The added benefits of keeping the Russians from gaining a vital foothold in Latin America makes the arguments in favor of prompt action very compelling indeed.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 18, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and join resolution:

S. 1462. An act to amend the act of September 2, 1960 (74 Stat. 734), in order to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum standards of quality for any variety of grapes and plums covered by such act, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1962.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, if there is no further business to come befor the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until Thursday, July 20, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 18, 1961:

U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE

Volt Gilmore, of North Carolina, to be the Director of the U.S. Travel Service.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Crane C. Hauser, of Illinois, to be Assistant General Counsel (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service).

U.S. MARSHALS

James R. Berry, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years, vice Albert A. DiMeolo.

Beverly W. Perkins, of Nevada, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Nevada for the term of 4 years, vice Cedric E. Stewart.

John G. Chernenko, of West Virginia, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of West Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice John F. Barr.

Thomas W. Sorrell, of Vermont, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Vermont for the term of 4 years, vice Dewey H. Perry.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following U.S. Coast Guard officers for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Capt. Theodore J. Fabik.

Capt. Oscar C. Rohnke.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointments to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

James B. Allen

To be ensigns

Gerald R. Cichy
Darryl D. Devnich
Maurice L. Geiger
Herbert L. Mansbridge
H. Dennis Matthews
Laurence A. Savage
James R. Tedrick

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 18, 1961:

U.S. MARSHALS

Leonard T. Heckathorn, of South Dakota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of South Dakota for the term of 4 years.

Doyle W. Foreman, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Anniversary of Spain's Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, July 18 marks the 25th anniversary of the start of the Spanish Civil War which began on July 18, 1936. Under the leadership of Gen. Francisco Franco, the people of Spain were successful in stamping out the Communist threat to their country. Had that effort been unsuccessful, there is no telling to what extent communism would be in control in Europe today.

The people of Spain were among the first in Europe to be subjected to the Communist way of life and Communist tactics. They chose to fight back in order to be able to live their own way of life, their right to believe in God, and to retain their dignity as human beings. They paid a very high price for it, to be sure, but the price would have been vastly greater had the Communist forces gained complete control of their country.

During the past quarter of a century the United States and Spain have attained a high degree of mutual understanding and friendly relationship. Spain is today recognized as a dependable friend and a strong ally of our country. In the struggle against Communist imperialism and enslavement, Spain not only maintains a strong and strategic position but is unquestionably a powerful bulwark of strength for the whole free world.

The United States has established important air and naval bases in Spain which give the free world forces a great military advantage in their defense effort. Furthermore, in the event of an international emergency, Spain could also provide many divisions of manpower to augment the forces of the free world.

It is my belief that we must do everything possible to encourage the closest relations with Spain because we need all the resources and the support of all nations in the effort to successfully combat and repel international communism. Spain has much to offer in this respect that could well serve to fortify our position and to strengthen the entire free world. Spain, like the United States, is aware of the common danger which communism represents to mankind and will not hesitate to fight against this evil.

On this historic occasion of the 25th anniversary of the struggle of the Spanish people to eliminate Communist domination of their country, I want to extend our greetings to General Franco and to the people of Spain. We express our solidarity with them in the common struggle. On this occasion, it is worth quoting from a letter of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, dated March 29, 1961, in which he said of General Franco:

> I have always held him in highest esteem.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to take this opportunity to express deep appreciation and recognition to His Excellency Mariano de Yturraldi, the Ambassador of Spain to the United States, who is a distinguished career diplomat and is doing an excellent job in promoting the most cordial relations between our two countries.

Tragic Anniversary: The Fate of the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the middle months of 1940, and particularly June of 1941, ushered in a new and tragic era in the history of Baltic peoples. During June and July 1940 the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania was smothered under the Soviet steamroller, and the orderly process of annexing these countries to the U.S.S.R. was systematically undertaken. Perhaps the most heartbreaking phase of this aggressive expansion of the Soviet Union was the summary arrest, imprisonment, and deportation of Estonians, Letts, and Lithuanians, in tens of thousands, to Asiatic Russia, in June of 1941. This wholesale arrest was carried out on orders from Moscow by its ruthlessly efficient agents in these countries, and this process of eliminating all Baltic elements opposed to the Soviet regime was so effective and thorough that the helpless peoples in these countries were completely subdued.

This marks the 21st anniversary of Soviet Government's occupation of these countries, and the 20th anniversary of Soviet deportation of Baltic leaders. I am indeed glad that the Joint Baltic States Freedom Committee is commemorating these tragic twin anniversaries jointly, thus honoring the memory of those who suffered and died in exile for the freedom of their kinsmen in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Did You Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, did you know that some of your tax dollars helped an Englishman, who for 6 years was on relief, purchase the suit which enabled him to win a contest as the best dressed man in his hometown?

The Associated Press, a reliable news service, July 6 so reported.

"Oh, well—what of it?" do I hear you comment? "Only a few dollars were involved"; and even though our national debt as of July 7 was more than $288 billion, a debt greater than that of the combined debt of all other free nations—and though we have an interest charge of something over $9 billion which you must pay each year—and the dollar you worked for and saved will purchase less than one-half of what it did when you earned it, and before we entered upon our so-called foreign aid policy—and even though the Government taxed the dollars as you earned them, and if you invested them in some dividend-paying security, now intends to tax the same dollars again by withholding a part of your dividend check—there is a limit to the billions we can spend and waste in foreign aid, or, for that matter, on New Frontier programs which are old—have been demonstrated to be unsound.

But—to get back to the best dressed Englishman. The Associated Press also

revealed that the gentleman had not worked, had drawn national assistance, for 6 years.

Again—"What of it?"

Oh, nothing at all except that the gentleman has been able for the last 6 years to live on relief and you, as a taxpayer, have made his idleness and winning pleasant as well as possible.

Billions of our dollars have gone to England—to Britain.

Have not we enough unsound, ruinous policies here at home? Giving first members of one group, then another, something for nothing—all at the expense of those who work and save—without sending billions which we do not have but must borrow, and on the borrowing pay interest, to other nations, none of whom will help us either in peacetime or in war if it is not to their national interest to do so?

Just remember, if you are a man reading this, that the next time the wife suggests she needs a new dress, advise her that you cannot afford it—you must help someone living in idleness in England, or, for that matter, in the Congo, purchase new clothing.

She may remind you that your first duty is to your family and to your own country—which has always been my thought but never that of the kindly, generous internationalists.

Income Tax Relief to Du Pont Stockholders Upon Divestiture of General Motors Stock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a substitute bill to replace H.R. 7349, a bill I introduced for income tax relief to Du Pont stockholders upon divestiture of General Motors stock. I am introducing a new bill, a clean bill, because the new bill has been worked out with the assistance of the Treasury Department and contains or includes the recommendations of the Department. I am informed that it now meets the objections of the administration and should have the approval of both the Treasury and the administration.

The following explanation outlines the purpose and the provisions of the bill:

AN EXPLANATION OF H.R. 8190

Section 1 of the bill would amend the code to provide that a distribution of stock to an individual pursuant to an antitrust order is not treated as a dividend distribution, but is treated instead as a return of capital. Accordingly, if the stock received in such a distribution is worth less than the basis of the underlying stock with respect to which the distribution is made, the basis of the underlying stock is simply reduced by the amount of the distribution. On the other hand, if the value of the stock distributed exceeds the basis of the underlying stock, the excess is recognized as gain and the basis of the underlying stock is reduced to zero. This may be illustrated by two simple examples:

Example 1: An individual (shareholder A) owns a single share of the stock of Du Pont which has a basis to him of $100. In a distribution pursuant to the terms of an antitrust order he receives 1⅓ shares of General Motors stock, worth $60. Because of the distribution, his basis for the Du Pont stock ($100) is reduced by the fair market value of the General Motors stock received ($60), so that after the distribution his basis for the Du Pont stock is $40 ($100 minus $60). If he later sells the Du Pont stock, of course, his gain is computed using the remaining $40 basis for that stock.

Example 2: An individual (shareholder B) owns a single share of Du Pont stock having an adjusted basis to him of $40. In a distribution pursuant to the terms of an antitrust order, he receives 1⅓ shares of General Motors stock worth $60. Since the fair market value of the distribution received is more than his entire basis, all of his basis is wiped out by the distribution and the amount in excess of basis is recognized as a gain. Accordingly, he will have a gain of $20 ($60 minus $40) because of the distribution, and his basis for the Du Pont stock after the distribution will be zero. If he later sells the Du Pont stock, of course, his gain will be computed using a basis of zero.

Since section 1 of the bill provides that the distributions within its terms are to be treated as a return of capital, it is necessary to prevent such distributions from diminishing the earnings and profits of the distributing corporation. Accordingly, under the first section of the bill, the earnings and profits would not be affected by the distributions described.

The first section of the bill does not apply to corporations which are entitled to a deduction for dividends received. However, this section provides that all distributions to corporations which are within its terms (i.e., corporations not entitled to the deduction) will be taken into account at fair market value, without regard to the provisions of section 301.

The effect of section 2 of the bill is best illustrated by a number of examples:

Example 1: A corporation distributes a bond having a fair market value of $100 and a basis to it of $100 or more. The dividend income to a corporate shareholder is $100 and the basis of the bond to the corporate shareholder after receipt is also $100. If the corporation has more than $100 net income, the dividends received deduction is, of course, 85 percent of $100, so that the receiving corporation pays a tax on $15 resulting income.

Example 2: A corporation distributes a bond having a fair market value of $100 and a basis to it of $50. A corporate shareholder receiving this bond has dividend income of $100 and has a basis for the bond of $50. As in example No. 1, the dividends received deduction is $85, so that the resulting income is $15.

Example 3: A corporation distributes a bond having a fair market value of $100 and a basis to it of $8. The dividend income to a receiving corporate shareholder is $100 and the basis of the bond received is $15, which is the same as the resulting income subject to tax computed by subtracting the 85 percent dividends received deduction from the $100 dividend income.

Example 4: The statute also provides for an allocation of the dividends received deduction under regulations prescribed by the Secretary in cases where the dividends received deduction is less than 85 percent of all dividends received. It is assumed that the regulations will provide that the limitation on the dividends received deduction will first be applied against cash. Assume that a corporation has a wholly owned subsidiary and that during a taxable year of the parent the subsidiary makes one distribution of $100 cash and one distribution of $100 bond having a basis of $8. Assume further that all the other operations of the parent for the year result in a $20 loss, so that the parent's net income for the year is $200 dividend income minus the $20 loss or $180. The total dividends received deduction instead of being 85 percent of $200 or $170 is only 85 percent of $180, or $153. Thus, the entire dividend income is reduced by $153. However, under the authority of the statute the regulations will provide that the dividend income attributable to the bond is reduced by a full $85 (so that the dividend income attributable to the cash distribution is viewed as reduced by only $68). Accordingly, the basis of the bond to the corporation receiving it will be $15 despite the fact that the limitation in section 246(b) applies to the dividend received deduction.

Section 3 of the bill provides a special adjustment to earnings and profits which is necessary due to the fact that under the bill the increase in earnings and profits will not be the same as the increase in the basis of the receiving corporation's total assets. For example, if a corporate shareholder receives a bond having a fair market value of $100, its earnings and profits under the bill are increased by $100. However, if the basis of the bond of the distributing corporation was only $50, the receiving corporation's basis for the bond will likewise be $50, so that on the sale of the bond the receiving corporation will have $50 capital gain. Since, however, this $50 was already included in earnings and profits once (as part of the $100 dividend income), it should not be so included a second time when the bond is sold. Accordingly, the proposed section 312(k) eliminates this double inclusion in earnings and profits.

Playing Politics With Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last an exceedingly remarkable statement was made in the other body by the distinguished acting chairman of the Defense Subcommittee of its Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Virginia, WILLIS ROBERTSON. His remarks are found at page 12543 of the RECORD. He related his concern over our apparent lack of preparedness to fight a brush-fire war with conventional weapons in Germany or anywhere else. He stated that on Saturday, July 8, he communicated that concern to the attention of the President. Newspaper accounts indicate on that date the President was at his vacation home in Hyannis Port, Mass. The Senator indicated the President responded by directing the Department of Defense to make an immediate review of our military which could be expected by the end of this current week, and be in the form of a statement as to what additional sums the President would like to have included in the pending Department of Defense appropriations bill.

Such need for added sums to bolster the Nation's conventional arms capability has long been apparent. The President, himself, on May 25, before his departure for Europe to meet with Khrushchev, stated the need to increase Army and Marine Corps strength, to meet brush-fire situations, for an increase in nonnuclear fire power, and for intensified guerrilla training of U.S. forces. This was contained in a special message to Congress, personally delivered and simultaneously broadcast to the Nation via radio and television.

Last Sunday's New York Times disclosed the existence of a letter to Senator ROBERTSON from the very distinguished and able chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], which expressed vital concern that the U.S. Army is not up to authorized strength and reportedly demanding that something be done about it.

It is also apparent that, vis-a-vis the Berlin situation, our military establishment has contingency plans current at all times upon which a specific appropriations request can be immediately based.

Moreover, it is apparent that within the Department of Defense there are specific plans and costs for the President's May 28 suggestions, upon which appropriations requests could have been based on or any time since May 28.

It is also no secret that the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Virginia is acting chairman has been stalling the closing of its hearings in hopes of receiving just such a request.

Why has no such request been submitted?

Why must the able chairman of the House Armed Services Committee be placed in a position of demanding that be done which must be done to defend our country?

Why must the able chairman of the Senate subcommittee prod the President, first by his communication to him at his vacation retreat, then prod him again 6 days later by public disclosure of the communication?

What is going on that the President of the United States must be pleaded with to do the things that must be done to insure the survival of the United States?

The possibility is that Mr. Kennedy is stalling on these requests for vitally needed defense expenditures for political reasons. He would have the regular defense appropriation enacted into law. Then he would have his extensive and costly domestic programs enacted into law. Only then, when these are safely enacted and campaign promises fulfilled, would he present a supplemental request for the added billions necessary for defense. In this manner, Congress would not be given an opportunity to equate the cost of these domestic programs against the cost of needed defense. The domestic programs, which may possibly be desirable, but certainly not essential, would not in this way be impeded or suffer delay by the priority of expenditures for defense and the necessity for keeping Government spending in line, even though keeping them in line is, in fact, a vital element of defense. Congress would be given no chance, with defense expenditures being brought up last, to choose to postpone the domestic programs in favor of more important items of defense.

This is playing politics with defense, with the safety on survival of the Nation.

Unless those requests promised to Senator ROBERTSON are, in fact, made by the President, no later than the time promised, that is, by the end of this week, and which Senator ROBERTSON'S remarks last Friday hint he doubts will be made, there is no question in my mind that the delay is just that, the playing of politics with defense and with the safety and survival of the Nation.

Federal Aid Fallacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a majority of Members of the Congress have been for years major contributors to the ill-advised growth of the scope of the Federal Government and the resulting fruits that this has yielded; namely, stifling of individual initiative, stifling of economic growth, destruction of home rule and functions of States, and subversion of American principles and policies which developed our Nation's greatness in the most sinister spreading of the disease of dependence on the almighty Government monster here in Washington.

Recently the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, the Honorable BARRY GOLDWATER, in a regular column which appears in the Tucson Daily Citizen, Tucson, Ariz., very precisely described these developments here in Washington in an article entitled "Federal Aid Fallacies." I am pleased to insert this article into the RECORD, realizing the educational value that it will have if read by the socialistically inclined Members who presently dominate the Congress, while dancing in tune with their philosophic brothers in the executive branch.

The article follows:

FEDERAL AID FALLACIES

(By BARRY GOLDWATER, U.S. Senator from Arizona)

Those eager supporters of Federal aid, who applaud each new expansion of Federal power, justify their actions on the grounds that the individuals in the various States cannot or will not provide for themselves.

My colleague, Republican Senator JOHN WILLIAMS of Delaware, in a recent and I'm afraid almost unnoticed speech in the Senate, clearly exposed the basic fallacy of the Federal aiders' position.

In March, at the urging of the President, we had a bill under consideration to extend and expand unemployment compensation benefits. Secretary of Labor Goldberg headed the list of administration witnesses who told the Senate the States alone could not support the necessary increases in unemployment compensation. This problem, they said, must be answered by all the people in all States.

In June, these same disciples of Federal aid are telling us the individual States cannot meet their responsibilities in regard to public schools. This problem is too large and must be borne by all the people of all the States.

In March, massive unemployment was confined to the industrial States—Pennsylvania, New York, Michigan, etc.—and the bill we passed in March was designed to take funds from States where unemployment was not a problem and deliver them to States where unemployment was a problem. The funds traveling through Washington will shrink by the usual bureaucratic brokerage fee.

Under the terms of this legislation, Pennsylvania receives $14.3 million more than it will contribute. New York State will collect $50.1 million more than it contributes. Tennessee will contribute $7 million more than it receives. Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Arizona and a host of other States all contribute more than they can possibly receive in benefits.

The big industrial States, under this legislation, are all on the receiving end. But now in June, the situation is suddenly reversed. We are told that Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Arkansas are just too poor to adequately support the school system. So the Federal aiders propose that we take from the rich States—Pennsylvania, New York, Michigan, Illinois, etc.—and distribute in the poor States.

All the States that were regarded as rich States and able to contribute to the Nation's unemployment problems in March are now poor States unable to underwrite their own educational systems.

New York, for example, which receives $50.1 million more than it contributes under the unemployment compensation bill, will contribute $75 million more than it receives under the aid to education bill.

The absurd inconsistency of the Federal aiders is clearly revealed. If New York can afford to contribute $75 million to aid other States in education, certainly it could have paid the $50 million necessary for unemployment compensation and been $25 million ahead.

Who gains from this shuffle of funds through Washington? The bureaus and bureaucrats who thus become dispensers of bounty. What is lost in addition to the money soaked up by the Washington brokerage fee? Individual freedom.

A Bill To Provide a Monthly Pension for Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, recently hearings were held by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on veterans' pensions. I appeared before the committee seeking favorable action on my bill, H.R. 3745, which I introduced at the request of the National Veterans of World War I organization to provide a monthly pension for the veterans of World War I.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement before the committee be inserted in the RECORD today:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WINFIELD K. DENTON, OF INDIANA, BEFORE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, JULY 11, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before your committee in behalf of my bill, H.R. 3745, which would grant a monthly pension in the amount of about $102.37 for the veterans of World War I. I introduced this bill on February 2, 1961, at the request of the National Veterans of World War I organization. It contains a means test of $3,600 for a married man with dependents and $2,400 for unmarried veterans. However, money received from social security, retirement funds under other pensions and annuities, and railroad retirement would not be considered as income under the provisions of my bill.

The Democratic Party's platform in the 1960 presidential election used these words to express the stand of the National Democratic Party on pensions for the veterans of World War I: "Veterans of World War I, whose Federal benefits have not matched those of veterans of subsequent service, will receive the special attention of the Democratic Party looking toward equitable adjustments." Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is no better time than now to fulfill the pledge made to the veterans of World War I by the Democratic Party. These men and women are dying at the rate of 302 a day, and if we wait much longer as a Nation, there will be very few left to receive the gratitude of their country—now so belated.

World War I ended more than 42 years ago. Thirty-five years after the end of the Revolutionary War, the veterans of that war, which gave this country its independence, were given a pension on the basis of service alone. Similar pensions were bestowed by a grateful Nation 39 years from the end of the Mexican War, and just 24 years after the close of the Civil War, the Nation granted pensions to the veterans of that conflict as a matter of right. Only 18 years elapsed after the close of the Spanish American War before those veterans received pensons. But in a period more than twice that long, since the armistice of 1918, no such benefits have been forthcoming for the veterans of World War I, the war that was called "the war to end war."

I am a veteran of both World War I and World War II. During World War I, I was in a branch of service which we in the first Air Corps considered hazardous. During World War II, I was a "retread," doing office work, and as safe as if I had been at home in bed. Nevertheless, I am very proud of my service in World War II. I cannot help but contrast the difference in the way the veterans of the two wars were treated at the close of each conflict. When their service ended, the veterans of World War II were given mustering-out pay of $200 to $300, which cost the Government approximately $4 billion, without a question. On the other hand, veterans of the First World War were given mustering-out pay of only $60 apiece in 1918 and 1919. At that time, $60 would not purchase a suit of clothes.

A man who enters the military service in wartime must give up his job or position, and after that service ends there generally follows a period of hardship during which he must find employment and readjust himself to civilian life. The Federal Government did very little to aid the veterans of World War I to tide themselves over during this period of readjustment. Even men released from prison are given a suit of clothes and travel fare home. They are treated better, it seems to me, than are the veterans of World War I.

And then came the long struggle to right that wrong. First, the Government gave World War I veterans the so-called adjusted-service certificates. The Government ascertained the amount of mustering-out pay that it should have paid to these veterans at the time of their discharge. An increment was added to make up for the delay in payment. There was determined how much paid-up insurance due in 20 years could be bought with each veteran's adjusted-service credits and each veteran was given a certificate for that amount of paid-up insurance, due in 20 years.

At first, the veterans were permitted to borrow on 10 percent of the face value of these certificates; then legislation was passed permitting them to borrow on 50 percent; and finally, 1936 saw a law passed over a Presidential veto to pay the veterans of World War I the full amount of their adjusted-service certificates—or mustering-out pay. Three similar bills have been vetoed by other Presidents. So, 18 years after they were discharged, the veterans of the "War to make the world safe for democracy"—finally received their just mustering-out pay. The amount that they received under this forced-investment or insurance idea of the adjusted certificates, was $3.8 billion. The expenditures would have been much less—only $1.5 billion—if the veterans of World War I would have been paid their just mustering-out pay at the time of their discharge. This was the case, of course, with the veterans of World War II.

In addition to justly deserved mustering-out pay of well over $5 billion, the veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict have received terminal leave pay which cost the Federal Government well over $3 billion, and unemployment compensation which cost the Government $4.3 billion. They have likewise been given social security credits for the time that they served in the Armed Forces. None of these benefits were paid to the veterans of World War I.

The veterans of World War II were also given the GI bill of rights. Under this educational program, they received on-the-job training and academic education. To date these benefits have cost the Federal Government some $15 billion. These veterans were also given the benefits of guaranteed loans to purchase homes, to go into business, or to start farming. Loans for veterans' homes, alone, have totaled $50 billion and $27 billion of this sum has been guaranteed by the Government.

Similar benefits have been granted to the veterans of the Korean conflict, although in some instances they were not so great as those granted World War II veterans. Twenty million World War II and Korean veterans have received or will have received 20 times the benefits which were begrudgingly granted the 4.6 million veterans who survived the First World War. This is a benefits ratio of more than 4 to 1 against the World War I veterans because of the small number of such veterans remaining.

Now, as many of you know, the World War II and Korean veterans have received these benefits because of the work and activity that the veterans of World War I unselfishly gave in the support and enactment of the GI bill of rights, and the so-called Korean bill of rights. The various veterans groups were very active in initiating this program, and, in 1943, a group of Members of Congress who had served in the First World War met and decided that something should be done to provide the veterans of World War II the benefits that they thought they should have had as veterans of World War I. As you all know, that movement on the part of these Members of Congress was successful, and a grateful nation provided these benefits to the men and women who came back home after the end of World War II.

These benefits which were provided for the veterans of World War II were certainly well earned and obviously money well spent. Any benefits that we should now provide the veterans of World War I would come to them late in their lives. The average age of these men and women is more than 66 years. It is an understatement to say that it was a priceless advantage to the veterans of World War II to have these many different benefits provided them while they were still young and their days of opportunity lay ahead of them. In the case of the World War I veterans and their widows, any benefits that the Congress should now decide to grant them would come too late to assist them in the same manner, but it would certainly be a boost to their meager resources in this day of ever-rising medical costs.

It has been estimated by a Census Bureau expert that the sum of $11,000 invested in a college education for a young man will increase his earning capacity by $177,000. That is a return or a benefit of more than 16 times the original investment. Multiply the World War II veterans' educational benefit payment of $15 billion by 16; the product is about $240 billion in final economic benefits to those veterans. The benefits of the housing loan program are countless and beyond all calculation.

Many veterans of World War II have said to me that they appreciate greatly the efforts made by the veterans of World War I in support of the GI bill. They said that without that support they would probably never have received these benefits.

According to figures from the Veterans' Administration, the cost of the first year under the provisions of my bill, H.R. 3745, would be about $942,327,000, but without the means test, the cost would increase. But this money would be spent in this country and the Library of Congress estimates that the Government would recover in tax revenues approximately 25 to 30 cents on every pension dollar. It would increase or award initial benefits to 1,564,700 veterans of World War I—some 830,500 fewer veterans benefiting than if there were no means test.

It is interesting to note that in 1890, the veterans' benefits represented 1.2 percent of the national income and in 1958 it was 1.4 percent or only an increase of roughly 0.2 percent for the current benefits arising from the last six wars. In the year 1910, the Federal Government spent 15.2 percent of the total national budget on Civil War pensions. I think everyone will agree that the country did not go bankrupt then—and I might mention, incidentally, that the Treasury ran a deficit of $18 million that year. Enactment of H.R. 3745 would increase the national budget approximately 1.2 percent.

If paying Civil War pensions amounting to 15 percent of the total budget did not break up the Treasury and drive the country to disaster in 1910, is it reasonable to assume that World War I veterans' pensions of 1.2 percent of the national budget would bankrupt the country in 1961? I don't believe that it is. The national income in 1910 was $25.6 billion; the sum of $105 million paid that year amounted to approximately one-half of 1 percent of the national income. And to pay the World War I pension that I propose—$942,327,000—for the year 1961 would take from the estimated national income of roughly $417.5 billion a portion no greater than one-quarter of 1 percent.

For the veterans of World War I, the sands in the hourglass of time are running low. Today, their average life expectancy is only about 10 years. Of the remaining 4.6 million veterans who returned from World War I when the fighting was over, only some 2,574,000 are left. Every passing day some 302 more die. I believe that the figures that I have presented here should convince any reasonable person that this country can well afford to pay the men and women of World War I the pension that I propose with cer-

tainly no more—and probably even less—strain than that imposed on the Nation as a result of the Civil War pensions in 1910. The Government affords a great many more things resulting from ordinary human justice today than we thought it could afford 51 years ago. To my mind we have already delayed far too long in correcting this situation. It is time that simple justice be granted to the veterans of World War I and their widows. It is time that action be taken. I hope that H.R. 3745 will receive the favorable consideration of this committee.

I should also like to urge the enactment of either H.R. 5152 or H.R. 7093 and H.R. 7094. H.R. 5152 would amend the present law to provide that social security benefits, other annuities, and up to $10,000 in payments under policies of life insurance shall not be considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility of individuals for pension. H.R. 7094 is a separate bill which deals with the life insurance benefits only, and H.R. 7093 deals with the payment of social security and other retirement annuities and similar plans, in determining eligibility.

Many veterans, because of lack of finances, permitted their Government life insurance to lapse, but later were able to purchase insurance. At that time, they were unable to purchase Government insurance so they bought private life insurance. It seems to me very unjust that the insurance from private companies should be considered income in determining eligibility while that form of Government insurance is not. They both were purchased for the same purpose and it has always seemed very unfair to me to deny a widow a Government pension for 1 year simply because her husband left her private insurance. Life insurance is more of a gift than income, and it has also seemed to me a gross injustice to treat it as income in veterans' pension cases when it is considered a gift or inheritance for taxation and other purposes.

There is a strong need to encourage people to take care of their dependents after they have passed away. Life insurance as well as public or private retirement annuities, endowments and similar plans, should be encouraged. As long as they are considered income under a non-service-connected Government pension plan, thrift, economy, and making provision for one's dependents after death, is discouraged.

It also seems very unfair to me to penalize a man who has been thrifty and who made these provisions by denying his widow such a pension, while on the other hand it is given to one who has not made these necessary provisions for his dependents.

In view of the changes made in the veterans' pension law of the last session of Congress, I think that enactment of H.R. 4409 is unnecessary, and I am not asking for its enactment.

In conclusion, I would like to urge the favorable consideration of H.J. Res. 229, which calls for the same treatment and benefits for the individuals and their survivors who served in the Moro Province after July 4, 1902, as those received by those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection. What my bill would do is to extend the Spanish-American War benefits to those who participated in the conflict in the Philippine Islands from 1902 to 1914 in the Moro Province and the islands of Samar and Leyte. This would cover relatively few people since there are only a few hundred remaining veterans and a lesser number of widows. I think that it was a mistake that these veterans were not included in the Spanish-American War bill. That bill did not fix the beginning and the end of the conflict, and, by administrative action, the beginning was set in 1899 and the end was established as the year 1902. These men engaged in one of the most bloody conflicts in the history of the United States.

I think it has been a great mistake for 50 years that these people were not included under the terms of the Spanish-American pension plan. The House has passed this bill on several occasions. It has died in the Senate on at least two occasions. The 78th Congress passed such a measure, only to have it vetoed by the President. With fewer and fewer of these veterans left every year, I feel that we cannot afford to allow another year to roll by. I think that we should act now to see to it that they receive their just due.

A Bill To Amend the Act To Promote the Education of the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instruction materials for the blind, and to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and to otherwise improve such act.

The distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the Honorable FRANK BURKE, is also introducing an identical bill today.

Earlier in this session of the Congress, both Mr. BURKE and I introduced similar bills, H.R. 39 and H.R. 5872, designed to improve this 82-year-old program under which the American Printing House for the Blind receives an annual appropriation through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in order to provide books in braille and large type, as well as tactual educational aids, for the instruction of blind schoolchildren. Although this federally financed program is small in terms of the numbers of children served and the annual dollar cost, it nevertheless remains one of vital significance to the Nation. For it is with the aid of these special tools provided by the Federal Government that blind children are enabled to receive an education through high school and go on to make their way in life, some with college training for a profession and others with vocational training for a trade, to become self-supporting, contributing citizens in their home communities.

Over the years, there has been a growing trend toward the education of blind children in regular local schools in their home communities with sighted children from their own neighborhoods instead of in special residential schools for blind children only. At present, slightly more than half of the almost 16,000 blind children in the country are being educated in their local schools. In addition, we have been experiencing a sharp increase in the number of blind children in our schools in recent years as those blinded by retrolental fibroplasia over the past 10 years have reached school age. I am happy to say that the cause and prevention of this blinding eye disease in premature babies—too much oxygen in incubators—has been determined through the research effort of the National Institutes of Health. However, we will not reach peak school enrollment for these children for approximately another 5 years; and we shall still have to contend with an increase in the numbers of blind children—fortunately a slower rate of increase—as our total population grows.

Thus, we have two problems to contend with and to solve simultaneously. We must develop an effective mechanism of distributing these federally provided books and educational aids, so that blind children being educated in local schools in their home communities and in the smaller residential schools for the blind will not be handicapped by lack of adequate aids. And we must increase the annual dollar appropriation to meet the increased cost occasioned by the sharp growth in the numbers of blind children.

The original act of 1879, even with its most recent amendments in 1956, does not solve these problems. First, the method of distributing aids and books was devised when all blind children who got a formal education attended residential schools for the blind; and it has not been changed to meet current needs. Second, the authorization of appropriations is limited to $400,000 annually, an amount woefully inadequate for present and readily foreseeable needs.

The two bills mentioned previously, which Mr. BURKE and I introduced earlier in the session, attempted to meet the needs of the program in different ways. The groups and individuals most concerned about improvements in the program took stands in favor of one bill or the other and gave the impression in their letters to the Congress of a deep-seated controversy among them.

Inasmuch as the groups concerned are sincerely interested in improving the program, despite differences in approach, we have urged them to resolve their differences. They have responded to this request and have come forward with a two-step plan as follows: First, introduction and, hopefully, enactment before the end of the session without hearings or with brief ones of a bill to provide for a much-needed increase in the authorization of appropriations; and second, development in the fall of legislation to improve the system of distributing books and other aids for consideration by the Congress next session.

The identical bills Mr. BURKE and I are introducing today would implement the first step and make a few additional desirable and agreed-upon changes. These bills would do the following:

First. Increase the authorization of appropriations by removing the statutory ceiling, thus leaving the annual appropriation to normal budgetary and appropriations procedures.

Second. Authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make rules and regulations governing the administration of the program.

Third. Make a technical correction in the present law, which, if literally construed, would limit expenditures to $10,000 annually regardless of the amount of the appropriation.

Fourth. Authorize the American Printing House for the Blind to use reasonable sums from the annual appropriation for the salaries and expenses of staff and other experts to assist special committees which may be appointed and for the expenses of such committees.

Fifth. Expand the ex officio board of trustees of the Printing House to include chief State school officers or their designees, thus formally bringing into this program officials of public school programs to join the superintendents of residential schools for the blind.

Sixth. Make these amendments effective immediately upon enactment, so that the much-needed increase in appropriation can be sought for the current fiscal year through a supplemental appropriation.

I sincerely hope that the Committee on Education and Labor and the entire House of Representatives will act on these bills as quickly as is feasible, so that congressional action can be completed before the end of the current session. As I indicated before, all of the interested groups are in favor of this legislation.

Similarly, I hope that the Committee on Education and Labor will give its consideration early in the 2d session of this Congress to another bill which I shall introduce next January to improve the method of distributing books and tactual educational aids for blind children under this same program. By means of this two-step approach we can assure all blind children wherever they may be educated of the educational aids they need to achieve their maximum potential as contributing members of our society.

Federal Aid: A Trojan Horse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the issue of Federal interference in the affairs of individuals and institutions is a cause of alarm to a growing number of people all over the United States. Daily my mail includes letters from individuals asking what they can do to help preserve and strengthen the traditional freedoms of our people.

A year ago in speaking throughout my district, I referred to this tendency of Federal Government to usurp the rights and responsibilities of the individual through collectivist and welfare schemes as creeping socialism. Having been a participant for the first 6 months of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, I know now that I was in error. What I called creeping socialism is socialism on the dead run. It is my conviction that our country is being led down a road of controls and welfarism which is not only foreign to its most precious and cherished traditions but which will if not checked, sound the death knell to the free enterprise system and the personal liberties so greatly enjoyed by our people through the past 185 years.

Under the guise of humanitarianism, we are engaging in programs that tend to destroy individual initiative and personal responsibility. This can only bring our Nation to moral collapse and make it easy prey for the type of godless collectivism which has brought so many people under the ruthless heel of tyranny in the past four decades.

It is my measured conviction that the intangibles of freedom are of greater worth than the promises of Government to ease the load of people who if they are to succeed must be allowed to face the possibility of failure.

I do not stand alone in my conviction. Many of my colleagues in Congress and in the pulpit as well as millions of people throughout the land are becoming increasingly aware of the precious privilege of freedom as they find themselves slowly but surely being stripped of the right to choose their own destiny.

The proposals for Federal aid to education are part of the tendency to impose Federal controls upon our people in an area most dangerous of all—in the area of molding the minds and wills of our children and youth. I am aware that we are promised that this in no way means or is intended to mean Federal control. However, we would be naive indeed if we were to assume that the Federal Government could become involved in any program without wielding the heavy arm of control. It is my belief that like all Federal programs the start will be innocently bereft of any semblance of control but as the years go on the desire for greater power and firmer political advantage will evaporate our most serious present intentions and we will find ourselves victims of a Federal machine which will be developed to brainwash our children during their most formative years. I, for one, do not desire my children or my yet unborn grandchildren to be made putty in the hands of intellectual planners, no matter how sincere and dedicated they are who apologize for communism or at best perpetrate their sophisticated collectivist ideas under the guise of liberalism and humanitarianism.

Federal aid to education must not be foisted upon our people against their will. Of course, no one will openly force our schools to accept aid but the pressure is nonetheless real. If you force the people of Wisconsin to pay out $14.1 million for $11 million in aid—you not only reduce the will of the people of Wisconsin to do for themselves to the tune of $11 million but you drain an additional $3 million from the present source of income—the taxpayers—$3 million they must send to Washington for which they will receive nothing but more Federal control. This in turn will reflect itself in a reduction of their present effort so that they will wind up with less effort; less available for educational needs; broken will to do for themselves; frustrated initiative to plan for their own; and greater control by so-called experts who insist they know better what is good for our children than we the parents and the community of which we are a part.

The following is a statement by John A. Howard, president of Rockford College, which summarizes most eloquently the thought I so inadequately expressed:

Recently the trustees of Rockford College voted to carry out the construction of the new campus without seeking any funds from the Federal Government either in direct, matching grants, if the pending legislation passes, or in building loans at token, subsidized interest rates. This is a particularly significant decision, for the commitment to relocate the college involves one of the largest single fundraising tasks ever undertaken by a small college.

The trustee action was voted only after a searching analysis of the issues. The central question, I believe, is the relative weight that is given to two opposing concepts. On the one hand it is reasonable to assert that the strength of the Nation depends on the education and training of its citizens, and consequently it behooves the National Government to foster, support, and strengthen education to the fullest extent possible. In contrast to this view stands a concept of man's nature that places self-reliance, independence, and ingenuity among man's greatest attributes and a judgment that these human traits are dangerously diminished by the expanding services of the Federal Government.

It cannot be denied that this country has moved rapidly toward an acceptance of the philosophy that the National Government assure the provision of man's wants and needs. The motives of such a philosophy may well be both humanitarian and commendable. The results of carrying out such a philosophy are here questioned. Apart from the issue of the economic feasibility, there arises the grave question of what happens to the character of the individual citizen in the welfare state. There is good reasons to believe the assurance that the Government will meet all needs erodes the moral fiber of the populace. Although that assurance may be undertaken with the best intentions, it appeals to man's baser motives and represses his virtues.

As governmental programs of grants and subsidies multiply, citizens (and boards of trustees), once proud of their self-sufficiency, overcome their repugnance to a dole and reach for their share of the proffered benefits. Man's human stature rises as he is self-sufficient, and declines as he is dependent.

Moreover, the taxes necessary to support the Government welfare programs have their own deleterious effect upon the people. As taxes rise higher, more people are tempted to suppress their scruples and adjust their tax returns. The individual begins to judge at what point or to what degree he should obey the law.

The welfare state not only encourages dependency and dishonesty among its constituents but it also appeals to man's selfishness rather than his altruism. Every man's life is a struggle between these inclinations which will benefit only himself and those which will serve a higher cause. The men of all civilizations who make us proud to belong to the human race are those who have risen far above self-serving actions. A government that offers gifts and promises of more gifts augments the will to receive at the cost of the will to give.

It has gone out of fashion to be concerned with virtue and integrity and self-reliance and other qualities of character, but a society that relegates these matters to a position of inconsequence, that places comforts and possessions ahead of character and freedom is a society in decline.

These considerations are held to be even more urgent than the rapid expansion of educational facilities.

Believing that Government subsidy of independent education is one more step toward the elimination of individual responsibility, the trustees of Rockford College are determined to fulfill the relocation and expansion program through private funds, however difficult a task it may prove. They are hopeful that their decision will not only preserve the integrity of their own institution, but that other organizations and individuals will be moved by their example to reflect upon the consequences of Government aid and take a similar position.

Providing Authority for States To Recount Congressional Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will provide the several States with the authority to act as agents of the House of Representatives in recounting the election for Representatives, subject to provisions of the laws of the States regarding election contests, and subject, of course, to the final authority of the House in determining its membership.

I am certain that I do have to explain my interest in this field to any of you. In my personal experience with the election contest laws and the election contest procedures. I have found that the recourse presented therein leaves much to be desired.

The members of the Elections Subcommittee obviously recognized the need for this legislation which would allow the States to pursue their own contest procedures. In the separate views submitted by four of the members of that committee, they expressed their concern in this manner:

> We believe serious thought should be given to the possibility of Federal legislation to require the various States to establish adequate procedures for contested election situations such as this. Such legislation possibly could specify that State contested election procedures be exhausted prior to the issuance of certificates of election.

The bill which I introduce will do just this. It authorizes the use of State election contest and recount procedures in a case of a contested election before an election is certified to the Clerk of the House. The result should be twofold. First, it legalizes the procedures already established, leaving no constitutional question and, second, it should prove an encouragement and incentive to other States to establish recount and election procedures for their congressional races. My bill provides a simple and an immediate course of action to a contestant, and it in no way restricts or infringes on the right and duty of the House to determine its own membership.

The Federal election contest statute which is now in effect and which provides the principal source of litigation in determining a questioned seat in the House of Representatives was adopted in 1851. It is a lengthy and nebulous procedure. I believe it is time to reexamine this procedure and to modernize it, for it does not meet the need of this day.

In my own case, this year, my district was without representation for more than 5 months because of a contest. Many hundreds of hours were devoted to the contest by the members of a House committee, its staff and its recruited help. The cost of the procedure was high. Although this investigation was pursued quickly and efficiently, because of the limitations of existing rules and procedures, unnecessary delay resulted.

Almost all of our States provide for a recount of close or contested elections, and they designate specific procedure. Many have, in fact, adopted procedure specifically for the recount and contest of the election to the House of Representatives. In some cases, their supreme courts have held that these laws are unconstitutional, since the House of Representatives must determine its own membership. This was the case in my State of Indiana.

Had the Supreme Court of Indiana not previously determined that the law was not applicable in the case of a congressional election, a recount by the State authorities could have equitably settled my contest, prior to the meeting of the Congress and without the cost to this body in terms of the hours of concern to its valuable members and their staff, and in terms of monetary cost.

This very thing was done in the State of Oklahoma in the 1960 election case of Mr. WICKERSHAM. The supreme court of that State overruled its State Election Board and ordered them to proceed to recount the election in that case. The recount was concluded and Mr. WICKERSHAM was duly certified as the winner of the election before January 3, 1961, and took his place here in the House on that date.

To me the frustration of the required procedure is a very real thing, for I have endured it. The most glaring example of this frustration is the area of specific, obvious error which cannot be corrected or examined by the present rulings by my State's supreme court and so many others.

For example, in Jefferson Township of Grant County of my district, there were obvious errors in the absentee ballot counting. Nineteen absentee ballots were applied for in the precinct. Seventeen ballots were returned. The greatest number of total votes in any race other than the congressional race was 16. Yet there were 31 votes for Congressman recorded and duly certified.

The count in this precinct was in error by at least 15 votes. The original margin of election was 12. Yet, though the error in this one precinct could have determined the outcome of the entire district election, there was no procedure to allow examination of those votes. When the House Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures did review those ballots, it showed a net difference in the race of seven votes, which, together with seven other net vote changes, swung the election results of the entire district.

I am certain that every Member of this body cherishes its given right to determine its own membership. I personally feel very strongly about this issue. However, I believe we can and should delegate the authority to proceed with all available recourse in the State jurisdiction in cases of contested elections. Such procedures would be available for our scrutiny and review. But in all fairness to the Congress, we should attempt to make all possible evidence available for our consideration. The way to do this is to allow the States to develop their own procedures in examining the elections.

Our Congress has depended heavily on the rules and procedures of the English Parliament in determining its own rules and procedures. The election laws governing the election of a member of Parliament provide authority similar to that provided for in my bill.

In English elections, the Crown appoints a "returning officer" for each constituency. This officer functions much like our own election boards, in that he supervises the election, the counting of the ballots, and is then responsible for declaring and certifying the returns. He is specifically authorized to recount the ballots of the election in a close or contested race. He personally is authorized to grant a request for same. If the contestant seeks further action in the determination of his case, he may submit a petition to a special election court seeking recount or other action as may be deemed necessary. This court acts on the petitions presented to it and reports to the Speaker of the House of Commons. The House of Commons then "may make such order in respect of that report as it thinks proper"—14 Halsbury's Laws of England, third edition, 315.

The bill I present provides for the delegation of authority to the various States to conduct a recount. This they do under their own statutes, precedents, and rules. The results are then subject to review by the House of Representatives where the Constitution reposes the final authority. I ask that the bill I present be given fullest consideration by the committee and by this House.

The Looming Decision on the N-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. HICKEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, our colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is a man who not only sees the grave responsibilities in these very grave days, he is a man in public life who comes forward with concrete, specific recommendations for courses of action. In this connection I wish to call attention to an informative

and persuasive discussion set forth by our colleague in the July 17 issue of U.S. News & World Report. The article is entitled "Neutron Bomb: Ideal Weapon for Defense."

The Senator from Connecticut makes three observations: First, the neutron bomb is scientifically feasible; second, is ideally suited for defense particularly by NATO whose very existence presupposes the fighting of a defensive war in Western Europe; and third, the time for decision is at hand.

The subject is crucial and the Senator's article is brief so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEUTRON BOMB, NUCLEAR TESTS—NEXT DECISIONS FOR UNITED STATES

(Two issues that could mean the life or death of this Nation are crowding in upon the Kennedy administration for decision. Issue 1: The neutron bomb. In an article written exclusively for U.S. News & World Report, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, points out the big advantages that could be gained by the first nation to perfect the fantastic weapon. Issue 2: Atomic tests. In another exclusive article, arguments against U.S. resumption of tests are answered by Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, head of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.)

N-BOMB: IDEAL WEAPON FOR DEFENSE

(By Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut)

Perhaps because it distills, or crystallizes, all the other issues involved, the national debate on the larger question of the nuclear-test-ban moratorium now appears to be focusing with increasing sharpness on the neutron bomb.

When I first spoke about the neutron bomb in the Senate on May 12, 1960, and described it as a weapon which had the ability to kill without physical destruction, one national periodical ran a note captioned, "DODD Bomb a Dud." Subsequent to my speech, there were several skeptical references to the neutron bomb in statements by nuclear physicists of some repute. Today, there is not a single objective scientist with knowledge in this area who would question the scientific feasibility of the neutron bomb.

Even though there is now no serious argument about its scientific feasibility, the debate about the neutron bomb is growing. Until recently, this debate has been carried on behind closed doors and under classified label. Today it is out in the open, where it ought to be.

In my opinion, all the hush-hush about the neutron bomb represents a glaring instance of the official abuse of secrecy. Since there almost certainly will be such a thing as a neutron bomb, and since there is a serious danger that the Russians might beat us to its development, the American people are entitled to this information. To keep the facts about the nuclear age from our people is both foolish and dangerous.

There are many qualified experts, including scientists, military men, and weapons technologists, who consider the neutron bomb a weapon of revolutionary significance, one that might very well cost us our freedom if the Soviets get it first. On the other hand, there are those who now claim that its potential military significance has been grossly overrated, and that we have other weapons that can accomplish much the same purpose.

They argue that the neutron bomb is not an important enough reason for the resumption of testing of new weapons. According to the New York Times such a debate is now going on within the President's advisory staff.

Over the past 2 weeks, the latter point of view has been reflected in a number of articles in the national press, purportedly based on high-level information. These articles contained so many inaccuracies and misconceptions that I feel they must be considered evidence of a deliberate effort to downgrade the significance of the neutron bomb.

The opponents of renewed testing, the last-ditch defenders of the moratorium on testing, find it increasingly difficult to oppose the neutron bomb on scientific grounds. Therefore, they dredge up every conceivable argument, some pseudomilitary, some just plain nonsensical, for not being worried about the neutron bomb.

The purpose of this article is to set the record straight on the most serious of these misconceptions and inaccuracies.

1. The most serious misconception was stated, in summary, in a recent headline in a Washington newspaper: "Neutron Bomb Dwarfed by 'H', Despite Furor." The article concluded with the words, "One thing seems certain: A neutron bomb will be no match for the hydrogen bomb. Nor can its development be considered a giant leap beyond the H-bomb."

This completely misses the point. No one, to my knowledge, has ever suggested that the neutron bomb would have a greater capacity to kill or to devastate than the H-bomb. The neutron bomb would, nevertheless, have a revolutionary impact on warfare. It is no exaggeration to say that, if the Soviets were to get it first, it might very well cost us our freedom.

The trouble with old-fashioned H- and A-weapons, even the tactical nuclear weapons we now have in our arsenal, is that they suffer from serious military liabilities, and even more serious political and moral liabilities. Such weapons, because they are still of large yield and highly destructive, and produce fallout in varying degree, represent a danger to whichever side uses them and, in many cases, they preclude the immediate occupation of the target area.

But, most important, they represent a danger to the civilian population in whose territory the war may be fought.

This danger is something that democratic countries in particular cannot ignore. Our European Allies are prepared to resist communism. But one cannot blame them for being disturbed over the prospect of a defense with tactical nuclear weapons that will settle radioactive debris on their towns and villages and contaminate milk and crops. They also fear that the use of tactical atomic and thermonuclear weapons on the battlefield will tend to escalate into all-out H-bomb warfare.

These dangers may be exaggerated, and the fears may be even more exaggerated. Nevertheless, their existence constitutes an inescapable political fact—a fact which lays a heavy hand of deterrence on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's tactical capability to defend itself.

Weapons that we are reluctant to use, and that our allies would be even more reluctant to see used, do not constitute the ideal deterrent to the Kremlin in its present emboldened state. The Kremlin apparently does not consider it credible that we would resort to all-out H-bomb war over Berlin. It could also not be blamed if it considered it not too credible that we would employ small H- and A-weapons for tactical purposes on the territory of our allies.

But the neutron bomb, if we had it, would be a completely credible weapon; and the element of credibility would enormously enhance the chances of keeping the peace.

The N-bomb would get away from both the military and political liabilities of our other tactical nuclear weapons.

It could be tailored in a variety of sizes to meet military requirements with precision.

Under battlefield conditions, it would be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to devise any practical protection against it.

Since there is no significant contamination, troops could move into the target area immediately after the explosion.

Since it kills without significant destruction, equipment and fortifications in the target area could be taken over reasonably intact.

WITH N-BOMB, THERE IS NO FALLOUT

Since there is no fallout, there would be no danger, either immediate or future, to the civilian population in nearby centers.

Since it is radically different from A- and H-weapons, and capable of precise limitation to the battlefield or target area, it would seriously reduce the possibility of escalation into all-out thermonuclear war.

These characteristics would make the neutron bomb an ideal weapon for defense or offense. But it would, above all, be an ideal weapon for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which has been constructed to fight a defensive war, initially on the territory of its own peoples.

2. The neutron bomb has another application of critical importance. Some articles have distinguished between a neutron bomb and a "neutron flux" warhead, which, they said, would be an antimissile weapon.

This terminology is confusing because it implies that there is some basic difference between a neutron weapon and a "neutron flux" weapon. There would obviously be some difference between a neutron warhead specifically designed for an antimissile missile and a neutron warhead designed for battlefield use. But the basic principle involved is the same for both. The neutron warhead for the antimissile missile cannot and will not be built unless we conduct the original or grandfather test that will establish the scientific framework for neutron weapons of all kinds.

Army technologists working on the antimissile missile have made impressive progress in solving the difficult problem of guidance. If this is solved, one of the most important single problems remaining would be the development of the most suitable and effective warhead. A neutron warhead would have great advantages over any now available to us, first because it could be built at a fraction of the price of an A- or H-warhead; second, because it would result in no atmospheric contamination, even if it were detonated in the atmosphere, accidentally or intentionally. This is a very important consideration.

EFFECTS OF HIGH-ENERGY NEUTRONS

3. One of the recently published articles downgrading the neutron bomb stated that "little is known of the biological effects of high-energy neutrons." It added that those irradiated might not succumb for as long as 30 days, "during which the victim would presumably become an ideal kamikaze," or suicide volunteer. This ability to create hordes of suicide shock troops, said the article, "greatly reduces the role of a neutron bomb as a battlefield weapon."

It is always difficult to reply to misinformation in a classified area because to correct inaccuracies detail by detail would require the revelation of classified information. I will only say in commenting on this that it conveys a completely inaccurate conception of the battlefield effects of the neutron bomb.

The overwhelming majority of those within the target area of an N-bomb would be incapacitated within minutes and would remain incapacitated until their death sometime within the ensuing several days. Those who survived for several days or, in rare

cases, longer, would not make ideal kamikazes, or suicide volunteers, of any kind, for the simple reason that they would not have either the will or the energy. Those who were affected but were beyond lethal range might not take too kindly, with the prospect of complete recovery, to the suggestion that they serve as kamikazes.

4. At the plain nonsensical end of the spectrum was one anti-N-bomb argument, recently quoted by one of our national columnists. His source, apparently someone of authority within the administration, was quoted as saying that there was really no military need for the N-bomb because we had bacteriological and chemical weapons that could do just as effective a job of killing.

This is straining hard for arguments. As anyone with an ABC knowledge of military matters should know, bacteriological weapons have never been used in warfare. Used as battlefield weapons, they would be so slow acting as to be purposeless, and they would be as much of a danger to the side that used them—and to the civilian population—as they would be to the enemy.

As for chemical weapons, they are notoriously hazardous to use on the battlefield because of shifting wind patterns. The side that uses them must equip its troops with cumbersome protective clothing, and must be indifferent to heavy casualties to the surrounding civilian population. They are not precision weapons nor do they have any of the other advantages of the N-bomb.

We beat the Soviets to the H-bomb by a matter of months only. If President Truman, instead of ordering a crash program to develop the H-bomb, had continued to listen to those who opposed its development for scientific reasons, or moral reasons, or political reasons, or for a combination of reasons, America today might very well be a Soviet colony.

The Soviets developed the H-bomb in complete secrecy. They exploded it without announcing it to the world, and our intelligence was completely unaware of Soviet progress in this field until it monitored the first Soviet H-blast.

The Soviet Government in its time has violated more than 1,000 treaties and agreements, as documented by a Senate study on the subject. If they have violated the 2½-year honor moratorium on testing—and, to my mind, they would not be Communists if they had not cheated on it—then they already may have beaten us to the neutron bomb.

If the day should ever come when the Kremlin forces a showdown crisis over Berlin and then demonstrates its possession of the neutron bomb, we would find ourselves confronted with the choice of capitulation in Europe or all-out nuclear war.

If this day of doom ever arrives, it will be small consolation to Republicans and Democrats that, on the cardinal issue of the moratorium, they have blundered hand in hand.

Atomic Testing by the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Kennedy administration has been buffeted from crisis to crisis, scarcely having had a chance to install itself in office and formulate its own policies. The immediate crises, though spectacular, must not divert our attention from the long-range problems which beset us.

A recent pair of articles in U.S. News & World Report point up two of these issues which we must soon decide. One article, by our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], discusses the spectacular neutron bomb and the necessity for the United States to be equipped with this fantastic weapon. The second article, by the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, argues that we should resume atomic testing.

I commend these articles to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

NEUTRON BOMB, NUCLEAR TESTS—NEXT DECISIONS FOR UNITED STATES

(Two issues that could mean the life or death of this Nation are crowding in upon the Kennedy administration for decision. Issue 1—the neutron bomb. In an article written exclusively for U.S. News & World Report, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, points out the big advantages that could be gained by the first nation to perfect this fantastic weapon. Issue 2—atomic tests. In another exclusive article, arguments against U.S. resumption of tests are answered by Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, head of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.)

N-BOMB: IDEAL WEAPON FOR DEFENSE

(By Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut)

Perhaps because it distills, or crystallizes, all the other issues involved, the national debate on the larger question of the nuclear-test-ban moratorium now appears to be focusing with increasing sharpness on the neutron bomb.

When I first spoke about the neutron bomb in the Senate on May 12, 1960, and described it as a weapon which had the ability to kill without physical destruction, one national periodical ran a note captioned, "Dodd Bomb a Dud." Subsequent to my speech, there were several skeptical references to the neutron bomb in statements by nuclear physicists of some repute. Today, there is not a single objective scientist with knowledge in this area who would question the scientific feasibility of the neutron bomb.

Even though there is now no serious argument about its scientific feasibility, the debate about the neutron bomb is growing. Until recently, this debate has been carried on behind closed doors and under classified label. Today it is out in the open, where it ought to be.

In my opinion, all the hush-hush about the neutron bomb represents a glaring instance of the official abuse of secrecy. Since there almost certainly will be such a thing as a neutron bomb, and since there is a serious danger that the Russians might beat us to its development, the American people are entitled to this information. To keep the facts about the nuclear age from our people is both foolish and dangerous.

There are many qualified experts, including scientists, military men, and weapons technologists, who consider the neutron bomb a weapon of revolutionary significance, one that might very well cost us our freedom if the Soviets get it first. On the other hand, there are those who now claim that its potential military significance has been grossly overrated, and that we have other weapons that can accomplish much the same purpose.

They argue that the neutron bomb is not an important-enough reason for the resumption of testing of new weapons. According to the New York Times, such a debate is now going on within the President's advisory staff.

Over the past 2 weeks, the latter point of view has been reflected in a number of articles in the national press, purportedly based on high-level information. These articles contained so many inaccuracies and misconceptions that I feel they must be considered evidence of a deliberate effort to downgrade the significance of the neutron bomb.

The opponents of renewed testing, the last-ditch defenders of the moratorium on testing, find it increasingly difficult to oppose the neutron bomb on scientific grounds. Therefore, they dredge up every conceivable argument, some pseudomilitary, some just plain nonsensical, for not being worried about the neutron bomb.

The purpose of this article is to set the record straight on the most serious of these misconceptions and inaccuracies.

1. The most serious misconception was stated, in summary, in a recent headline in a Washington newspaper: "Neutron Bomb Dwarfed by 'H', Despite Furor." This article concluded with the words, "One thing seems certain: A neutron bomb will be no match for the hydrogen bomb. Nor can its development be considered a giant leap beyond the H-bomb."

This completely misses the point. No one, to my knowledge, has ever suggested that the neutron bomb would have a greater capacity to kill or to devastate than the H-bomb. The neutron bomb would, nevertheless, have a revolutionary impact on warfare. It is no exaggeration to say that, if the Soviets were to get it first, it might very well cost us our freedom.

The trouble with old-fashioned H- and A-weapons, even the tactical nuclear weapons we now have in our arsenal, is that they suffer from serious military liabilities, and even more serious political and moral liabilities. Such weapons, because they are still of large yield and highly destructive, and produce fallout in varying degree, represent a danger to whichever side uses them and, in many cases, they preclude the immediate occupation of the target area.

But, most important, they represent a danger to the civilian population in whose territory the war may be fought.

This danger is something that democratic countries in particular cannot ignore. Our European allies are prepared to resist communism. But one cannot blame them for being disturbed over the prospect of a defense with tactical nuclear weapons that will settle radioactive debris on their towns and villages and contaminate milk and crops. They also fear that the use of tactical atomic and thermonuclear weapons on the battlefield will tend to escalate into all-out H-bomb warfare.

These dangers may be exaggerated, and the fears may be even more exaggerated. Nevertheless, their existence constitutes an inescapable political fact—a fact which lays a heavy hand of deterrence on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's tactical capability to defend itself.

Weapons that we are reluctant to use, and that our allies would be even more reluctant to see used, do not constitute the ideal deterrent to the Kremlin in its present emboldened state. The Kremlin apparently does not consider it credible that we would resort to all-out H-bomb war over Berlin. It could also not be blamed if it considered it not too credible that we would employ small H- and A-weapons for tactical purposes on the territory of our allies.

But the neutron bomb, if we had it, would be a completely credible weapon; and the element of credibility would enormously enhance the chances of keeping the peace.

The N-bomb would get away from both the military and political liabilities of our other tactical nuclear weapons.

It could be tailored in a variety of sizes to meet military requirements with precision.

Under battlefield conditions, it would be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to devise any practical protection against it.

Since there is no significant contamination, troops could move into the target area immediately after the explosion.

Since it kills without significant destruction, equipment and fortifications in the target area could be taken over reasonably intact.

WITH N-BOMB, THERE IS NO FALLOUT

Since there is no fallout, there would be no danger, either immediate or future, to the civilian population in nearby centers.

Since it is radically different from A- and H-weapons, and capable of precise limitation to the battlefield or target area, it would seriously reduce the possibility of escalation into all-out thermonuclear war.

These characteristics would make the neutron bomb an ideal weapon for defense or offense. But it would, above all, be an ideal weapon for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which has been constructed to fight a defensive war, initially on the territory of its own peoples.

2. The neutron bomb has another application of critical importance. Some articles have distinguished between a neutron bomb and a "neutron flux" warhead, which, they said, would be an antimissile weapon.

This terminology is confusing because it implies that there is some basic difference between a neutron weapon and a "neutron flux" weapon. There would obviously be some difference between a neutron warhead specifically designed for an antimissile missile and a neutron warhead designed for battlefield use. But the basic principle involved is the same for both. The neutron warhead for the antimissile missile cannot and will not be built unless we conduct the original or grandfather test that will establish the scientific framework for neutron weapons of all kinds.

Army technologists working on the antimissile missile have made impressive progress in solving the difficult problem of guidance. If this is solved, one of the most important single problems remaining would be the development of the most suitable and effective warhead. A neutron warhead would have great advantages over any now available to us, first because it could be built at a fraction of the price of an A- or H-warhead, second because it would result in no atmospheric contamination, even if it were detonated in the atmosphere, accidentally or intentionally. This is a very important consideration.

EFFECTS OF HIGH-ENERGY NEUTRONS

3. One of the recently published articles downgrading the neutron bomb stated that "little is known of the biological effects of high-energy neutrons." It added that those irradiated might not succumb for as long as 30 days, "during which the victim would presumably become an ideal kamikaze," or suicide volunteer. This ability to create hordes of suicide shock troops, said the article, "greatly reduces the role of a neutron bomb as a battlefield weapon."

It is always difficult to reply to misinformation in a classified area because to correct inaccuracies detail by detail would require the revelation of classified information, I will only say in commenting on this that it conveys a completely inaccurate conception of the battlefield effects of the neutron bomb.

The overwhelming majority of those within the target area of an N-bomb would be incapacitated within minutes and would remain incapacitated until their death sometime within the ensuing several days. Those who survived for several days or, in rare cases, longer, would not make ideal kamikazes, or suicide volunteers, of any kind, for the simple reason that they would not have either the will or the energy. Those who were affected but were beyond lethal range might not take too kindly, with the prospect of complete recovery, to the suggestion that they serve as kamikazes.

4. At the plain nonsensical end of the spectrum was one anti-N-bomb argument, recently quoted by one of our national columnists. His source, apparently someone of authority within the administration, was quoted as saying that there was really no military need for the N-bomb because we had bacteriological and chemical weapons that could do just as effective a job of killing.

This is straining hard for arguments. As anyone with an A-B-C knowledge of military matters should know, bacteriological weapons have never been used in warfare. Used as battlefield weapons, they would be so slow acting as to be purposeless, and they would be as much of a danger to the side that used them—and to the civilian population—as they would be to the enemy.

As for chemical weapons, they are notoriously hazardous to use on the battlefield because of shifting wind patterns. The side that uses them must equip its troops with cumbersome protective clothing, and must be indifferent to heavy casualties to the surrounding civilian population. They are not precision weapons nor do they have any of the other advantages of the N-bomb.

We beat the Soviets to the H-bomb by a matter of months only. If President Truman, instead of ordering a crash program to develop the H-bomb, had continued to listen to those who opposed its development for scientific reasons, or moral reasons, or political reasons, or for a combination of reasons, America today might very well be a Soviet colony.

The Soviets developed the H-bomb in complete secrecy. They exploded it without announcing it to the world, and our intelligence was completely unaware of Soviet progress in this field until it monitored the first Soviet H-blast.

The Soviet Government in its time has violated more than 1,000 treaties and agreements, as documented by a Senate study on the subject. If they have violated the 2½-year honor moratorium on testing—and, to my mind, they would not be Communists if they had not cheated on it—then they already may have beaten us to the neutron bomb.

If the day should ever come when the Kremlin forces a showdown crisis over Berlin and then demonstrates its possession of the neutron bomb, we would find ourselves confronted with the choice of capitulation in Europe or all-out nuclear war.

If this day of doom ever arrives, it will be small consolation to Republicans and Democrats that, on the cardinal issue of the moratorium, they have blundered hand in hand.

THE CASE FOR ATOMIC TESTING BY UNITED STATES

To test new weapons again or not to test, is moving to top position among decisions pressing in on President Kennedy.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, in a key position as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and as a friend of Kennedy, is among those pressing for a decision to resume testing. His views, based on years of dealing with matters of national security, are shared by many top military men and members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

In what follows, arguments that are advanced against weapons testing are stated and answered by Chairman HOLIFIELD.

Argument: "We should not resume testing nuclear weapons, because Russia and the United States have enough to destroy each other right now."

Answer: "This argument could be true in terms of numbers of weapons and total explosive power, and still be fallacious.

"Reason? It ignores the problem of delivery of such weapons. Quantities of nuclear weapons in hands of either United States or Russia could be meaningless unless they are related directly to modern, sophisticated delivery systems.

"As an example, delivery of a 10-megaton bomb by a manned bomber plane might become impossible in the near future. In fact, this will be the case very soon as a result of antiaircraft missiles, or Sidewinder rockets from supersonic interceptor planes. Missiles launched from planes and armed with relatively small nuclear warheads and electronic guidance systems which seek their target, could seal the doom of our SAC [Strategic Air Command] bomber planes.

"Intermediate and long-range missiles are becoming a reality. Ways of delivering missile warheads are improving at a fantastic rate. Note the rate of improvement in solid-fuel missiles such as the Polaris and Minuteman in the past 18 months."

Argument: "But atomic warheads for these missiles have already been developed. Any further improvements are bound to be marginal."

Answer: "Further improvements could be tremendous, not marginal. Further testing of warheads is imperative.

"Let me give an example, using theoretical warhead weights:

"A warhead weighing 500 pounds has a present range of 1,200 miles. If the weight of the warhead were reduced from 500 to 250 pounds, the range could be increased to 1,700 miles with the same amount of missile fuel. Reduction in weight, size, and configuration of warheads requires testing, except in minor instances.

"The real problem which faces us—and which depends on testing—is not to create larger yield weapons with more megatons, but to create lighter and smaller missile warheads which are practically invulnerable to interception.

"Our national security may rest on this point. We cannot gamble with weapon systems which are rapidly becoming obsolescent. If we believe that an equal or slightly superior weapon capability in our hands is, or has been, a primary factor of deterrence, then we cannot afford to lose that deterrence by depending on obsolescent weapons or methods of delivery."

Argument: "It isn't actually necessary to test—and explode—atomic devices, because improvements in weapons can be made in laboratories."

Answer: "This argument is dangerous and is refuted by every important event in the history of research and development. Only minor improvements of existing devices can be made without testing. Any major improvement must be proved by testing.

"There are new and revolutionary concepts of delivery systems and warheads in today's rapidly moving technology. These concepts must be tested stey by step from theory to accomplishment. Continuous testing of missile propulsion and guidance at Cape Canaveral and Vandenberg missile facilities are conclusive as to the need of testing of warheads as well.

"The continuous testing of nuclear submarines is another example. Such revolutionary concepts of warhead delivery are being proved in test after test. How naive and impractical and inconsistent are those who are satisfied with the existing state of nuclear warheads while they fail to protest, at all, tesing of the basic delivery systems.

"Protests against testing of warheads become emotional rather than logical. Denial of testing in one phase of our weapon research and development, while continuing

testing in all other phases, can only be crippling in nature. It cannot remove the danger of war; it can only increase the danger of defeat by a determined and ruthless opponent."

Argument: "We should be patient. We should continue negotiating with the Soviets in the hope that an agreement on a test ban can be reached."

Answer: "We have been patient. We have negotiated for 33 months. During this period only minor concessions have been made by the Soviets to our request for an adequate inspection and detection system, to prevent possible cheating.

"On the first meeting in March of this year, the Soviets nullified all previous concessions by advancing a demand for the 'troika' principle of administering the agreement.

"The Soviets reneged on a previous agreement for a one-man neutral administrator and demanded a three-man administration, each to have the right to veto any action of the international inspection team. Since one of the three would be a Soviet representative, this of course made a mockery of any previous agreement. Future chances of an equitable administration of any provision of a treaty agreement were destroyed by the Soviets."

Argument: "The only alternative is to 'walk out'—and that would give Russia a propaganda victory."

Answer: "Breaking off the talks in Geneva is not the only choice. Notwithstanding the futility of our negotiations, I agree that we should continue to negotiate or be willing to negotiate.

"However, we should no longer be bound by our voluntary moratorium during the time of future negotiations.

"We should not 'walk out' on the negotiations, neither should we tie our hands on nuclear-weapons testing for strength and security."

Argument: "(a) The Soviets are not testing secretly; (b) the Soviets are testing secretly."

Answer: "Neither of these statements can be proved by the United States. It is precisely because we do not know the answers and because the Soviets will not agree to an adequate system of detection which would give us firm answers, that we face the grave decision."

Argument: "If the United States and Britain resume testing, then, the Soviets will resume testing."

Answer: "This argument assumes that the Soviets have not been secretly testing. If the assumption is not true, then they would not 'resume,' they would continue.

"On the other hand, if they have honored the moratorium and have not been secretly testing, we will start out at the same relative position we were in 33 months ago. Our course of action will not be based on ignorance of our opponent's actions, but on proven procedures for improving our capability to deter war."

Argument: "The Soviets have more to gain by resuming nuclear tests than the United States and Britain."

Answer: "This argument is based on the assumption that the Soviets have not been secretly testing during the 33-month moratorium. The assumption, therefore, must be evaluated. It can neither be proved nor disproved, because we lack dependable information.

"If the Soviets have been secretly testing, they may have closed any gap in their technology which may have existed at the beginning of the moratorium.

"If they have not been secretly testing, then it is reasonable to assume that the same gap exists today as we believe existed at the beginning of the moratorium. Assuming this latter situation, we then must evalute our respective technological capabilities. On this point, I see no reason for doubting our own capability. The record of the past proves that we have had a superior capability in both quality and diverse types of nuclear weapons.

"Undoubtedly the Soviets will improve their weapons technology whether their testing is secret or open. Because we lack information as to the present status of their nuclear-weapon technology, we can only speculate as to the relative gain in the future between the Soviets and ourselves.

"In a contest of this type, I have confidence in the ability of the United States and Britain to maintain any lead in weaponry that we may now have."

Argument: "If tests are resumed, people all over the world will be alarmed and blame the United States."

Answer: "There will undoubtedly be some adverse public opinion toward any nation that resumes testing of nuclear weapons. The degree of blame directed against the United States will depend on several factors, some of which can be modified by the skill we exercise in presenting our case to world opinion. Some factors are beyond our control.

"The President should, in my opinion, devote a major television speech to this presentation. He should give a brief résumé of our patient negotiations over the 33-month time period. He should then explain the continuous refusal of the Soviets to accept any basic agreement which would give us assurance against secret violation.

"The people should be given the facts regarding the need for improvement of existing weapons and the probability of revolutionary weapons development. The basic factor for resumption, of course, would be the maintenance of our position of military strength in the interest of deterrence and the preservation of peace.

"We now have a considerable cushion of good will and confidence on the part of our allies and most of the neutral nations. That good will and confidence is based on the belief that we have negotiated sincerely during the recent months.

"There is a corresponding decrease in respect for the Soviets. Their failure to advance constructive proposals and their rejection of United States and British concessions have caused growing doubt as to their sincerity. The recent "troika" proposal in the United Nations and the Geneva conferences has worked to their disadvantage before the bar of world opinion.

"In making the decision to resume testing because we believe it necessary for the preservation of our national security, we must be willing to accept criticism from those who are not responsible for our national safety and who, in most instances, are misinformed or uninformed on the reasons for making the decision."

Argument: "Fallout from nuclear-weapons testing by the United States, the Soviets, and possibly other nations, will contaminate the atmosphere and be harmful to people."

Answer: "The United States and Britain would not conduct tests which would involve contamination of the world's atmosphere.

"Tests which are necessary to improve existing weapons, or prove the principle of new and possibly revolutionary weapons, can be conducted in underground cavities, thereby solving the problem of atmospheric contamination.

"Each sovereign nation determines its own course in nuclear-weapon testing. The present test-ban negotiations affect only the United States, Britain, and the U.S.S.R. The fact that the negotiations were being held did not prevent France from conducting atomic-weapon tests in the Sahara Desert.

"It would indeed be naive to believe that Communist China would refrain from testing atomic weapons, if such tests were within her capability or to her advantage."

Address by Hon. Charles E. Goodell, of New York, Before Annual Convention of Eighth District of the American Legion, Department of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, the Honorable CHARLES E. GOODELL, who represents the 43d District of New York, was the main speaker at the 23d Annual Convention of the Eighth District of the American Legion, Department of New York, held in Jamestown, N.Y.

Before becoming a Representative, Mr. GOODELL served in the U.S. Navy during World War II, and in the Air Force during the Korean conflict. In the short time that he has served in Congress, he has proved to be an able legislator and an outstanding debater, commanding the attention of the House membership.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to include his speech which follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL, OF NEW YORK

It is a privilege to be asked to address the Eighth District American Legion Convention this year. I speak to you today as Americans and I will not invoke your loyalties to either the Republican or the Democratic Parties.

The members of the American Legion are citizens who have fought and bled and suffered for freedom. Let me tell you today, that though our guns are silent, we are at war with international communism. The sooner we face up to this fact the more chance we will have for survival. I speak bluntly when I say that in certain respects we are losing the war in which we are engaged today. You can do nothing about it personally, but in this great free land the firm resolve of the people is inevitably felt by our leaders.

President Kennedy has stated that we are embarked upon "a decade of development" throughout the world. Two-thirds of the world's peoples today live in the free world and one-third in the Sino-Soviet bloc. We control in the free world 69 percent of the steel production, 79 percent of primary aluminum production, and 79 percent of electric power production. We are strong militarily. We are strong economically. We need not back down in any international crisis. But nonetheless we are losing the world because the enemy of our freedom, the enemy of our way of life, is dictating precisely where we will next do battle—on what terms, on what issues, and with what weapons. We are on the defensive and we seem bedazzled with the idea that concessions to Communists can buy a restless peace.

As we move well into the 1960's, our people must understand that peace with freedom can only survive if we, in this cold war, pass the test of fortitude in the same way our brothers and our ancestors have met that test in the past. If our country and our people, with a whimper and a wail, embrace compromises with communism to avoid hard decisions, we are already in death row as a nation. And if the United States of America goes under, mankind will face a night without end.

President Kennedy needs reinforcements from our people. He needs you and me—Republicans and Democrats—standing firm

behind him and, if necessary, even pushing him on the issues that involve life and death for our civilization.

I'd like to talk to you today about one or two of the most crucial issues upon which public opinion must be rallied if we are, in the words of Bertrand Russell, to "acquiesce in our own survival."

1. President Eisenhower in 1958 accepted a voluntary suspension of testing of nuclear weapons. We have no evidence that Russia has violated this voluntary agreement. But we know that underground testing can be concealed. In 1958 this country was far ahead of Russia in its capabilities to utilize the great nuclear potential of weaponry. If Russia has been secretly testing for the past 3 years, they may now have passed us by. Mankind is on the threshold of new fantastic discoveries in nuclear science. Some of those developments will be unimaginably fearful. We had better acquire such monster weapons first or we won't have much to say about the decade of the 1970's. As the 1950's has been the decade of abundance, the 1970's can be the decade of bondage if we go to sleep today.

We'd better start developing the deadly neutron bomb and the lithium bomb right now. I ask you what would have happened after World War II if the Communists had had the atom bomb instead of the United States? Europe, Asia, and Africa would have almost certainly been overrun by godless men. I doubt if our own Western Hemisphere could have survived if the atom bomb had been in the hands of Joseph Stalin instead of Harry Truman. What do you suppose would happen tomorrow if Khrushchev announced the successful testing of a neutron bomb which has no blast or heat but kills all life within a wide radius of its target? No one can doubt that the Dark Ages would settle on freedom for centuries to come.

And yet we are today listening with one ear to the siren call of craven, wishful thinkers who tell us that these weapons are too awesome to develop and we should therefore trust the Communists in not developing them. These misled people point convincingly to the history that armament races solve nothing, but merely increase the heavy load on all mankind. They then jump the wide gulf and land on the conclusion that we can avoid the race with Russia by refusing to run. I tell you the race with communism is on, in deadly earnest, and if we refuse to run we will lose by default. And frankly, the likelihood of a real agreement on disarmament with the Communists will be greatly enhanced by Communist certainty that they are losing the race to a resolute and determined free world. We must renew nuclear tests immediately. The spark of hope for real disarmament can be kept alive only if freemen stay ahead of the enemies of peace.

2. Much has been said about our prestige abroad. We are obsessed with the desire to please the ignorant, the backward, the savage in this world. America trimming its sails to the opinions of illiterate peasants in South America is like a commanding general popularizing himself with the raw recruit by consulting him about military strategy. Our job is not to be popular in the world, it is to be respected. Sure, we must live by our Christian principles and die for them if necessary. Sure, we must demonstrate that we want to help the little people throughout the world to attain a better life. In the words of Arnold Toynbee, ours "is the first generation since the dawn of history in which mankind dared to believe it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race." That's our dazzling, inspiring message to impoverished people on this globe. But we have been foolish enough to believe that our demonstration of freedom and abundance at home and our good intentions abroad are enough to bind a steadfast friendship with a poor beggar on the streets of Caracas, Venezuela, or in Laos.

When you take a hungry man, who has struggled all his life just to bring home a handful of rice or garbage to keep his family alive, he's not interested in talking about freedom or human rights. He will vote with his stomach. He will shout for a Castro in a hysterical mob because Castro promises him land and food. He will even shut his eyes for a while to unspeakable repression and the bloodshed of his own family and neighbors.

America is making a dangerous mistake in the way it is seeking to defend the underdeveloped nations of the world. We believe in the shining ideal of self-determination, meaning that however impoverished in mind and spirit the natives of the jungle are, they know what's best for themselves. This just is not true. Such people cannot be expected to see through the false facade of communism until communism has their country by the throat and it's too late. I will never criticize our leaders, and President Kennedy particularly, because his prestige among the ignorant and downtrodden of South America, for example, falls to a low ebb. We cannot transplant the full-blown flower of freedom to a nation where only 1 percent of its people are literate. Yet that is just about what we have been attempting to do in many aspects of our foreign aid program.

St. Paul said to his worldly followers, who knew little of the spiritual verities, "I have fed you with milk and not with meat." Let's stop trying to feed underdeveloped countries political food they are unable to digest. They are newborn babies. They need milk, not charcoal-broiled steak.

3. You know there is a lot of fuzzy thinking about the Communists. If you and I suddenly came upon a man about to throw himself off the Third Street bridge, the first thing we would do, if we could, would be to hold him back by force. There would be time enough to lecture him and reason with him after the immediate danger had passed. When we see an underdeveloped country about to embrace communism, the first thing to do is to prevent such a disaster by force, and then reason with the people about the type of government that can best serve the people's needs. Communism is not a national system of government. It is an international conspiracy of evil, dedicated to the destruction of human dignity and human rights. It feeds upon fear and force and ignorance. It can be defeated only by the unshakable faith and courage of strong men who have flourished in the sunshine of freedom and who are willing to risk their lives to keep that sun shining.

This is the time when we should pray in unison the stirring words of Josiah Gilbert Holland:

"God give us men. A time like this demands
Strong minds, stout hearts, true faith and ready hands!
Men whom the lust of office does not kill,
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy,
Men who possess opinions and a will,
Men who love honor, men who cannot lie."

President Kennedy not long ago told the Congress of the United States, and I quote: "The complacent, the self-indulgent, the soft societies are about to be swept away with the debris of history." I agree with the President. We'd better wake up as a people and stand up as a Nation, before it is too late.

We must begin to fight the war with international communism to win. It is time we countered Communist pressures on our weak points with real pressure on Communist weaknesses. It is time we abandoned our defensive position for a strong offense of freedom. I don't mean we should start a hot war or invade countries now behind the Iron Curtain, but it is imperative to our survival that we recognize that neither hot wars nor cold wars are won by weakness and compromise. When we give foreign nations help, let's make it unmistakably clear that we insist that the money, the material, the food, or whatever else it is that we're giving them, be used to help those people in the way we want it used. If the little band of rich intellectuals who are exploiting the people in some underdeveloped countries refuse to accept our aid on our terms, then so be it. They will soon see the great benefits flowing to the people of neighboring countries who have had the good sense to keep Uncle Sam happy while he is forking out the money they need to live on. And believe me, we are paying a high price to help the less fortunate peoples of the world. President Kennedy's request for a total of $5.2 billion for this fiscal year in foreign aid will cost every taxpayer an average of $97. Admitting that the price must be paid, it is my feeling that you veterans of war want your Congressman to see to it that the money does the job that has to be done.

We are so sensitive today about our prestige in the eyes of underdeveloped peoples that we lean over backwards to avoid interference in the way that they spend our money. In addition, we give our friends who are committed 100 percent to our cause piddling amounts of aid while we send enormous amounts of aid to neutral countries who refuse to support our policies. This was dramatically brought to the world's attention last Wednesday when the President of Pakistan, Ayub Khan, spoke bluntly to a joint session of Congress.

Pakistan is anti-Communist and it sides consistently with the United States as a friend. India slaps us in the face and clings to a philosophy of neutralism. Throughout the world neutralism is a burgeoning force. Is it any wonder? We are subsidizing it. We reward the boys who play both sides against the middle and virtually ignore our friends because we can count on them anyway.

The simple and the foolish answer to abuses in foreign aid expenditures is to abandon the foreign aid program. Such a policy would be, in my opinion, disastrous for this country and the free world. We can no longer turn our backs on the world without sooner or later getting a dagger right between the shoulder blades.

President Kennedy has promised a complete revamping of our foreign aid program. He has asked Congress to authorize the spending of taxpayers' money, not for 1 year or 3 years, but for 5 years into the future. He has asked Congress to give up its control over the spending of the taxpayers' money by permitting the President to borrow money without the necessity of congressional appropriations.

Although I support the President in his resolve to clean up the foreign aid program and to increase the amounts of foreign aid, I will never vote for a proposal which requires Congress to abdicate its responsibility. This issue will come before the Congress this summer and I predict that we who represent you taxpayers back home will insist that the foreign aid program undergo the most careful congressional scrutiny every year. I believe a fair and effective foreign aid bill will be passed that will thrust this country forward in its great crusade to promote the dignity and freedom of man throughout the world.

And so that is my message to you who carry the wounds of war in your bodies and in your hearts. The American Legion has always carried the message of strength and courage to our people. You have never been fooled by the fuzzy-minded people who think Communists have good intentions and will compromise with weakness. President Kennedy will make no decision more critical in the coming weeks than the decision as to

when we start nuclear testing again. We can continue to talk with the Russians about disarmament but a renewal of nuclear testing will serve notice upon them that we mean business.

Let's forget about our prestige with the man in the street abroad and do the job that has to be done to help the people of the world attain their aspirations. We will sacrifice whatever it takes in the faith, as expressed by Benjamin Franklin at the birth of this Nation, that "God rules in the affairs of men."

In that faith, we cannot fail.

Thank you.

Secretary Udall Makes Important Statement on the Saline Water Research Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has under active consideration the legislation recommended by President Kennedy to redouble this Nation's efforts to find economical means of converting sea water and other saline water to water that is usable for municipal and industrial purposes. This saline water research program was initiated by the Congress in 1952. Much progress has been made with the limited funds that have been available to the Department of the Interior. However, with this Nation's economy so closely related to and dependent on a plentiful supply of fresh water and with our water needs increasing so rapidly, a speedup in our efforts is necessary. In addition the program has international significance.

Secretary Udall presented a fine statement to the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee yesterday which emphasizes the importance of this program and the need for pushing forward more rapidly. In order to call Secretary Udall's important statement to the attention of all Members, I am including it as a part of these remarks. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 17, 1961

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this statement supplements the earlier statement I made to this committee on June 27, 1961. Because certain information was not available from the Department, it has been necessary to recess these hearings on two occasions and the hearings have not maintained the continuity desired by the committee. For that reason and in the interest of stating more clearly the views of the Department of the Interior, I am submitting this additional statement for your information.

On June 26, 1961, President Kennedy recommended a draft of a bill "To expand and extend the saline water conversion program being administered by the Department of the Interior." The suggested legislation borrowed heavily from and is an expansion of the three bills introduced by members of this committee: H.R. 4721, by Mr. ASPINALL; H.R. 4757, by Mr. ROGERS of Texas; and H.R. 4759, by Mr. SAYLOR.

These three bills would expand a program developed by this committee 9 years ago. When I had the pleasure of being assigned to this committee some 6 years ago the saline water program was already 3 years in operation. The program launched by this committee 9 years ago has already assisted in reducing the cost of converting sea water to fresh water from $5 to about $1 per thousand gallons.

President Kennedy agrees with the members of this committee who have for several years recognized the importance of the saline water program. He recommended legislation which is now incorporated in H.R. 7916, introduced by Congressman ASPINALL. The suggested legislation can be divided essentially into two parts:

Title I of the draft bill relates to research and development and carries forward the policies and expands the scope of this vital program previously authorized by Congress. This suggested legislation will enable the Department to do more research.

Titles II through V relate to demonstration plants and actual operating units, and would provide limited financial assistance on a "share the risk with industry" approach to the program.

I should like to make one thing clear to this committee: The Department of the Interior has no intention nor desire to enter the municipal water business. The Department does, however, feel a keen responsibility to foster and assist the research and development which will enable American industry and municipalities to succeed in saline water conversion.

It is important to keep in mind the significance of the achievement we seek. You will recall President Kennedy's conviction that obtaining inexpensive fresh water by saline conversion would dwarf any other scientific accomplishment as a benefit to mankind. Assuming the best set of circumstances according to engineering hydrology, it seems certain that at some future year many communities on the face of America will have seen their source of fresh water dangerously depleted unless we take steps to guard against such a situation. Let us then make no mistake, the need is urgent, the effort will be rewarding.

On the other hand, it is equally important that the problems of saline water conversions be viewed with utmost candor and in proper perspective. Those who say that this program will quickly make it possible to provide water so that "the deserts will bloom" are not facing the facts. Producing fresh water from the sea or brackish sources cannot in the foreseeable future be a substitute for other broad programs of water conservation to meet agricultural needs. At the present time, the cost of converting sea water may be as much as 100 times the present cost of irrigation water. This, of course, assumes a cheap source of fresh water, but even in areas where irrigation water is expensive the cost of converting saline water is now about 10 times the cost of water to produce crops. In certain areas where water is scarce and has a high value the cost of converted sea water is three times as great as that of water from present municipal and industrial water sources.

In brief, this is the situation: We must reduce the cost of converted sea water more than 50 percent or to about 40 cents per thousand gallons to make it economically attractive for industrial and municipal uses in the more critical areas. It is quite possible that this can be done. We must further reduce the cost of converted sea water to one-fifteenth its present cost before it could compete for irrigation purposes in some places with scarce supply.

I have stated these costs as they exist generally and they should not be misinterpreted in relation to the vital need for this program. The chairman of this committee and the chairman of this subcommittee and its members are aware that in some parts of this country, and certainly in many parts of the world, potable water is worth what you have to pay to get it. We can put a price on water but we cannot place a value on it. To sharply emphasize this, you may recall that not many summers ago people stood in lines in Dallas, Tex., to pay 50 cents a gallon for water, and they were glad to get it.

If our program could reduce the cost of water to 40 cents per thousand gallons, and that appears scientifically possible, the accomplishment would be sufficiently economic to satisfy the domestic, municipal and industrial water demands in many key areas of America.

Moreover, if the cost of converting sea water to fresh water could be reduced to 40 cents per thousand gallons, I need not emphasize to this committee the worldwide significance that would be attached to this program. In the field of foreign relations, this accomplishment could be extremely beneficial to the United States. There are many developing countries in the world such as Kuwait, Pakistan, Israel, Chile, Australia, and many others, in which major economic progress may depend on producing fresh water from the sea.

This committee may properly ask what achievements have been made in the past to justify further expansion of this program. In answer to that inquiry, permit me to cite what happened in Coalinga, Calif. Water too salty for domestic use was replaced by fresh water hauled in tank cars at the almost prohibitive cost of $9.35 per thousand gallons. But, as a result of a process developed under the saline water program, the city of Coalinga now gets its domestic water supply at about $1.45 per thousand gallons.

This committee may also ask if there is truly a need for this program. The need can best be shown by emphasizing that we are racing against time to discover new sources of fresh water before our expanding demands exhaust our present supplies. In the northern Great Plains region of America an alarming number of communities sought the single demonstration plant authorized under our present limited program because their municipal water supplies are becoming too brackish for domestic consumption. In the panhandle and west Texas-New Mexico area the present sources of underground water are being consumed at a dangerous rate. Reasonable engineering estimates predict that, in many communities, economical sources of water will soon be gone.

It is because of this challenge that the President sent his recommendations to this committee on June 26, and it is because the need for new sources of usable water is vital that the President mentioned it specifically to the Congress in his special message on natural resources.

To meet our responsibility of assisting States, municipalities, and private enterprises in the field of saline water conversion, the second portion of the President's recommendations provides for financial assistance on what I should like to call a share the risk with industry basis. The answer we seek in saline water conversion will be the result of American ingenuity. It is imperative here as in other endeavors that proper financial assistance be made available to private industry as an incentive to move this program forward as quickly as research will permit.

You may be sure that if this expansion of the saline water program is authorized

by the Congress, the Department of the Interior will carefully guard the funds made available to encourage industry in its quest for new sources of fresh water. Each proposal for financial assistance will be carefully scrutinized. At the same time I should make it clear that we are plowing new ground, and I cannot at this time recommend limitations on appropriations nor tell you with certainty what amount of money this program will require for each succeeding year. You know the safeguards provided by the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committee, which guard against unwarranted expenditures.

The more detailed justification of the expanded authority we are requesting will be given by Mr. C. Fred MacGowan, Director, Office of Saline Water. With him will be Dr. Roger Revelle whom I have just appointed as the science adviser to the Secretary. Dr. Revelle will be assisting us in the approach to this problem from a scientific standpoint. I am sure he will prevent us from making the mistake of trying to equate accomplishment with appropriation of funds. This is not the way we intend to solve the problem. Dr. Revelle will help us to determine whether demonstration plants are too big or too small, and he will advise me in this difficult area where research and development in effect becomes applied research. Every effort will be made by Mr. MacGowan, Dr. Revelle, and other members of my staff to carry on a program that is technically and economically sound.

In conclusion, I commend the chairman and the members of this committee for their record of moving forward on a program that is so vital to the future of our country and indeed vital to the future of the free world. I urge you to decide upon a policy through this legislation that will enable us in the Department of the Interior to work with you on a joint legislative-executive effort to make America the leader in the conversion of fresh water from sea water.

Quotas on Cheese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement made this morning by my colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN H. DENT, at a hearing before the U.S. Tariff Commission relative to enlarging or eliminating the quotas on blue mold and cheddar cheese. I would like to commend to my colleagues this very interesting statement:

STATEMENT PRESENTED BY HON. JOHN H. DENT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE IMPACT OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS ON AMERICAN EMPLOYMENT, TO THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, JULY 18, 1961

Members of the Tariff Commission, recently at the request of the cheese manufacturers of Wisconsin, the subcommittee of which I am chairman held hearings in the city of Fond Du Lac, Wis. As you know, this subcommittee is making a study on the impact of imports and exports on American employment. I realize that the Commission hearings today are restricted under section 22(d) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which, in a sense, would bar information relating to the importation of cheese and its effect on employment in the cheesemaking industry, as well as allied industries; therefore, I will refrain from making statistical summation but will try to show that from testimony received before my committee that the great cheese industry is affected inasmuch as the support program is directly identified with cheesemaking in all of its phases: the feed grains, dry milk subsidies, and cheddar cheese. In fact, testimony from the Pure Milk Producers Cooperative showing the storage status of natural American cheese to be in excess of 350 million pounds, which is a 33-percent increase from a year ago, with other varieties of cheese having a surplus storage of over 46 million pounds, an increase of 15 percent over last year. For the purpose of this hearing, it might be interesting to note that quotas on cheese now in effect require a milk production of 280 million pounds with total purchase of milk for supporting dairy prices last year of 300 million pounds of milk equivalent. Increasing quotas would burden the support program further and needlessly. The more cheese imported and the less milk used in production, the more costly the program will be. It is the belief of the cheese manufacturers and other allied industries that unless quotas are maintained rigidly, the markets they develop which would be well established with very expensive and well advertised programs plus the natural market that is caused by increased population can be wiped out by the importation of lower priced competitive products.

One organization representing 115,000 dairy farm members stated that nearly two-thirds of their entire milk production goes to grade B patrons, almost exclusively manufacturers of cheese plants and about 40 percent of the remaining production which is shipped to grade A patrons also move to manufacturing plants—a large number of which are cheesemakers.

Inasmuch as this hearing is more concerned with the question of agricultural support programs, it might be interesting to note that there have been phenomenal increases in purchases of products to support dairy farm income. The Department of Agriculture purchased 17,400,000 pounds of cheese since April 1, 1961. During the same period last year purchases amounted to only 63,000 pounds. Nonfat dry milk purchased this year was 455 million pounds as against 226 million pounds last year. Butter purchases have jumped from 55,349,000 to 113,748,000 pounds. Milk production in all probability will be up slightly this year. Any opening up of quotas in an end product of milk such as cheese cannot mean other than increased cost of the Government support programs. It appears ironic that the only suggestion made to offset the predicted damaging effect of increased quotas is the suggestion by the representative of the foreign exporters that the makers of blue mold cheese and other specialty cheeses could protect themselves by shifting their production to cheddar cheese which is a subsidized cheese product. However, a representative of one of the large blue and foreign-type cheese manufacturers had this to say:

"Blue cheese and foreign-type cheese plants cannot be converted to cheddar which is the variety of cheese purchased by Commodity Credit Corporation to support milk price to the farmer patron. A plant making blue mold cheese has one employee for approximately each 1,500 pounds of milk, while a plant making cheddar will have one employee for each 15,000 pounds of milk, which makes an employment ratio of 10 to 1. Most foreign-type cheese plants are located in areas where they are the only source of employment available to the local employable people. Should milk be diverted from foreign-type cheese plants to cheddar the resulting unemployment would be disastrous."

Aside from the logic and philosophy, we believe it to be an economic program that in the present state of our economy the economic phase should be the criteria upon which any decision is based even if it is restricted to the farm and agricultural economy determinations. Although we discuss freely the program of damaging effects, and while we talk of opening up our already overproduced farm product market according to Robert P. Dorang in the Wall Street Journal of April 15, 1961, there are grave fears in our Agriculture Department at this very moment that the six European economic community nations "could go far toward wiping out an export market for U.S. crops which currently approaches $1 billion a year." In fact, a document being circulated by the Department of Agriculture for discussion purposes charges the Common Market of "aiming at self-sufficiency in agriculture and not at freer trade."

This and other publicly printed stories in the Canadian press, cannot help but give the American producer a sense of uneasiness and a feeling that his Government has become too far detached from his problems of product, costs, and marketing here in our own free market.

This I say to you, that in my observations as a Member of Congress, there is a smoldering revolt in the productive areas of this country against any further liberalization of quotas and tariffs which have proven in the past to be a discouraging spectacle to the normal supporter of the free enterprise system. I beg of you to give very serious consideration to the pleas of the American producers concerning the quotas now being studied by the Tariff Commission. I might say that the President of the United States stated in a public statement, which was given to me by one of the witnesses, in which he said, and I quote in part:

"The best protection for domestic industry and jobs is a prosperous and growing economy. Where an industry continues to suffer from imports, additional steps would be necessary.

"The office of President carries with it the authority and influence to explore and work out the solution within the framework of our foreign trade policies. This should be a high-priority objective

"We should make vigorous use of protective provisions by Congress, such as section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act in the intention and accordance of Congress in enacting these laws.

"Finally, should any further authority be necessary to enable the President to carry out the basic objective of a strong and prosperous economy, he should request such authority from the Congress."

The full statement is available if the Commission desires to see it. I only quote this to show that each of us in turn when faced with the situation recognizes the equity of an American producer when he complains to his Government that governmental policies can be injurious to the point of extinction. I, for one, do not believe that the American people elect their Government to participate in a liquidation of any industry or the job of any workman—no matter how small that industry is or how unimportant that workman's job may appear to be. Over the years the cases such as this one reflect the interests of a comparatively small American industry which seems to have become expendable in the interest of world trade. However, the isolated cases which were once the exception are fast becoming the rule. The American industry (although as yet there has been no concerted effort to speak collectively) is finding out that, without a doubt, none of us are expendable and that an injury to one usually ends up being an injury to all.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear at this hearing.

Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, there is presently before the Appropriations Committee the question of whether or not we should approve the request for funds by the Bureau of Reclamation to build an all-Federal transmission grid for the Colorado River storage project. Against this we must consider the proposal by five electric companies to market power from the project to the Department's customers over a joint system of utility company and Federal lines. This issue will involve basic congressional policy with respect to the marketing of Federal power and it would be well for us to know just what that policy is and how it has evolved over the years.

The need for a Federal power marketing policy came to a head when large quantities of Federal power began to be available from large multiple-purpose projects that had been authorized in the late thirties and early forties.

It was not until the Flood Control Act of 1944 that the policy was first expressed in legislative language. It was further evolved in connection with the Southwestern and Southeastern Power Administrations, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

From the outset this policy has sought to strike a balance between Government and industry. It has avoided encouraging the growth of one at the expense of the other, but at the same time it has striven for maximum results in terms of benefits to the Nation as a whole.

It has at no time permitted the Department of Interior, the sole marketing agent for most Federal power, to assume an all-inclusive, dominant role by constructing all-Federal power systems to the exclusion of industry or non-Federal groups. Instead, it has encouraged and promoted cooperative, joint development in every case possible.

As a result, no Interior Department power marketing agency today has a completely all-Federal system. All reflect cooperation and joint use of facilities to one degree or another.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1944

Section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 contains the first significant declaration of policy on the subject. With regard to the construction of transmission lines it states:

> The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, from funds to be appropriated by the Congress, to construct or acquire, by purchase or other agreement, only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies (Public Law 534, 78th Cong., 58 Stat. 890).

In considering this legislation the House of Representatives refused to accept an amendment drafted by the Interior Department that would have granted it much more extensive authority to build transmission lines. The Senate committee reported a bill with a provision similar to the one quoted above and gave this reason:

> The committee desires an amendment which provides a convenient and practical method of disposing of power at projects under the control of the War Department without setting up a public power trust which would be unduly competitive with established private power utilities.

Several years later Senator HAYDEN emphasized that wheeling agreements could be used to carry out this provision of the 1944 Flood Control Act:

> We know of no other way of assuring the carrying out of the purpose of the Flood Control Act, which gives preference to preferred customers, such as the Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives, to municipalities, to government itself, except by working out proper wheeling agreements. If that can be done, we would like to see it done (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 6, p. 7774).

On the same occasion he also said:

> Every member of the committee prefers to see private industry do this work where it can be done fairly and equitably; and we find that wherever it is done, it is to the mutual advantage of the Government and the private utilities (same, p. 7781).

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

One of the first places where the policy implicit in the language of the 1944 act evolved was the Southwestern Power Administration. In 1946 SWPA's Administrator proposed the construction of an all-Federal transmission network with steamplants to cost about $200 million. Congress was willing to appropriate only $7,500,000, largely for one line which, according to the report of the House Committee on Appropriations, "will not parallel or duplicate existing private transmission facilities"—79th Congress, House Report 1984, page 30. Speaker RAYBURN, who sponsored the $7.5 million figure, said at the time:

> What we are seeking to do by this amendment is not to parallel anybody's lines, not to put anybody out of business, but simply to tie this Government property together. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, p. 5131; speech delivered on May 16, 1946.)

After Congress refused to approve the plan for a huge exclusively Federal transmission network, SWPA began to make power marketing arrangements with electric companies. The first such agreement was in April 1947 with the Texas Power & Light Co. This contract became a model for other agreements.

In fiscal 1948 and 1949 Congress refused new transmission line funds to SWPA. The House Appropriations Committee report for fiscal 1949 said any necessary additional facilities "as may be required, should be provided by organizations in the power business in that area where the power is to be distributed"—80th Congress, House Report No. 2038, page 7.

SWPA Administrator Douglas Wright responded to a request and stated:

> I am pleased to advise that it has always been the policy of this Administration to utilize existing facilities in discharging our responsibility of distributing and marketing power whenever it has been possible to make reasonable arrangements to do so. Insofar as I know, no agency of the Department of the Interior has rejected any reasonable offer of this character (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 9, p. 12031).

Since that time, as a result of numerous wheeling contracts with companies and non-Federal groups, SWPA has become an excellent illustration of the integration of Federal power facilities with the non-Federal power agencies in the area. It has avoided the all-Federal system proposed in 1946.

In a speech in January 1960, Mr. Wright described the SWPA system and observed:

> This has been accomplished, not by the building of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of transmission lines, but by sitting at a table with private utility companies telling them what we had to offer, what they needed, and how it could best be put together.
>
> We think we're getting widespread use when we spend $27 million for transmission lines and have the use of about $2 billion of transmission system.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

The best example of the exclusive use of wheeling agreements instead of the direct construction of an all-Federal transmission system to market power to preference customers is the Southeastern Power Administration. This agency has no Federal transmission lines. In cases where Congress did vote transmission line funds, other arrangements were made subsequently.

In fiscal 1952 funds were rejected for numerous proposed transmission lines. That year the Senate Appropriations Committee report stated in part:

> Considerable progress has been made in the last few years in the negotiation of wheeling agreements in other areas of the United States, and the committee knows of no valid reasons why similar agreements cannot be obtained in the southeastern area of the United States (82d Cong., S. Rept. 499, p. 4).

In the Appropriation Act for 1953 Congress provided for funds for constructing the Clark Hill-Greenwood line and to begin planning on another line, but incorporated this limiting proviso in the act:

> *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated by this paragraph or any part of the unobligated balance appropriated under this heading in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1952 shall be available for the construction of transmission lines and related facilities in the southeastern power area until (1) a contract with the affected power companies in the area of substantially the type which has heretofore been executed in other power areas for systemwide transmission of electric power and energy from Government-owned projects to preferred customers has been executed, or the said companies have refused to execute such contracts, and (2) the Secretary of the Interior has so informed the Congress (82d Cong., Public Law 470; 66 Stat. 445).

Congress' repeated refusal to appropriate funds to build Federal lines made it necessary for SEPA in disposing of power from projects other than those on the Cumberland River—where power is sold directly to TVA—to make wheeling agreements with the existing investor-owned electric companies. Under

these agreements, negotiated from 1951 to 1956, the companies deliver through their lines SEPA power to that agency's preference customers. These wheeling agreements have made unnecessary larger appropriations and have resulted in cheap power for the consumer.

SEPA Administrator, Charles W. Leavy, in a statement in 1958 in connection with the 1959 appropriations, noted that an adequate transmission system with substations for the agency would cost about $118 million. The Administrator concluded that if the Government had built such a transmission system it would have increased the price of power to the wholesale buyers by at least 25 percent and possibly by as much as 80 percent in some instances.

In connection with wheeling agreements, Mr. Leavy this year told the House Appropriations Subcommittee:

It has been our experience generally that once contracts have been negotiated operations under the contract are on an amicable and on a proper basis (pt. 3, p. 739, Public Works Appropriation hearings).

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Bureau of Reclamation has no blanket legislative authority to build transmission lines. Generally, its right to build them is considered to be implicit in the authorizing legislation for specific projects.

The policy of Congress relative to the construction of such facilities by this Bureau was summarized by the House Committee on Appropriations in a report on a Department of Interior appropriation bill. There the committee said:

The Bureau of Reclamation should not use its power and authority or funds entrusted to its care to construct power facilities that are not essential to carrying out the purpose of the reclamation laws. It is unsound and against the principles of our form of government to appropriate funds for the construction of transmission lines, switchyards, substations, and incidental facilities where private capital is prepared to provide them (80th Cong., H. Rept. 2038, p. 20).

In 1949, Senator HAYDEN said concerning the Department of Interior's policy relative to transmission lines and wheeling agreements:

The Department of the Interior has stated during the hearings on this bill that its policy with respect to arrangements for the delivery of power produced at Federal hydroelectric projects or for delivery beyond load centers is to make wheeling arrangements where:

First, private utilities have ample surplus transmission capacity available or are willing to construct transmission lines for that purpose.

Second, private utilities are willing to furnish such service to the Department at a reasonable price.

Third, such arrangements will enable the Department to render acceptable power service to customers having preference, under existing law, in the purchase of federally produced power (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 11, p. 14116).

This means that, wherever possible, power from Federal reclamation projects should be distributed through the transmission networks of existing power systems in the area concerned, whether such systems are public or private. In accord with this policy, in 1953 the Bureau of Reclamation had 54 wheeling and power standby agreements with electric companies, co-ops, or public power agencies. Where adequate facilities do not exist and no one else desires to build them, Congress has provided Federal lines. This has been the case in some areas of the Missouri basin. But many wheeling agreements have also been made in this basin.

Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN, Republican, of Minnesota, stated at the House Appropriations Committee hearings in May:

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out in connection with that the splendid cooperation we have in southwestern Minnesota. There we have almost a perfect example of where private utilities and public power get together. The private utilities are benefited. The Federal Government has seen to it that private utilities do not have in competition with them transmission lines unnecessarily constructed by the Federal Government. The private utilities are paid a fair price for wheeling the power to the REA's in the areas and the municipalities. What we have in southwestern Minnesota could well be multiplied many times over throughout the United States. I think you would agree with me, Mr. Dominy, it is a very good example of what can be done to the benefit of everybody concerned (pt. 3, p. 15, Public Works Appropriation hearings).

Basically, the Bureau of Reclamation has built transmission lines with congressional approval only to tie together Federal powerplants in the same development and to transmit power to pumping facilities.

Congress has generally refused to appropriate funds for transmission lines for reclamation projects where the lines go beyond tying together powerplants in the same development or where existing electric systems are willing and able to wheel power to preference customers.

For instance, in the late 1940's and early 1950's Congress refused numerous Bureau requests for transmission lines in the Central Valley because they went beyond this policy.

In 1951 the House Committee on Appropriations based its refusal of three Central Valley project lines on the existence of a wheeling agreement, saying:

[This] was made possible by the execution of a contract between the major privately owned utility company in California and the Bureau of Reclamation whereby the transmission of Government power over the company's lines to serve the Government's customers was provided for. The committee is happy to note the execution of this contract (82d Cong., H. Rept. 339, p. 11).

Congressional policy was also reflected in its refusal to appropriate funds for 1950 to build several transmission lines in the Colorado-Big Thompson project in Colorado. In explaining its refusal, the Senate Committee on Appropriations cited SWPA's contract with the Texas Power & Light Co., saying:

These two transmission lines have been disapproved by the committee upon the assumption that the Public Service Co. of Colorado will negotiate a contract with the Secretary of the Interior in conformance with the basic principles found in the contract between the Southwestern Power Administration and the Texas Power & Light Co. (81st Cong., S. Rept. 661, p. 14).

Congress again refused transmission line funds for the Colorado-Big Thompson project for fiscal 1951.

THE KEATING AMENDMENT

To implement the transmission line policy just discussed, Congress in 1951 forbade Reclamation to build transmission lines where wheeling agreements had been made. It did this through the so-called Keating amendment to the Department of Interior Appropriation Act for 1952. This provides in part:

No part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers (act of Aug. 31, 1951; Public Law 136, 65 Stat. 255).

An identical provision has been included in the acts making appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for every fiscal year since 1952.

In proposing this amendment in 1951, Representative—now Senator—KEATING, Republican of New York, said its purpose was to "guarantee" that the Bureau of Reclamation would carry out "the will of Congress" that the Federal Government should not construct duplicating transmission lines where private utilities have agreed to wheel Federal power over their lines to Government customers at a reasonable price—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 4, page 4645.

The final version of the amendment included some language suggested by the Senate. The Senate Appropriations Committee's report said the committee's objective was to implement the policy of Congress that "within those areas where wheeling-service contracts have been executed, use will be made of transmission facilities of the wheeling agencies wherever possible to avoid duplication and, at the same time, to provide for the integration of Federal projects and to provide an adequate and dependable supply of power to rural electric cooperatives, Federal establishments, and other preferred customers." The committee added:

The maximum utilization of the facilities of others, rather than the construction of Government transmission facilities, will result in the savings of Federal funds and critical materials needed for the defense effort (82d Cong., S. Rept. 499, p. 23).

The Keating amendment was designed by Congress to implement its basic policy that the Federal Government should not build an exclusive transmission system or that its lines should not duplicate the transmission systems of other power suppliers. It is a restriction upon the construction of transmission lines only in areas where wheeling agreements already have been made. Therefore, it would not apply in the case of the Colorado River storage project. It is a device that Congress has adopted to assist in enforcing on Reclamation Congress' fundamental policy in this field. Of itself, the amendment did not expand this basic policy; but by its reenactment each year Congress indicates its continued approval of the policy it symbolizes.

THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Federal transmission line policy as it has evolved over the years makes completely incongruous the proposal by the Interior Department to build an all-Federal transmission grid for the Colorado River storage project. In the period since World War II, Congress has shown no willingness at any time to authorize an all-Federal transmission grid in any area, and it has repeatedly prevented the Bureau of Reclamation from establishing such a system in a major river basin development. It might be argued that TVA is an exception, but TVA is a Federal monopoly, independent of the Department of Interior. The Pacific Northwest, while containing many Federal lines, makes extensive joint use of non-Federal as well as Federal systems.

The specific language of the law authorizing the Colorado River storage project does not require the construction of a Federal network. In fact, the report on the legislation by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs stated:

The proposal by the power companies [to wheel power] seemed entirely reasonable to the committee. The proposal is consistent with the policy expressed by the Congress for many years in appropriation acts and elsewhere whereby the Federal Government builds the basic backbone transmission system and distribution is made through existing systems where satisfactory arrangements can be worked out. The procedure is similar to that which has worked very satisfactorily for the Central Valley project (84th Cong., H. Rept. 1087, p. 17).

Recent statements of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses indicate a continuing congressional desire for cooperation in developing a mutually acceptable program of transmission lines to market this power. The House Committee on Appropriations in reporting the public works appropriations bill for 1960, emphasized the need for working out such arrangements through joint planning:

The committee heard considerable testimony that the Bureau is proceeding with planning of the Federal transmission line system in the Colorado River storage project area without consulting either the private utilities or the preference customers who would be interested in the distribution of this power. The report on the authorizing legislation specifically requires that coordinated study and planning with these groups be undertaken (86th Cong., H. Rept. 424, p. 25).

The report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations expressed the same idea:

The committee expects the Bureau to confer with representatives of the preference customers and the utilities serving the Upper Colorado River Basin area in the planning of the transmission system to market Colorado River storage project power (86th Cong., S. Rept. 486, p. 43).

Both of these committees were taking the same attitude on this problem that they have expressed repeatedly for more than a decade: that it is incumbent upon the Department of Interior to do everything possible to work out effective and economical wheeling agreements necessary duplicating transmission system that would constitute an exclusive Federal network for marketing power that will preclude the building of an unfrom Federal projects.

Significantly, existing policy was hammered out largely during World War II and the Korean war—periods of crises when the Nation had to utilize the most efficient and economical means available to achieve its objectives. Since it has proven itself under those conditions, there would seem to be no justifiable reason for reversing this policy under today's cold war conditions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Job 36: 5: *Behold God is mighty in strength and wisdom.*

Almighty God, in these days of crisis and confusion, may all the citizens of our country reveal those heroic qualities of a Nation whose God is the Lord and who are strengthened and fortified by a great faith that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.

Grant that this may not be for us a time of panic but a time when we are quietly and resolutely yielding ourselves to the pressure and power of those moral and spiritual resources which are abundantly adequate for whatever may befall us in the fluctuating fortunes of a cold or hot war.

May the magnitude of world issues and the agony of suspense make clear unto us that for calmness and courage, for patience and perseverance we need Thy sustaining grace which is inexhaustible in its fullness.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7576. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1644. An act to provide for the indexing and microfilming of certain records of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in Alaska in the collections of the Library of Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7444) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 17 and 23 to the foregoing bill.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, AND SUNDRY AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 7577) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President, the Department of Commerce, and sundry agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 375, Rept. No. 730) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4998) to assist in expanding and improving community facilities and services for the health care of aged and other persons, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE LATE W. KINGSLAND MACY

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to take this time to pay tribute to the memory of a man who from 1946 to 1950 represented in Congress the district which I now have the honor to represent, who for 25 consecutive years was the Republican chairman of Suffolk County, N.Y., for 4 years Republican State chairman of the State of