

3. Defense officials argued against public disclosure of the dates when the United States could fly a nuclear-powered rocket, although they maintained there was no military requirement for this craft. If the rocket isn't a military device, what difference does it make if another nation knows when it may fly? Incongruously, the Pentagon released the dates when the Atlas and Minuteman missiles would be operational.

Asked about this general problem of classification on another occasion Vice Adm. John M. Hoskins, Director of Declassification Policy, commented: "I've never known a man to be court-martialed for overclassifying a paper."

But overclassification presents more security problems than it solves. This was recognized by the Coolidge Committee on Secrecy Problems in the Defense Department when it warned that "overclassification has reached serious proportions."

"The result," the committee said, "is not only that the system fails to supply to the public information which its proper operation would supply, but the system has become so overloaded that proper protection of information which should be protected has suffered. The press regards the stamp of classification with feelings which vary from indifference to active contempt. Within the Department of Defense itself, the mass of classified papers has inevitably resulted in a casual attitude toward classified information, at least on the part of many."

Contrary to the popular notion that the military inherently is best able to keep secrets, evidence shows that the Defense Department's procedures for protecting atomic information are less stringent than those of the civilian AEC. Highly classified information, my experience shows, is passed on by Defense to personnel and contractors without the background investigation required for comparable transfer by the AEC. This is like trying to hold back the water by building a dam across half the river.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy's security subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has held the first of a series of hearings on what we believe is a double standard in the handling of nuclear secrets. A 1954 law stipulated that the Defense Department's regulations for safeguarding atomic secrets must be "adequate and in reasonable conformity" with those of the AEC. But recent months have brought a rash of leaks of secret information, apparently from the Defense Department.

An example of leaking—a favorite indoor sport in the Nation's Capital—is a recent Washington newspaper story headlined: "Secret Data Indicates Substantial Improve-

ment in H-Bomb Efficiency." The story disclosed that analysis of the fall series of Soviet atomic tests revealed impressive improvements in nuclear weapons. The information came from a secret report. Disclosure of part of the report obviously served someone's narrow objective.

The Atomic Energy Commission corroborated the story to the extent of revealing that the Russians had made substantial progress. But the AEC added that there is no reason to believe that the balance of nuclear power has changed to favor the Soviet Union.

Slivers of information slipped to the press by officials, or preconceived appraisals by informed persons outside the Government, are no substitute for a frank explanation by the administration of the technical, strategic, and political reasons for its policy conclusions. President Kennedy has said that he will explain the basis for his decision on atmospheric tests when he reaches a final conclusion. I applaud that. I believe it would have served the national interest for the public to have had much of this information right along.

The blackout on fuller information on nuclear weapons testing is, I believe, accepted by the general public in the belief that the subject is too complex for comprehension and the information too vital to national security to be broadcast. This forecloses a widespread understanding of the options available to this country.

While the handful of leaders who must determine the Nation's course and their advisers are men of good faith and ability, the critical questions of war and peace cannot be left to the experts, free of scrutiny by citizens and Congress. The citizen cannot abdicate his responsibility. Without being given military secrets and without a scientific background, the citizen can still be informed and can understand the issues which underlie the test debate. Ignorance of these issues is neither necessary nor desirable.

It would be most useful to the current discussion if more information were provided the public, as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has done in open hearings on radiation hazards. An official white paper setting forth the basis for Executive decision has been recommended by some committee members.

Without compromising our intelligence network, the public can be told a good deal about what the Soviet Union has achieved in its recent atomic tests. The Russians have gained considerable sophistication in nuclear weapons. They know it. Why shouldn't the American people?

The approximate number of American, British, French, and Soviet tests has been disclosed. But it should be explained that, although we have conducted more tests than the Russians, a number of ours were to improve safety methods rather than to perfect new weapons.

I believe excessive secrecy left us out on the limb after the Russians exploded their multimegaton anticivilization bombs. Much was said about the heavy fallout which would result from these devices. Actually, the level of radioactive debris produced by them was far below expectations. It was some time after this fact was officially known that the AEC made the information public.

Although somewhat removed from the immediate issue of atmospheric testing, the public is also entitled to know more about our plans to share nuclear weapons and information with our allies. Americans should be told the extent of their overseas obligations.

Summing up, I would urge—

1. Release of fuller information on where the Russians stand in relation to United States nuclear strength;

2. Deliberate action by the heads of departments to halt the odious practice of leaking classified information;

3. Improvement of Defense Department security methods for protecting nuclear secrets to bring them into line with the AEC system; and

4. A clampdown on the publication of technical weapons data of significant aid to unfriendly countries, or which contribute to the proliferation of atomic weapons.

The educational campaign that has been conducted to inform Americans on the rather complex issue of foreign trade presents an excellent example of how a democratic society can promote its objectives through government-by-discussion. Within the bounds of essential secrecy, the same sort of effort can be useful in the test question, to gain popular support for upcoming Government decisions. The task is made easier by the continuing rise in educational levels in this country.

Viewing with foreboding the threat of Nazi Germany in the 1930's, Winston Churchill made a statement to his Prime Minister which is appropriate to the United States today. Churchill urged: "Tell the truth, tell the truth to the British people. They are a tough people and a robust people. They may be a bit offended at the moment, but if you have told them exactly what is going on, you have insured yourself against complaints and reproaches, which are very unpleasant when they come home on the morrow of some disillusionment."

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1962

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:

Lord of all life, here and beyond, Thou art the God of this terrestrial ball we tread, and Thou art the God of the farthest star in the vastness of space which is beyond our imagination and comprehension.

If we take the wings of the morning and fly to the uttermost parts of the earth or sea, behold Thou art there; and if Thy earth children in expanding their dominion shall at last stand on some other whirling world, still man will find

Thee there, for the hallowed words which our childhood lips were taught to utter—"Our Father"—mirror the final truth of all Thy creation. It is Thine immutable law which propels our tiny ships now venturing forth on the ocean of immensity.

Give us to see that the breathtaking vistas of the universe rebuke Thy earth children's separation into hostile camps on this third-rate planet of a third-rate sun.

Make us big enough and united enough to do our part in making the divided wilderness of this earth blossom as the rose in the garden of Thine infinite love. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 1, 1962, 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. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 3, 1962, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 67. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale;

S. 235. An act for the relief of Evagelos Mablekos;

S. 241. An act for the relief of Haralambos Agourakis;

S. 429. An act for the relief of Aic Percy J. Trudeau;

S. 531. An act for the relief of Eugenia Chrzastowski;

S. 1076. An act for the relief of Nancie Ellen Williamson;
 S. 1348. An act for the relief of Sulzbach Construction Company;
 S. 1560. An act for the relief of Yasuko Otsu;
 S. 1685. An act for the relief of Brigitte Marie Ida Kroll;
 S. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Tzy-cheng Peng;
 S. 1776. An act for the relief of Frances E. Sarcione;
 S. 1832. An act for the relief of Susanne Rae Deremo;
 S. 1866. An act for the relief of Dr. Berchmans Rioux;
 S. 1870. An act for the relief of Lucia Bianca Cianto Rosa;
 S. 2149. An act for the relief of Hugo Kolberg;
 S. 2163. An act for the relief of Saifook Chan; and
 S. 2385. An act for the relief of Dr. Hau Cheong Kwaan, his wife, Tech Phalk Loui Kwaan, and their daughter, Laura Wai Man Kwaan.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE—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 the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-906, as amended, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Third Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure covering the period ending December 31, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 1962.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. KUCHEL, and by unanimous consent, the Aeronautical and Space Sciences 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 REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Arion E. Lyon, of California, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board.

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

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gertrude M. Cwikla, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn.

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

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all 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 letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION AT NASA-LANGLEY RESEARCH CENTER, VIRGINIA

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction at the NASA-Langley Research Center, Langley Air Force Base, Va., of a rendezvous docking facility; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for January 1962 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INDEX LISTING OF LEGISLATION OF GOVERNMENT OF THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, an index listing of legislation of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands dated February 28, 1962 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION ON ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES AND SUBCONTRACTING PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of that Administration on administrative expenses by activity, for the period July 1-December 31, 1961, and report on the subcontracting program, dated February 19, 1962 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE PRACTICES FOR TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT IN THE MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of aircraft maintenance practices for transport aircraft in the Military Air Transport Service, Department of the Air Force, dated February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF PROGRAMING AND PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN EQUIPMENT AND SERVICES IN THE SEMIAUTOMATIC GROUND ENVIRONMENT SYSTEM, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of programing and procurement of selected operational equipment and communication services and the utilization of certain technical personnel by the Department of the Air Force in the Semiautomatic Ground Environment System (SAGE), dated February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF, EXPENDITURES BY, AND DONATIONS TO THE CHARLES R. ROBERTSON LIGNITE RESEARCH LABORATORY OF THE BUREAU OF MINES, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory of the Bureau of Mines at Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1961; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS ON RECEIPT OF PROJECT PROPOSALS UNDER SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipt of a project proposal under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, from the Cassia Creek Reservoir Co., of Cassia

County, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipt of a project proposal under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, from the Settlement Canyon Irrigation Co., of Tooele County, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration, and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF IMMIGRATION STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order entered in behalf of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); 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 House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; ordered to lie on the table:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 12

"Resolution congratulating Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., for his successful flight around the world through space

"Whereas the world has expectantly and prayerfully watched the preparations to rocket Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., through space; and

"Whereas the final moment arrived on the morning of February 20, 1962, and the countdown proceeded successfully; and

"Whereas Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., America's favorite astronaut, was launched into orbit around the world and successfully completed the course of his flight: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona:

"1. That the people of the State of Arizona herald the event of this flight into space by Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., as one of the greatest moments in U.S. history and the members of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona do hereby extend congratulations and good wishes to our favorite astronaut in this moment of greatness for the United States of America.

"2. That the Honorable Wesley Bolin, secretary of state of Arizona, is directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to each of the following: The President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps.

"Adopted by the house February 21, 1962.

"Approved by the Governor February 21, 1962.

"Filed in the office of the secretary of state February 21, 1962."

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Cigar Manufacturers' Association of America, Inc., New York, N.Y., favoring an embargo on the imports of all Cuban tobacco; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Advertising Club of Beaumont, Tex., opposing the amend-

ment of the tax reform bill permitting deductions for most legislative activities; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanian Americans at Kenosha, Wis., relating to Lithuania's fight for freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A proclamation issued by the Independent Citizens Council of the United States, of Chicago, Ill., embodying a petition of that council, praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"The military forces and public health agencies of our Nation have a vital and continuous need for medical services. Difficulty has long been experienced in obtaining a sufficient number of medical men to administer proper care to military personnel and their dependents, and to efficiently carry on essential public health services.

"It is, therefore, deemed highly desirable that a Federal service school be established in the field of medicine patterned after West Point in the field of Army training, Annapolis, in the field of naval training, and the Air Force Academy in the field of aviation, which school would supply a steady flow of trained medical personnel for all of the branches of the service and for conducting our important public health service.

"It is also deemed desirable that such a school be established in a conveniently located medical and hospital center. No better location could possibly be found than Pittsburgh, Pa., which in recent years has become one of the leading medical centers of the United States, and which has a readily accessible central location: Therefore, be it

"Resolved (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to establish a Federal medical school in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa.; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Presiding Officer of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

"JOHN MORGAN DAVIS,
"President of the Senate.

"PAUL C. MOOMAW,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"J. OMINSKY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts):
Resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES IN FAVOR OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS IN THE PRESIDENT'S CABINET

"Whereas the guidance, assistance, and supervision of the Federal Government is required in the increasingly complex and vital areas of city planning, urban renewal, traffic control, slum clearance, city administration, and those matters especially pertaining to the social and economic well-being of urban areas; and

"Whereas the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs in the President's Cabinet would assure uniformity of action, eliminate overlapping functions, and insure an integrated program; and

"Whereas the guidance within the President's Cabinet would aid inestimably in the financing of such projects, thus promising relief from burdensome taxation: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby urges the Congress of the United States to take such action necessary for the establishment of a

Department of Urban Affairs in the President's Cabinet so as to provide more adequate assistance, guidance, and supervision in matters pertaining to urban affairs; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, February 19, 1962.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"Attest:
"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

RESOLUTIONS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself, I present a resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to the closing of the East Boston Lamp Works by the General Electric Co. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON THE PERMANENT CLOSING OF THE EAST BOSTON LAMP WORKS BY THE GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.

Whereas the General Electric Co. has recently announced the permanent closing of their East Boston Lamp Works, and the transfer to the South of the work now done here; and

Whereas General Electric's excuse for moving is that it can manufacture cheaper in the South and be better able to compete against Japanese imports; and

Whereas a majority of the 450 affected employees have more than 15 years' service, and some as much as 40 years' service, in specialized jobs; and

Whereas many shopkeepers, tradesmen, professional people, and the community itself will also be adversely affected; and

Whereas this is only the latest of a long series of similar moves by General Electric and other corporations; and

Whereas the continued prosperity and well-being of the Commonwealth is contingent upon the elimination of the unfair practices and conditions used to solicit the runaway shop; and

Whereas the problem of the runaway shop, which constitutes a threat to the Massachusetts economy, cannot be solved as a Massachusetts problem alone but requires a broader national solution: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives takes note of the existing general attitude of helplessness which now permits these runaways with the resultant losses to employees and communities; and be it further

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Federal Government and the Massachusetts congressional delegation to take whatever steps are necessary to convince General Electric to rescind its order to move this work out of Massachusetts; and be it further

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives further respectfully urges the Federal Government and the Massachusetts congressional delegation to take the necessary measures, by tariff, quota, negotiation, or other appropriate means, to prevent

the complete domination of the domestic lamp market by imports; and be it further

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives further respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to prevent the runaway of companies to backward areas by establishing standards of responsibility, by setting up national standards of basic conditions and preventing the giveaways now being used to solicit business; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

Adopted by the house of representatives February 1, 1962.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

Attest:
KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

RESOLUTIONS OF WESTERN STATES LIVESTOCK SANITARY OFFICIALS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the State veterinarian of Utah has called to my attention three resolutions passed by the Western States Livestock Sanitary Officials which were adopted at a meeting held in conjunction with the Inter-mountain Veterinary Medical Association in Salt Lake City, Utah, January 24, 1962. These resolutions express concern—and I share that concern—over threats to domestic livestock from diseases from foreign animals and meats. The diseases specifically mentioned in the resolutions are foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, and cattle and sheep scabies.

The livestock sanitary officials make three specific recommendations, as follows:

First. The Secretary of Agriculture should take immediate steps to require that all prohibited sea store meats on vessels operating in foreign commerce be sealed at all U.S. ports of entry.

Second. Congress and the Department of Agriculture should continue to prohibit the importation of cloven-hoofed animals and fresh meats from countries where foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest exist, and that no portion of such countries be regarded as free from these diseases, and that we do not relax our present requirements on animals and meats from such countries until it can be proven beyond doubt that there would be no hazard to livestock in this country.

Third. The Department of Agriculture and Congress should approve an increase in funds for the eradication of scabies. At the present time our budget for this service is \$330,000. The recommended budget for this program is \$1,450,000.

The Western States Livestock Sanitary Officials are concerned over the effects on our livestock industry and on the economy of the Western States

should a condition such as foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, or scabies be introduced into this country. Almost all livestock-producing countries in the world have had outbreaks of these diseases and other diseases not known to exist in this country. These diseases can be carried in fresh and cured meats and livestock from foreign countries.

Utah is one of the largest sheep-producing States in the Nation. Our State has been free from sheep scabies for many years, but our officials feel that our own sheep industry would benefit from other areas becoming free from this disease. The means for complete eradication of scabies is available and should be exercised to accomplish this end.

We have adequate means and programs to eradicate each of these diseases, but it is important that the proper steps be taken and that adequate funds be made available to implement and complete such programs. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the resolutions adopted by the Association of Western States Livestock Sanitary Officials.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON PROHIBITED MEAT STORES ON SHIPS

Whereas it is important that each animal disease regulatory official, either State or Federal, call attention to any possibility of the introduction of exotic diseases into the United States; and

Whereas the prevention of the entrance of exotic diseases is a "must" to the economy of livestock and allied industries; and

Whereas it also becomes important from a civil defense standpoint to prevent the introduction of foreign diseases since biological warfare is a threat to our national security; and

Whereas most all livestock-producing countries of the world had foot-and-mouth disease and/or rinderpest, and many other serious diseases not known to exist in this country; and

Whereas these diseases can be carried in fresh and cured meats from such countries for indefinite periods; and

Whereas fresh, chilled, or frozen meat from countries where rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists is prohibited entry into the United States; and

Whereas vessels operating in foreign commerce carry prohibited sea store meats, and such vessels dock at ports in this country; and

Whereas employees on boats carrying such sea stores may remove food meat stores from boats in port; and

Whereas considerable improvement has been made by officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the last year in sealing lockers containing such prohibited meats, for which these officials are commended, there still remain many ports throughout the United States where prohibited meats are not being placed under seal when vessels arrive in such ports; and

Whereas the last two outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States occurring in the State of California resulted from feeding of garbage from foreign vessels carrying prohibited sea store meats; and

Whereas the eradication of the disease resulting from these outbreaks cost livestock owners the loss of thousands of animals and the Federal and State Governments millions of dollars; and

Whereas if prohibited sea store meats are not placed under seal there is grave danger that such prohibited meat stores or garbage containing meat scraps from same may be removed and ultimately find their way to swine and other livestock and thus introduce dangerous exotic diseases causing great losses of livestock in this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Association of Western States Livestock Sanitary Officials meeting in Salt Lake City, Utah, January 24, 1962. That the Secretary of Agriculture take immediate steps to require that all prohibited sea store meats on vessels operating in foreign commerce be sealed at all U.S. ports of entry to prevent the introduction of animal disease from foreign countries; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association forward copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, to Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Agriculture, and to Representative JAMIE WHITTEN, of Mississippi, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Congress of the United States, to the congressional delegates of the several States by the chief livestock sanitary official of each of the States, to the president of the United States Livestock Sanitary Association, to the American National Cattle-men's Association, and to the National Wool-growers Association.

RESOLUTION ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE MISSION

Whereas the President of the United States announced on January 6, 1962, that a scientific mission from this country would leave on January 7, for Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, and the island of Tierra del Fuego; and

Whereas the countries this mission will visit are known to be plagued with foot-and-mouth disease; and

Whereas the mission is to visit ranches, meatpacking plants, and scientists to discuss foot-and-mouth disease; and

Whereas livestock sanitary officials and livestock owners in this country believe the purpose of this mission is to explore the feasibility of having the island of Tierra del Fuego declared free from foot-and-mouth disease as has been attempted in the past and, further, to explore and report on some possible ways whereby fresh meats may be shipped from South American foot-and-mouth disease infected countries to the United States; and

Whereas laws passed by the Congress of the United States and enforced by the Secretary of Agriculture are designed to prevent the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease from these countries; and

Whereas foot-and-mouth disease has been introduced into the United States on nine different occasions, into Mexico at least once and Canada once, and further, two of the outbreaks in the United States were fairly definitely traced to meats originating in South American countries; and

Whereas the costs to this country of eradicating the Mexican and the United States outbreaks have run into many millions of dollars; and

Whereas should the disease be introduced and become established due to unsuccessful attempts to eradicate it, this country would be burdened with one of the most costly and serious diseases known to man, as well as quarantines and embargoes invoked by other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Association of Western States Livestock Sanitary Officials at its annual meeting in Salt Lake City, Utah, January 24, 1962. That the Congress of the

United States and the Secretary of Agriculture continue to prohibit the importation of cloven-hoofed animals and the fresh meats thereof from countries where foot and mouth disease or rinderpest exist and, further, that no portion of such country, such as the Island of Tierra del Fuego, be regarded as free from these diseases and that, further, the Secretary not permit any relaxation in the present requirements imposed on animals and meats from the countries referred to until it has been definitely proven beyond any doubt that there could be no hazard to the livestock of this country; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of this association to the Secretary of Agriculture; to Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee of the Senate; and to Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the Agriculture Committee for the House of the Congress of the United States; and to the congressional delegates of the several States by the State livestock sanitary officials of those States.

RESOLUTION ON CATTLE AND SHEEP SCABIES

Whereas the disease of scabies in cattle and sheep continues to be a serious problem in many States; and

Whereas adequate means have been available for many years to eradicate these diseases, and programs have been adopted to eradicate such diseases; and

Whereas these diseases will increase and spread unless adequate funds are available to implement and complete such programs; and

Whereas the budget of the Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, allots only \$330,000 for the fiscal year 1961-62 for the eradication of scabies; and

Whereas there is a consensus of livestock regulatory officials throughout the country that the amount of Federal funds allotted to scabies eradication is inadequate to eradicate the diseases in time to receive maximum benefits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Association of Western States Livestock Sanitary Officials in its annual meeting in Salt Lake City, Utah, January 24, 1962, That the Secretary of Agriculture request, and the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture approve an increase in these funds to approximately \$1,450,000 during each of the fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the association send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, to Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Agriculture, and to Representative JAMIE WHITTEN, of Mississippi, chairman, House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Congress of the United States, to the congressional delegates of the several States by the State livestock sanitary officials of those States, and to the president of the United States Livestock Sanitary Association.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Ar-

chivist of the United States, dated February 12, 1962, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 2937. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for increases in annuities, eliminate the option with respect to certain survivor annuities, and provide for interchange of credits between the civil service retirement system and the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 2938. A bill to provide a standard procedure for the leasing of noncompetent allotted farming and grazing lands on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCCLELLAN:

S. 2939. A bill to grant the American Numismatic Association perpetual succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 2940. A bill for the relief of Dr. William M. Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2941. A bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S.J. Res. 165. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of February 20 of each year as National Space Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S.J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to contract pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, for the construction of at least two oceangoing ore or coal carriers; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON):

S.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim May 15 of each year as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the calendar week of each year during which such May 15 occurs as Police Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

DESIGNATION OF MARCH 25, 1962, AS VOLUNTARY OVERSEAS AID WEEK

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61), re-

questing the President to designate the week of March 25, 1962, as "Voluntary Overseas Aid Week," which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

INCREASE IN ANNUITIES FOR CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for increases in annuities, and other matters.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, first, that the bill may be printed in full at this point in my remarks; second, that an explanation and justification, consisting of a section-by-section explanation, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks; and third, that the bill may lie on the desk until the end of business of next Thursday so that additional cosponsors may have an opportunity to join in presenting the proposed amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, explanation, and justification will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill may lie on the desk as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 2937) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for increases in annuities, eliminate the option with respect to certain survivor annuities, and provide for interchange of credits between the civil service retirement system and the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Civil Service Retirement Act is amended by redesignating section 18 as section 21, and by inserting after section 17 the following new sections:

"INCREASES IN ANNUITIES

"SEC. 18. (a) Upon the first general adjustment in the rates of compensation of classified employees of the Government after the enactment of this section, the annuity of each annuitant (including survivor annuitants) whose annuity is payable from the fund and is based upon service which terminated before the effective date of such general adjustment shall be increased by a percentage determined by the Commission to be approximately equal to the average increase in rates of compensation resulting from such adjustment.

"(b) The annuity of each annuitant (including survivor annuitants) whose annuity is payable from the fund and is based upon service which terminates during the period beginning on the effective date of the general adjustment referred to in subsection (a) and ending five years after such date

shall be increased in accordance with the following table:

If the annuity is based upon service which is terminated—	The annuity shall be increased by the following percentage of the increase determined by the Commission under subsection (a):
Not more than one year after such date.	80 per centum
At least one year but less than two years after such date.	60 per centum
At least two years but less than three years after such date.	40 per centum
At least three years but less than four years after such date.	20 per centum
At least four years but not more than five years after such date.	10 per centum

"(c) Effective on the first day of the first calendar month which begins at least one year after the effective date of the adjustment provided by subsection (a) and annually thereafter, the annuity of each annuitant (including survivor annuitants) receiving an annuity payable from the fund shall be increased by a percentage equal to the percentage of increase, if any, in the cost of living as determined by the Commission on the basis of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer's Price Index for Moderate Income Families in Large Cities, since the last previous increase under this section, provided that such increase in the cost of living amounts to at least one per centum. In computing any increase in annuity under this subsection, there shall first be added to the annuity any increase therein authorized by subsection (a) or (b).

"(d) No increase shall be made under this section in the portion of any annuity purchased by voluntary contributions. The increase in the annuity of a retired employee under this section shall be included in computing the amount of the annuity of any survivor of such retired employee, but no survivor annuity shall be increased under subsection (b) in any case in which the annuity of the annuitant upon whose service the survivor annuity is based received an increase under subsection (a) or (b). Determinations by the Commission under this section shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review.

"TRANSFER OF SOCIAL SECURITY CREDITS

"SEC. 19. (a) In determining length of service for the purpose of computing the annuity under section 9 of any employee or member who—

"(1) retires upon or after attainment of age 62;

"(2) has at least one quarter of coverage under title II of the Social Security Act, but is not a fully insured individual (as defined in section 214(a) of such Act); such employee or member, upon compliance with subsection (c), shall be credited with three additional months of service for each such quarter of coverage under such title.

"(b) The annuity under section 9 of any employee or member who—

"(1) retires prior to attainment of age 62;

"(2) has at least one quarter of coverage under title II of the Social Security Act, but is not a fully insured individual (as defined in section 214(a) of such Act);

shall, upon subsequent attainment of such age and compliance with subsection (c) be recomputed so as to include credit for three

additional months of service for each such quarter of coverage under such title.

"(c) No additional service shall be credited pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) unless the employee or member—

"(1) makes application for such credit at such time and in such manner as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe;

"(2) deposits in the fund an amount for each quarter of coverage for which credit is requested equal to the amount by which—

"(i) one-fourth of his average salary multiplied by the rate of contribution under section 4 applicable on the last day of such quarter exceeds

"(ii) the amount of tax imposed by sections 3101 and 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code, by sections 1400 and 480 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or prior provisions of law imposing taxes with respect to employment for social security purposes, as the case may be, with respect to his earnings and self-employment income for such quarter.

"(d) No credit shall be allowed in the case of any employee or member under this section for any quarter of coverage if during any part of such quarter he performed service which is credited, without regard to this section, for the purpose of computing an annuity under this Act.

"(e) Service credited under this section shall be disregarded in determining average salary and eligibility for retirement for the purposes of this Act.

"(f) Any quarter of coverage credited to an employee or member under this section shall not thereafter be considered to be a quarter of coverage for purposes of the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act.

"(g) In any case in which an employer or member is credited with service in accordance with this section, with respect to any quarter of coverage, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall transfer from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Fund and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund to the civil service retirement and disability fund an amount equal to the amounts deposited therein for such quarter by reason of the tax imposed by sections 1401, 3101, and 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, by sections 480, 1400, and 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, or by prior provisions of law imposing taxes with respect to employment for social security purposes, as the case may be.

"TRANSFER OF CIVIL SERVICE CREDITS

"SEC. 20. (a) In determining entitlement to, and the amount of, any benefit payable under title II of the Social Security Act upon the basis of the earnings or self-employment income of any individual who at the time application is made for such benefit shall have performed less than five years of service which is creditable under section 3, such service shall be deemed, subject to subsection (b), to be 'employment' within the meaning of section 210 of the Social Security Act, and such individual shall be deemed to have received during such service 'wages' within the meaning of section 209 of the Social Security Act in an amount equal to the lesser of (1) the basic salary paid to him for such service, or (2) the maximum yearly amount which may be considered as wages under section 209 of the Social Security Act.

"(b) No service shall be deemed to be 'employment' under subsection (a) unless—

"(1) the individual performing such service so elects at such time and in such manner as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall by regulation prescribe, and

"(2) there is paid into the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund amounts determined by the Secretary to be equal to the amounts which would have been paid into such funds by reason

of the taxes imposed by section 3101 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, section 1400 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, or prior provisions of law imposing taxes on employees with respect to employment for social security purposes, as the case may be, if such service had been employment subject to such sections or such prior provisions of law.

For the purpose of paying in whole or in part the amount required by paragraph (2), such individual may, if he so elects, cause to be transferred to such funds from the civil service retirement and disability fund a sum equal to such amount or equal to his lump sum credit, whichever is lesser, and in such case the lump sum credit shall be reduced by the amount so transferred. Whenever an individual referred to in this subsection is deceased, any election which he would be authorized to make under this subsection may be made by any person who, upon application therefor, would be entitled to a monthly benefit under title II of the Social Security Act on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of such individual. In any case in which service is deemed to be employment in accordance with this section, the Civil Service Commission shall transfer from the civil service retirement and disability fund to the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund an amount determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to be equal to the amounts which would have been paid into such funds by reason of the taxes imposed by section 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, or prior provisions of law imposing taxes on employers with respect to employment for social security purposes, as the case may be, if such service had been employment subject to such sections or such prior provisions of law.

"(c) Any service deemed to be 'employment' under this section shall not thereafter be considered as service for the purposes of any other section of this Act."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 9(g) of the Civil Service Retirement Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The annuity as hereinbefore provided, for any employee or member retiring under section 6, 7, or 8 who at the time of retirement has a wife or a dependent husband, or any such employee or member who at the time of retirement designates her husband (other than a dependent husband) to receive an annuity after her death computed as provided in section 10(a)(1), shall be reduced by 2½ per centum of so much thereof as does not exceed \$2,400 and by 10 per centum of so much thereof as exceeds \$2,400."

(b) Section 10(a)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) If a member or employee dies after having retired under any provision of this Act and is survived by a wife or dependent husband to whom the member or employee was married at the time of retirement, or by a husband designated under section 9(g), such wife or husband shall be paid an annuity equal to 50 per centum of an annuity computed as provided in subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 9, as may apply with respect to the annuitant."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by the first section, insofar as they add a new section 19 to the Civil Service Retirement Act, and the amendments made by section 2, shall not apply in the case of employees retired or otherwise separated prior to the date of enactment of this Act, and the rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if these amendments had not been enacted. Such amendments made by the first section, insofar as they add a new section 20 to the Civil Service Retirement Act, shall take effect upon the date of enactment of

this Act, but nothing contained in such section 20 shall be construed to require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to grant a recomputation of any individual's monthly insurance benefit under title II of the Social Security Act solely by reason of

the enactment of such section 20, if such individual is entitled to such benefit for the month in which such section 20 is enacted.

The explanation and justification presented by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION—CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF 1962

EXPLANATION

JUSTIFICATION

General increase in benefits

Section 18(a) provides that retired civil service employees shall receive a percentage increase in their annuities equal to the average percentage increase in salary granted to active classified employees by the next general pay raise, presumably in 1962.

Subsection (b) is a "tapering" provision, granting a proportional share of the increase to those retiring in the next 5 years.

Retirees received their last increase in 1958, which is two pay raises ago. Active civil servants received a general increase in 1960, presumably based in part on increases in the cost of living, but retirees were not included. Since 1958, the Consumers Price Index has risen about 4 percent. (Note: this will not affect the Budget, since it will be paid from the retirement fund.)

It takes 5 years for a pay increase to be reflected fully in an individual's retirement benefits, since these are based on the average of the "high five" years of his earnings record. Therefore without a "tapering" provision, persons retiring in 1963-67 would receive less than those already retired with comparable earnings records.

Future cost-of-living increases

Subsection (c) provides for automatic cost-of-living increases in the future, to be computed annually, provided the cost of living has risen at least 1 percent.

Subsection (d). Technical.

The retirement bill offers an excellent opportunity to establish the principle that the Government should stand behind its obligations to the aging in constant dollars.

Transfer of credits between social security and civil service

Section 19 permits a Government employee who has some coverage under social security but not enough coverage to qualify for benefits (the requirement is now 11 quarters, rising to 40 quarters by 1991) may transfer his credits to the civil service retirement system and increase his civil service pension accordingly. He would be obligated to pay to the civil service retirement fund an amount equal to the difference between what he paid in social security payroll taxes and what he would have paid into the retirement fund if he had been employed by the Government. For this purpose, it would be assumed the employee's earnings during the period he was covered by social security would be equal to the average of his "high 5" years used as the base for computing his civil service retirement. Payroll taxes paid into the social security trust fund on the employee's wages would be transferred to the civil service retirement fund.

Section 20 authorizes a corresponding transfer of credits from civil service retirement to social security, in those instances where the employee has worked for the Government less than the 5 years required for civil service retirement and where such transfer would affect the employee's entitlement to social security benefits or the amount of his benefits. The employee would be required to pay into the social security trust fund the amount he would have paid in payroll taxes if he had been in covered private employment, and the employer's share of payroll taxes would be transferred from the civil service retirement fund to the social security trust fund.

Automatic provision of benefits for surviving spouse

Section 2 removes the option in present law whereby a civil service employee may either provide benefits for a surviving widow or dependent widower by reducing his own annuity, or collect his full annuity until his own death and make no provision for a surviving spouse. This section would make automatic the provision of benefits for the surviving widow or dependent widower.

Section 3. Technical.

At present, an employee may have worked both in the civil service and in private employment covered by social security, but not long enough to be eligible for retirement under either act. In those cases, he simply loses what he has paid in social security payroll taxes and gets no benefit from the employer's contribution under either program. This provision would enable the employee to combine his credits so as to become eligible for social security benefits. It would also enable him to increase his benefits in instances where his civil service employment would have the effect of raising his average wage base.

With the present option in the law, some civil service employees elect to take their full annuities and make no provision for a surviving widow, either gambling that their wives will predecease them or for other reasons. As the consequence, some widows are left destitute. Many are surprised to learn that their husbands have failed to provide for them, and Congress is under recurrent pressure to provide them the benefits their husbands have denied them. The Social Security Act offers no such option but instead makes automatic the protection of surviving widows. This section writes the same principle into the Civil Service Retirement Act.

GRANTING OF PERPETUAL SUCCESSION TO AMERICAN NUMISMATIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to grant the American Numismatic Association perpetual succession.

This association has already been granted a Federal charter for a period of 50 years. That term, which commenced on May 9, 1912, will expire on May 9 of this year, if not extended, and I am now introducing a bill to grant perpetual succession to this fine organization.

This association, I may say, was first established in 1881 as a nonprofit organization, and, as I have said, was granted a Federal charter in 1912. Among other things, it was founded to advance the knowledge of numismatics and to aid and to maintain a feeling of good will between collectors of numismatic material throughout the world. It also has the important function of serving as a clearing house for the exchange of research material and historical reference works in this field.

The association has members in all of the 50 States and in at least 40 foreign countries. Its official monthly magazine, the Numismatist, has been published continuously since 1888. The current advertising manager of this journal is Mr. S. W. Freeman, of Newport, Ark.

My bill would make only one minor substantive alteration in the association's charter. This modification, which was requested by the association, merely would change the authorized number of persons who may serve on its board of governors.

I hope that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary will take early and favorable action on this measure.

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

The bill (S. 2939) to grant the American Numismatic Association perpetual succession, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL SPACE DAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution for designation of February 20 annually as National Space Day.

The successful orbiting of *Friendship 7*, manned by Col. John Glenn, represents, in my judgment, one of the greatest, most historically significant events in the progress and history of the United States.

The designation of a special day, then, would—

Provide an annual opportunity to pay tribute to the magnificent, almost miraculous, accomplishment in a new, largely unknown field of human endeavor;

Create greater public understanding of what we are shooting for in space;

Encourage qualified individuals to enter the field vocationally, not only as astronauts, but also to provide us with the essential space engineers, scientists, technicians, and other skilled personnel

needed for such highly complex activities; and finally

Give greater impetus and direction to our national effort to explore and utilize space to benefit mankind.

I request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD: first, a copy of the joint resolution; second, excerpts of my weekend broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations on the merits of such a proposal.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 165) to provide for the designation of February 20 of each year as National Space Day, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in honor of the successful completion of the first United States manned orbital flight around the earth by Lieutenant Colonel John H. Glenn, Junior, United States Marine Corps, on February 20, 1962, and in recognition of the significance of space exploration programs to the future of humanity, February 20 of each year is hereby designated as National Space Day, and the President of the United States is requested and authorized to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe and celebrate such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The excerpts presented by Mr. WILEY are as follows:

WILEY PROPOSES NATIONAL SPACE DAY

The United States—indeed, all free humanity—has joyfully witnessed the successful space orbiting of Astronaut Col. John H. Glenn.

Launched before the eyes of the world—not secretly behind an Iron Curtain extending upward to the edge of space—the flight of *Friendship 7* opens a new horizon to freedom. Entrusted with a new miracle-type capability, we—and humanity—must now build further upon this initial foundation of space conquest. The ultimate goal, of course, is to utilize space potentials for serving, not destroying, mankind. Within its brief lifetime, the U.S. space exploration program has made tremendous progress. Despite the fact that the Soviet Union launched the first sputnik in 1957, the United States has now made a total of 69 launchings, as compared with 13 by the Communist world. The successful orbiting of Col. John Glenn, of course, marks the highlights of U.S. accomplishments up to the present time. Realistically, however, this provides only a foundation stone (although highly significant) upon which to build a great space program of the future.

As the ranking minority member of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, I have been privileged in the past to work with my colleagues on developing and speeding up the space program. This week, I was privileged to discuss with Colonel Glenn and other astronauts the outlook for the future.

Wisconsin, also, can be particularly proud that one of its sons, Air Force Capt. Don Slayton, of Sparta, is to be the next pioneer in space. As of now, the flight is scheduled for within the next 40 to 60 days. With him (as with Colonel Glenn) will go the pride, as well as the prayers, of the Nation.

Historically speaking, the space exploration program is still in its formative years. Consequently, there is difficulty in assessing its ultimate significance to mankind. Nevertheless, there is a real need to attempt to evaluate, insofar as possible, its potential, both for defense and peaceful purposes. What, then, will be its practical values? Among others, these benefits will include the following:

1. A stronger defense through, for example, utilization of space spy satellites and a space guard to detect and alert us against possible sneak attack.
2. Improved radio, television, and telephone communications.
3. More effective weather forecasting to minimize losses from tornadoes, hurricanes, and other storms, and thus benefit conservation and agricultural programs; and
4. Further man's efforts to utilize heat and light from the sun, and other natural forces of the universe to serve mankind.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL SPACE DAY

Recognizing, then (a) the significance of space programs to the future of humanity; and (b) that the successful orbiting by Col. John Glenn, represent a great historically significant event to U.S. progress and history, I shall propose legislation to create a National Space Day. Commemorating the first successful orbit of the U.S. astronaut, the designation of February 20 each year would—

Provide an annual opportunity to pay tribute to the magnificent—almost miraculous—accomplishment in a new, largely unknown field of human endeavor;

Creating greater public understanding of what we are shooting for in space;

Encourage qualified individuals to enter the field vocationally—not only as astronauts, but also to provide us with the essential space engineers, scientists, technicians, and other skilled personnel needed for such highly complex activities; and finally,

To give greater impetus and direction to our national effort to explore and utilize space to benefit mankind.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN OCEANGOING ORE OR COAL CARRIERS

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to contract, pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, for the construction of at least two oceangoing ore or coal carriers.

I feel that the United States must develop and maintain an adequate, well-balanced merchant marine, owned and operated under the U.S. flag by citizens of the United States and composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels constructed in the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 166) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to contract, pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, for the construction of at least two oceangoing ore or coal carriers, introduced by Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. CLARK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

VOLUNTARY OVERSEAS AID WEEK

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation declaring the week of March 25, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week. The purpose of this concurrent resolution is to pay tribute to the accomplishments of the nonprofit voluntary agencies. They have done, are doing, and I am confident will continue to do an outstanding job of channeling the desire of the American people to help their less fortunate neighbors. At present there are 58 voluntary agencies engaged in people-to-people programs in some 100 countries and areas. Last year these agencies distributed educational and medical supplies, clothing, and cash, totaling around \$75 million to over 100 million people. This food, clothing, and medical supplies came from direct personal donations of the American people.

In addition these agencies assisted in the distribution to needy people of a substantial part of the food made available under the food-for-peace program. These voluntary agencies have shown prudence and ability in carrying out these efforts matched only by the dedication to the cause of mankind.

A companion resolution is being introduced today in the House by Representative HAROLD COOLEY, of North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61), submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas U.S. voluntary agencies have participated actively in international social and economic development efforts in many countries; and

Whereas the Government of the United States and its people have endorsed and supported the efforts of these agencies to provide varied types of assistance over a large area of the world; and

Whereas the people-to-people concept of assistance typified in the programs of these agencies is a reflection of American good will and our belief in human dignity and the democratic way of life; and

Whereas it is the declared policy of the Congress to encourage the continued contribution of these agencies in the less developed countries through their various programs of technical assistance and relief: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that, people-to-people programs administered by nonprofit voluntary agencies registered with the Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid evidence our friendship for peoples in other lands.

The President of the United States is requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of March 25, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week.

PROVISION OF SYSTEM OF FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 1, 1962, the name of Mr. ANDERSON was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2936) to

amend chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the system of forest development roads and trails needed for the utilization and protection of lands administered by the Forest Service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators) on March 1, 1962.

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, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 201. An act to donate to the Zuni Tribe approximately 610 acres of federally owned land; and

S. 1299. An act to amend the Act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies."

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2990) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the claim against the United States of Amis Construction Co. and San Ore Construction Co.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CARROLL:

Statement prepared by himself for presentation to the House Health and Safety Subcommittee on February 21, 1962, in connection with the consideration of House bill 133, to establish a National Accident Prevention Center.

THIRTEENTH ANNUAL PANCAKE RACE AT LIBERAL, KANS.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], I ask unanimous consent that a statement which he has prepared on the 13th annual pancake race at Liberal, Kans., be printed in the RECORD.

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

THIRTEENTH ANNUAL PANCAKE RACE AT LIBERAL, KANS.

The 13th annual pancake race at Liberal, Kans., will be run March 6. This event between the housewives of Liberal, Kans., and Olney, England, is always held on the Tuesday before Ash Wednesday.

The race is sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Liberal, for the promotion of international relations between England and the United States. Thirteen years ago the housewives of Liberal, Kans., issued a challenge to the housewives of Olney, England, to a pancake race. Every Shrove Tuesday since then, this pancake race has taken place.

In fact, as a result of this, Liberal has become world famous as the pancake hub of the universe. Thousands of people gather

in Liberal every Shrove Tuesday for this event, which starts with a pancake breakfast at 6 a.m.

I expect to attend the Pancake Day festivities in Liberal next Tuesday, as does my colleague, Senator PEARSON. On behalf of the Jaycees of Liberal, I should like to invite any and all Members of the Senate to attend this pancake breakfast in Liberal, as well as the other festivities, which include the big race between Liberal and Olney, the children's race, and other activities. I will guarantee any Senators who may be able to be there 100 free pancakes made from the world's finest flour milled from Kansas wheat.

Our Governor, the Honorable John Anderson, has proclaimed Tuesday, March 6, 1962, as Pancake Day. His proclamation follows:

"PANCAKE DAY PROCLAMATION"

"To the People of Kansas, Greetings.

"Whereas the Liberal Junior Chamber of Commerce, Liberal, Kans., has sponsored and fostered the International Pancake Day Race between the housewives of Liberal, Kans., and Olney, England, for 13 years and such relationship between the United States and England has brought about better international relationship and promoted good will and a better understanding toward each nation; and

"Whereas Pancake Day is traditionally on Shrove Tuesday—the same being the first Tuesday before the lenten season—and that Shrove Tuesday falls on March 6, 1962; and

"Whereas the good people of Liberal, Kans., and of the State of Kansas observe Shrove Tuesday by eating the traditional meal of pancakes and the ingredients of pancakes are made from our good Kansas wheat and grown by our great Kansas wheat producers: Now, therefore,

"I, John Anderson, Governor of the State of Kansas, do hereby proclaim March 6, 1962, as Pancake Day for the State of Kansas and urge all of the good people of Kansas to attend the festivities in the pancake hub of the universe, Liberal, Kans., on March 6, 1962.

"By the Governor:

"JOHN ANDERSON,

"PAUL R. SHANAHAN,

"Secretary of State.

"LEONE M. POWERS,

"Assistant Secretary of State."

This is but one of the many community activities being carried on by the Liberal Jaycees, and is indicative of the fine leadership qualities of our young people. Congratulations, Liberal Jaycees.

PROS AND CONS OF CALIFORNIA'S WATER DISPUTE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, before the two Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, of the two Houses of Congress, is a contract of crucial importance to the people of California. It has been entered into by Secretary Udall, representing the Government of the United States, and by the Governor of California, representing the people of California. I regret that there are some—I very much hope not too many—who oppose it.

At any rate, I was asked by the Washington Post to prepare a statement justifying the approval of the contract. Yesterday, the article which I prepared, and also an article by Mr. Walter E. Packard, of California, objecting to the contract, were published in that distinguished newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that the text of both articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PROS AND CONS OF CALIFORNIA'S WATER DISPUTE

CONSERVATIONIST SEES REAL DANGER IN STATE'S LAND AND POWER INTERESTS

(By Walter E. Packard)

Within a year, California will be the most populous State in the Nation. The rate of population growth in California is 2½ times larger than the average in the Nation, due in part to the mass movement of people into the State. This migration is stimulated to a considerable degree by the high wages paid in California's defense industries.

Where this population explosion will lead, nobody knows, but that it poses a growingly serious problem is evidenced by the fact that those who are planning to provide water for the people of southern California base their estimate on the expectation that southern California's population of 8,850,000 in 1958 will increase to 28 million in the year 2020, making southern California one of the most densely populated areas of the world with less than an eighth of an acre of farm land per person.

This is not an issue which concerns California alone. If the Nation's rate of population growth continues, within our lifetime the population of the United States will equal that of China today. This enormous increase, coupled with our hoped-for rise in the average level of living, will greatly accelerate the already serious decline in our indigenous reserves of industrial raw materials and will make the United States a strikingly have-not nation in sharp competition with other nations for access to the remaining industrial raw materials in the resources-rich but underdeveloped countries.

California and the other semiarid Western States are peculiarly dependent upon both water and power and are fortunate in having a potentially ample supply of both, if these resources are managed wisely. The Bureau of Reclamation has performed a very notable service in both of these fields.

It built the All-American Canal, which serves Imperial Valley; Boulder Dam, which supplies both water and power to the metropolitan district of southern California; the Central Valley project, which transfers surplus water from the Sacramento River to the dry lands in the upper San Joaquin Valley and develops a large block of power at the Shasta Dam; the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects on the Columbia River; and numerous irrigation and power projects on the Snake and Colorado Rivers and their tributaries.

The Bureau of Reclamation is now the largest producer of hydroelectric power in the United States.

But more significant than these accomplishments are the two united western proposals prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation during the last period of the Truman administration. These two reports together provide:

1. A comprehensive plan for water development which will provide ample water for the irrigation of all irrigable areas lying west of the Rockies and all that needed for industrial and municipal uses, including enough water for southern California to permit the metropolitan district to release all the water it now takes from Boulder Dam for use in Arizona and all water now taken from Owens Valley for use in that valley and in portions of the Mojave Desert.

2. A comprehensive plan for the development of a power network tying the hydroelectric and atomic energy potentials of the Pacific Coast States with the thermoelectric potential of the coal producing areas of Utah, Wyoming, the Dakotas, and Iowa in the creation of a 500,000-volt transmission system which would provide all the power needed by

all of the area lying west of the Missouri River for an indefinite period.

No greater service could be rendered to California and the Western States than the perfection and early implementation of these united western proposals.

The Federal financing would create no serious problem. In fact, the construction would help meet one of our national problems—substituting sound peacetime development programs for defense spending.

This policy would provide a guide for similar developments in all parts of the United States. The need for a sound approach to this problem is completely compelling. That is why the situation in California is of such vital importance.

In the face of the successful record of the Bureau of Reclamation in California and other Western States and the thoroughly sound character of the united western proposals as long-range means of meeting water and power needs of California and the entire West, California has unilaterally adopted a thoroughly unsound State water plan.

What, one asks, were the factors which led to this action? Why did a majority of the people of the State support it by their vote? One answer to this query is that they and Governor Brown rightly recognized the pressing need for a long-range plan for water development and were offered no alternative.

The united western proposals were withdrawn from circulation soon after being approved by the then Secretary of the Interior, due to pressures of private land and power interests in California who wish to avoid the acreage limitations and public power preference clauses of the Reclamation Act passed by a Republican Congress in 1902 and supported by every administration, Democratic and Republican alike, since that time.

The fact is irrefutable that the big land-owning and private power interests were able to condition the minds of a narrow majority of the people of the State to the acceptance of their wishes.

The practical political power of these two groups is measured, to a degree, by their financial interests in the State water plan. The large land-owning interests of the upper San Joaquin Valley may get the water they want at a price that will give them a net increase in land value amounting to more than the total capital costs of the State water plan.

In addition to avoiding the acreage limitations of the Reclamation Act, they also will seek to avoid the provisions of the 1889 irrigation district law of California, which provides for the taxation of land values as a means of paying construction costs.

All of the costs associated with land development under the State water plan will be paid by the consumers of the products produced on the land, based on the high cost of production of the marginal producer.

The total corporate holdings in the vicinity of the proposed State aqueduct comes to over 6 million acres. Add to this another 288,000 acres of land held in excess of 1,000 acres and the total area in the upper San Joaquin Valley that might conceivably be served by the State water plan comes to nearly 6½ million acres.

An increase in value of \$300 per acre for this area, which include 1,674,000 acres of potentially irrigable but presently dry land, would exceed \$1,750 million—the cost of the entire project.

The commonly expressed anticipated value of irrigated land in that area ranges up to \$1,000 per acre.

The issues created by the existence of these large corporate farms is not necessarily going to be solved by the establishment of the old-style family farm. A family farm of 160 acres in the upper San Joaquin Valley valued at \$1,000 per acre, with other investment costs added to cover buildings and

equipment, does not present the image we have in mind when we become nostalgic over the "good old days."

The point I wish to make here is that no one has yet solved the complex problems associated with modern agriculture. What we want to do, and rightly so, is to preserve the human values associated with Jeffersonian democracy without destroying the efficiency of industrial techniques.

Only one fact relating to this problem is clear, and that is that the increase in land values created by the growing pressure of people upon land resources provides a source of income which can be used to finance public enterprises designed to serve the public interest without putting any extra burden on the consuming public.

It would be stupid to disregard recognized economic law and make the consuming public pay the project costs in the prices they are charged for the food they eat. The increment in land value, the need for taxing this value as a means of financing public works and the need for keeping consumer prices down are all results of the population explosion and should not be ignored.

In much the same way that large land-owning interests profit at public expense by supporting the State water plan, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. will, it is expected, be in a position to monopolize the power.

According to the State water plan, the P.G. & E. probably will get the 331,000 kilowatts of installed capacity capable of producing 1.3 billion kilowatt-hours of new energy developed by the Feather River project and probably will have a captive market for the energy needed to pump water over the Tehachapi Mountains, an amount of energy which is several times greater than the entire amount of energy developed by the Feather River project.

Provisions of the California State water plan governing water policies are not yet in force. Congress has time to review the decision of the Secretary of the Interior, who had acted without congressional approval in signing the contract on the San Luis segment of the State project, contrary to the reclamation law which he has sworn to uphold.

The legality of the contract is sufficiently in question to convince Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy that the question should be settled by Congress during the review period.

If the contract is disapproved by the Interior Committee of either House, the whole issue will be clarified. The longstanding reclamation law will be upheld. Governor Brown will be relieved of his responsibility for the water policy and the Secretary of the Interior can come to the rescue by offering to support a request from California that the Bureau of Reclamation reenter the picture and that the original Central Valley project be extended to include the facilities required to meet present and future needs.

This transfer from State to Federal responsibilities would make the project an interstate undertaking as contemplated by the united western proposal.

Both the acreage limitation and the public power preference clauses of the Reclamation Act would apply and the taxing provisions of the California irrigation district law could be employed to charge construction costs to the increase in land values created by the project as has been done very successfully in the Turlock and Modesto districts.

The transfer also would open up several opportunities for development of various alternative means of obtaining the desired physical ends.

The purpose of that part of the united western proposals which would supply southern California with water from the Columbia River could be accomplished without delay by the early construction of an enlarged

cross-delta channel to supplement a salt-water barrier in the lower delta of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers.

This would permit use of a larger portion of the 26 million acre-feet of good river water which now wastes into the sea.

When this supply is added to the 12 million acre-feet which can be brought into the Sacramento Valley from a series of storage dams in the northwestern portion of the State, it will provide enough water to supply the metropolitan district with ample water without using water from either the Colorado River or Owens Valley and without seriously diminishing the water supply.

What is needed in this dangerously artificial period in our history is the development of the type of statesmanship exhibited by Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, George Norris, Woodrow Wilson, the Robert M. La Follettes, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and other great progressive leaders of the 20th century, both Democratic and Republican.

We need leaders who can see and understand the complicated problems created by the population explosion, the concurrent decline in industrial raw material reserves and the resulting need for the conservation and development of our land, water and power resources on sound technical, social and economic principles.

These needs are mandatory conditions of both economic viability and social stability. The time to act is now and the responsibility rests directly upon the Congress.

The contract on the San Luis project signed by the Secretary of the Interior should be rejected during the 90-day review period as the first move toward sound planning. Wise action now will forestall serious and inescapable consequences later on.

SENATOR BACKS RESERVOIR PROJECT FOR ITS FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION

(By THOMAS H. KUCHEL)

The probabilities are that the indigenous Indians of what is now southern California faced no serious water problem in those historic days before outsiders came. The reason is simple. It was not that nature then was pouring more rain and snow on the mountains and valleys. It was simply that there weren't too many human beings living there around, say, 1776.

But even then, the balance between availability and need was a delicate one. The Creator had made of the great southwestern expanse of the North American land mass a relatively dry desert. The native flora was geared to survive on a minimum of water. I think perhaps the people were too.

When the Spanish came in the late 1700's, shortage of water became a direct hazard to survival. As Father Serra trod our soil, building his missions years before our country was born, our first irrigation and reclamation projects began, with Indian labor under Spanish direction constructing earthen dams and crude aqueducts. Thus provision was made in early days to conserve water for domestic and agricultural use in those times when Mother Nature was unavailing.

During all the intervening years—180 and more—adequate water supply continued to be California's basic problem. The crude waterworks of the dons have been vastly supplemented by some of the most imposing—and most costly—projects which people anywhere ever undertook to construct.

During 1962 California will replace New York as the most populous State in the Nation. Each year over 500,000 new residents come to my State. Experts prophesy that by 2020 our present population will more than treble—believe it or not—to 57 million.

Most of our people, perhaps 13 million out of about 17 million, live in metropolitan areas. By 1975—13 years hence—9 million more will live in densely populated areas. Yet we continue to be also the first State in the value of our agricultural produce. With

this incredible increase in population has come a profound change in our demand for water.

This mounting thirst has been quenched, in part, by local people establishing local agencies under State law, investing an estimated \$4 billion in local conservation projects. The city of Los Angeles built a 240-mile aqueduct to bring water to its people. And the Federal Government has built many reclamation and flood-control projects. We began to receive water and, incidentally, electricity from the Colorado River through Hoover Dam, a great Federal undertaking, supplying most of our parched Southland. Today that source is placed in jeopardy by the *Arizona v. California* lawsuit.

The most farflung Federal reclamation project is the Central Valley project, which serves much of the needs of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. Under Federal law it delivers, including acreage limitation, 3 million acre-feet of water to 800,000 acres. Its powerplants produce 3 billion kilowatt-hours, available on preference to public agencies. Water and power users will repay 94 percent of the Federal investment.

But the problem is still far from solution. Southern California, with more than half the population, has only 2 percent of the State's water resources. There is a present overdraft on the Southland's underground supply.

Until surplus northern water comes south, increasing needs of the South must depend on what the Colorado River may be able to supply.

It was incumbent, therefore, that the State government assume a concomitant responsibility with the Federal Government. It did. At a cost of many millions, it fashioned the State water plan, to be paid for by the people of the State, at an estimated cost of \$12 billion. And to construct the first segment of that plan—called the Feather River project—the people, by their votes, have bonded themselves in an amount of \$1,750 million.

Briefly, the Feather River project contemplates a State multipurpose dam at Oroville and a main aqueduct down the west side of the San Joaquin Valley bringing water across the Tehachapi Mountains to Los Angeles and most of the Southland. Other aqueducts will connect with the main stem to bring water to other areas en route.

A storage reservoir, so save water in wet months, is an indispensable part of this engineering marvel. The site chosen for such a reservoir is San Luis, located on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley.

San Luis is the only reservoir site the Creator has provided for a storage reservoir in this entire area.

Meanwhile, the Bureau of Reclamation had been studying means by which to bring supplemental water to a new and larger Federal service area in the San Joaquin, under the Central Valley project. With almost unanimous approval of the landowners and farmers on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, the Bureau recommended that 500,000 additional acres be included in an enlarged Federal service area. More water, of course, would be needed. A storage reservoir would be required. Bureau engineers sought a reservoir site. Only one was found, San Luis.

Had there been two reservoir sites available, the State would have proceeded to construct a dam on one of them for the State project, while the Federal Government would have utilized the other. Side by side, the two sovereigns then would have gone forward with their separate water projects: State law governing the one exclusively; Federal law governing the other exclusively. But there weren't two sites.

And here, to the infinite credit of both governments, a statesmanlike agreement was reached. The Federal Government needed

about 1 million acre-feet of storage. So did the State. Why not build one dam, double in size, to be used by both sovereigns, each to pay its proportionate share of the cost, precisely as if each had proceeded independently?

So a bill was fashioned authorizing a Federal-State agreement for construction and operation of the San Luis Reservoir. To assure the State of its own prerogatives in such a joint operation, the bill provided: "The State shall not be restricted in the exercise of its allocated right to the use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities for water service outside the Federal San Luis Unit Service Area."

California needs expanding reclamation projects. It also needs its own State project. Surely, Federal and State use of a double-size storage reservoir should create no jurisdictional strife. Could not each government release and sell its own waters, temporarily impounded at San Luis, under its own regulations, unhampered by the other government? The State should not seek to impose its will on the Federal system paid for by Federal funds. Nor should the Federal Government seek to impose its will on the State system, paid for by State moneys.

In the 85th Congress, I coauthored legislation authorizing the Secretary of Interior and California to enter into an agreement for construction and operation of the San Luis Reservoir, each to pay an agreed share. It passed the Senate and died in the House. In the 86th Congress it was enacted into law.

Debate on the bill was heated, vigorous and long. Some Members of Congress wanted the State project to be subject to Federal law, basing their argument on Federal participation in the construction and operation of the San Luis Reservoir. The rest of us vigorously disagreed. Like debate on any proposal, there were, to say the least, divergences of view. At long last, the bill became law.

Did Congress intend that Federal law should control the State project simply because both sovereigns would share the use of one storage reservoir? I do not believe so.

Neither does the solicitor of the Department of Interior. He ruled:

"Since the San Luis Act and national reclamation policy do not require the application of Federal acreage limitations to the State service area, and since the application of Federal law to the State service area would clash with another basic national policy to leave the State free where Federal interests are not impaired, I have concluded that Federal acreage limitations do not apply to the State service area and that the proposed agreement for San Luis may be signed by you in its present form."

Neither does the U.S. Attorney General, who said to the Secretary of Interior, "after a careful examination of the relevant laws and legislative history, I concur in the conclusion of your solicitor that the San Luis Act does not require that an agreement executed by you and the State of California contain provisions imposing the acreage restriction upon the State service area."

The Attorney General then suggested that Congress might reexamine the question. But if, as he has concluded, the Congress has ruled on this question, why should the Congress have to do so again? The Constitution does not require that a bill be passed twice before it becomes effective.

Indeed, the San Luis Act is specific on the question of approval of the contract. It provides that no Federal moneys shall be appropriated for the Federal share of construction, until the contract has been submitted to Congress for 90 days, "and then only if neither the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees has disapproved it by committee resolution within

said 90 days." Secretary Udall and Governor Brown have signed such a contract. It was sent to Congress and is before the two committees.

Some people now demand the contract be repudiated. They would tear down long years of planning to bring water to dry areas of California. They would frustrate and destroy my State's growth and future development.

A few fancifully talk about "substitution of sound peacetime [Federal] development programs for defense spending." That is living in a dream world. California ought to be given credit for wanting to do all that it can for its own people. Of course, we need continued Federal help. But Congress ought not to be asked to assume the entire cost of satisfying our thirst. And I respectfully suggest there can be no substitution for defense spending, particularly when we are about to increase defense spending this year by billions of dollars.

I believe the intent of Congress, the rule of reason, and the interest of the public require approval of the San Luis contract.

The joint reservoir will serve both sovereigns. From the Federal standpoint, it will save money. According to the reclamation commissioner, were the dam to be constructed by the Federal Government alone to serve the Federal service area alone, Uncle Sam's cost would be \$226,038,000. But through joint construction with State participation, the Federal share of joint costs to achieve the same service to the Federal area would be \$196,211,000. The Commissioner reports a Federal savings of \$31,211,000 on a joint facility.

Federal projects provide cheap water for farmers. Federal law makes no interest charge against the irrigator; power revenues reduce the cost of water to him. In the Central Valley project the farmer pays \$3.50 per acre-foot, as against a charge of \$20 per acre-foot which the State must charge for its water, regardless of use.

The State's Feather River project water will be expensive. All users, municipal, industrial or farmer, will pay the same interest on the \$1,750 million bonds. The project is power deficient. Thus, it must buy power for pumping. In the future as in the past, California farmers will continue to look to Federal reclamation projects, acreage limitation and all, for their main source of supplemental water. Most of the Feather River water will go to cities and to industry. Incidentally, California contracts with irrigation districts provide for a 50-percent cut in delivery for farm use in any period of drought. And they require a \$2 per acre-foot surcharge on water delivered to excess (over 160 acres) lands. Thus, an excess landowner pays \$22 against \$3.50 the Federal Government requires.

I am not unmindful of the problem of unjust enrichment. But Congress has neither the right nor the time to assume the responsibilities of the California Legislature. The unassailable fact is that a State project, built by State moneys, ought to furnish water under State law—not Federal law. Federal-State partnership of one reservoir cannot alter that fact.

This contract must not be rejected. To contend that if it were repudiated the Federal Government would immediately supply all the money to solve California's water problems is nonsense.

If the San Luis contract were to be rejected, a cruel, frightful wrong would be done to California. Rather than to attack a joint Federal-State water reservoir, America should salute California for assuming a multi-billion-dollar burden. We don't want to dry up and blow away. We are eager for continued Federal cooperation, and we want to do our part. Secretary Udall does not want to dictate how Californians use their

own water in their own waterworks; neither does—nor should—Congress. After all, Californians are people, too.

S O S—SAVE OUR STREAMS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, highway construction is ruining many fine streams. On January 30, I introduced S. 2767, which would require the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on the Federal-aid highways systems, for the purpose of protecting fish, wildlife, and recreation resources. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Public Works.

Recently, Utah State University published a study entitled "Road Construction and Resource Use"—Extension Circular 297. This statement, with recommendations for coordinated planning, is a contribution of the College of Forest, Range, and Wildlife Management, at Utah State. The concluding recommendations are:

First. Begin a stepped up research program to determine future transportation requirements as related to resource use and human populations. It is suggested that the resources of universities be utilized for this research.

Second. Enact Federal and State legislation requiring coordination of all agencies having responsibility for resources affected by highway construction. At present, such consultation frequently takes place on a voluntary basis; but there is no legal mandate for coordinated planning.

Third. Establish through legislation, State highway planning boards or commissions having broad representation in all phases of land use, with authority to review and reject highway-design proposals.

Fourth. Obtain legislative recognition by local, State, and Federal governments of this principle: The costs of adequately protecting major resources—forest, range, and watershed; recreational and scenic; and wildlife—are normal costs of highway construction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this pamphlet printed in the RECORD.

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

THE GENERAL IMPACT OF HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION UPON LAND USE

The United States is experiencing a mass shift in population. There are movements from farms toward cities and from city centers outward, engulfing farms. This twofold shift has created the modern suburban phenomenon.

There are many reasons for these movements, but their direction is determined largely by highway construction. This has been true since man's earliest times. Shelters, villages, towns, and cities have followed trails, roads, and waterways. To a large extent, accessibility and transportation govern where people live and how land will be used.

Perhaps the most obvious effect of highway construction is the direct loss of land, especially farmland—an incipient erosion of a national resource. For example, the new Federal freeway program requires 30 acres per mile of highway. The freeways will consume the equivalent of 11,000 farms of 160

acres each. Of even greater importance is the indirect loss. Residential, business, and industrial expansions follow new highways, leapfrogging from one intersection to the next. These developments consume a vast acreage and modify the use of adjacent lands. Between the intersections, islands of unmanageable lands are created. These frequently become the sites for junkyards, shoddy developments, and other land wasting areas. The older concentrations become less important, but remain. This unplanned development of shoestring communities alters tax structures and complicates public services such as school facilities, garbage and sewage disposal, and police and fire protection.

There are many other impacts including direct destruction of scenic, recreation, and wildlife values as well as the more subtle influence upon animal behavior, especially wildlife movements.

While man has strong material interests, he has, through recorded history, demonstrated a strong desire and need for the aesthetic values of life. This is evidenced by the culture of early civilizations and by present day efforts to beautify utilitarian objects. Similar expressions are evident today in Europe. England, for example, takes great pride in the green belts which surround and beautify its communities. These make highway travel a more pleasing experience.

Basically, highways serve a strictly utilitarian purpose—their function is to get people and materials from one place to another, whether this be for reasons of commerce, defense, or recreation. There is, however, a growing interest in beautifying these routes. This requires more money, first to minimize damage, and secondly to enhance the beauty of the road.

Highway designers are primarily concerned with three factors: traffic patterns; engineering feasibility; and economy of design. These have been the guides governing highway construction. Traffic demands, destinations, safety factors, and public pressures have been important considerations. Rarely has the impact upon land use and human population distributions received adequate attention. Indeed, those who urge consideration of other resources are often labeled "obstructionists to progress."

In States lacking a highway planning board or commission, the highway department has in effect become the land use planning agency, generally without personnel competent in many aspects of land use.

This statement is concerned with the impact on only three major resource groups: (1) Forest, range, and watershed resources; (2) wildlife resources and (3) scenic and recreational resources.

FOREST, RANGE, AND WATERSHED RESOURCES

Highways have certain positive values for forest and range resources. Timber and livestock are commonly transported by truck; hence, the improvement of roads aids in the normal activities of marketing these resources.

Deleterious effects also occur. With better highways, more people visit forest and rangelands which are frequently critical watershed areas. Increased visits magnify fire dangers and the risk of denuding critical areas. Moreover, livestock losses due to theft and accident may occur more frequently. The latter loss can be minimized by fenced roadways. Fenced rights-of-way, however, complicate range management practices.

Highway cuts frequently alter water table levels in their immediate vicinity. These changes often have adverse effects upon adjacent timber, causing it to become weakened and more susceptible to disease and insect infestation that may spread through the entire stand. This is but one of the unexpected and complex impacts of highway construction on natural resources.

Watershed problems are serious. The large cuts and fills common to modern highway design expose raw, unstabilized soil to the forces of erosion. Further, hard-surfaced roadbeds accumulate water which must be disposed of wisely to prevent erosion damage. In mountainous range and forest lands this is not easy. Natural channels are often forced to accommodate quantities of water far beyond their natural capacities, and the frequently steep gradients intensify erosive action.

Concentrations of runoff from large areas into a limited number of culverts which conduct the concentrated flow into inadequate channels on the downhill side create major watershed problems. Highway engineering and designing should include facilities to reduce the concentration of runoff and to expend the energy of increased runoff volume and velocity so that soil stability is retained. Gully formation below culverts lowers water tables and is a prime contributor to deterioration of vegetation.

There are similar problems, on a smaller scale, with access roads, trails, and other unsurfaced routes in forest and watershed areas. These, too, deserve careful attention.

Erosion can be minimized by careful engineering. In the past, this has received too little attention. This may reflect a weakness in engineering education. Many engineers are not aware of the complex and adverse biological effects of erosion.

WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Game: Highways are increasingly hazardous to game animals. Wider roads, higher speeds, and fenced rights-of-way combine to cause losses among game animals, especially in the West where big game migrations take place from mountains to foothills.

Some of these losses and hazards will not be eliminated. Speed limits cannot be reduced to levels which would eliminate game losses. Nor can the width of the roads be reduced. Two features may be effective in considering game needs: road location, and type of construction, including fencing.

In the West, big game animals, particularly deer, migrate from high mountain summer ranges to the foothill winter ranges. Since towns and cities are often located in the mouths of canyons, the major highways which connect these towns lie at the base of the mountains and, frequently, directly across these semiannual migration routes. Considerable losses occur in localities where there are large migrating herds. This has been true in the past with single lane roads, unfenced or so poorly fenced as to cause no obstacle to animal movements.

The construction of wide, divided, and fenced freeways is of greater concern. The fences are not complete barriers to deer. Older and weaker animals often fail to clear the fence and become entangled. The animals entering the right-of-way face other obstacles, the second fence and the oncoming cars. They often become confused and mill about until hit by vehicles. Also, of paramount concern is the hazard to human life and property.

These losses may be minimized by advance planning. In some areas, the highway could be located far enough from the foothills to avoid the major migration route and be fenced as an added precaution. Fences should be big-game proof. Where there is sufficient winter range above the highway, this may solve the problem.

In some cases, highway location cannot be varied to avoid migration routes. This is true in canyons and where the winter range is a great distance from the planned route. The solution to this hazard may be fencing to prevent entry of animals into the right-of-way, combined with underpasses at strategic intervals. If properly constructed and located, it seems likely that these safeguards would provide sufficient opportunity for game to safely bypass the highway.

However, the responses of big game to by-passes are not well known.

Another problem is in maintaining adequate game harvest. Many canyon highways are narrow and tortuous. Often the entire canyon bottom may be expropriated by the right-of-way, effectively sealing off access to the trails and secondary roads leading up tributary drainages formerly open and used by hunters. The Federal freeway system, with its limited access, has the same effect. This prevents hunter access and proper harvesting of game in the contiguous areas, resulting in a deterioration of range conditions. Proper planning can minimize, if not eliminate, the difficulties. Interchanges leading to existing roads and new construction of subsidiary roads should be part of the roadbuilding operation if proper game harvest is to be maintained. Access is also needed in managing other resources—for timber removal, fire suppression, and moving livestock.

The direct and indirect loss of farm lands is important to upland game, especially pheasants and quail. In addition to the land used for roads, residential, and industrial purposes, "shoestring" developments create isolated islands of habitat where game management and harvest is impractical. These "islands" cause safety problems; some areas must be closed even where game is present in harvestable numbers.

Shifting human populations, following highway construction, cause changes in hunting pressures. Further, modern highways and automobiles result in a very mobile hunting public, with hunting areas within easy reach. This means that game managers should develop and use means of manipulating hunter pressure.

Clearly, the impact upon game resources and their harvest must receive more attention in highway planning.

Fish: Water courses, lakes, swamps, and marshes often complicate highway construction. Often the "ideal" site for a proposed highway is also the location of bodies of water. The simplest expedient is to follow the most economical course, and this course very often modifies the flow rate, gradient, pools, and riffles of a stream, or the water levels of marshes, swamps, and lakes. Waters, wherever they occur, are of scenic value. For that reason alone, their protection should be considered.

A body of water capable of supporting fish is a living thing—a delicately balanced system. This is not generally understood. There is a delicate "chain" that must not be broken—a chain of light and shade, aquatic plants and animals, adequate oxygen, proper temperatures, and other factors. Any disturbance of this chain upsets the delicate balance so essential to fish life.

For example, channelizing or straightening a stream increases erosion and siltation, resulting in turbid waters. Sunlight reaching the stream bottom is reduced, eggs are smothered, and tiny food organisms suffocated. Removal of streamside vegetation reduces shade and increases water temperatures. Channelizing eliminates meanderings, increases the gradient and the velocity of the water. Fish, like all animals need rest. With high velocity, rest is impossible and fish are eliminated. Channelizing also reduces the length of a stream, decreasing the amount of living space. The sum effect of channelizing a stream is to eliminate or very seriously reduce fishing.

Earth filled structures across lakes cause biological changes. Water above the impoundment may fluctuate or stagnate, often causing changes in its biological composition.

Drainage of swamps or marshes eliminates fish habitat and ultimately the fishery along with waterfowl and furbearer resources.

Even with the best of intentions and substantial funds, complete mitigation of losses is virtually impossible. We do not know how to immediately create a fishing hole or restore a length of stream with the proper biota—with the proper relationship of pools, riffles, and shade. Further, restoration costs more than protection.

SCENIC AND RECREATIONAL RESOURCES

Highways which provide access to areas of scenic grandeur are a service to a vast number of Americans. What is often not considered, however, is that the country through which these highways pass is often of scenic and recreational value in its own right. These values should be preserved wherever possible.

Many highways pass through canyon bottoms. Because it is usually narrow, the canyon bottom is the cheapest and most direct course. This type of road very often sacrifices the bottom of a canyon, eliminates valuable streamside trees, channelizes a meandering stream, and reduces scenic beauty simply because it costs more money to build a bridge or move away from the stream.

The West has a great many scenic areas that are sought by millions of people every year. The American public has shown a need for scenic values and open spaces. Millions leave the cities on weekends to enjoy and recreate in areas of natural beauty. This need must not be ignored when highways are planned. Highways should be designed to minimize damage to recreational values.

ESTHETIC AND SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Enjoyment of the out of doors is no longer a trivial pastime. National leaders are stressing that under modern-day conditions outdoor recreation is vital to our individual and national character. Marion Clawson, a director of Resources for the Future, has cautioned, "We don't just want outdoor recreation, we need it."

Outdoor recreation has become of tremendous social importance. It is a form of national therapy. The need is evidenced by the phenomenal return to the out of doors through the increase in fishing and hunting, picnicking, camping, and boating. The increase in these activities outstrips the population gain. Consideration for scenic and recreational values is justified solely on the basis of esthetic and social values.

ECONOMIC CONSIDERATION

Tourists in the United States spend over \$20 billion annually. Scenic and natural recreational opportunities are responsible for much of this tourism. Fishermen and hunters spend over \$5 billion. These expenditures will continue to rise.

Tourism can and is adding a third dimension to the usual two-dimensional agricultural economy. Obviously, good roads are essential to increasing tourism. It is equally obvious that destruction of the attractions is poor resource use and poor economy.

Considering the tremendous and increasing economic value of wildlife, scenic and recreational resources, it is absurd and ridiculous to damage these resources unnecessarily simply to reduce highway costs. Such thinking is shortsighted and untenable.

THE NEED FOR COORDINATED PLANNING

Obviously, highway construction has an important impact on natural resources and on every phase of human activity, particularly upon urban and rural growth, development, and government. With more people placing more demands upon natural resources and the obvious necessity for a modern transportation system, there is an urgent need for coordinated and integrated planning. The United States can no longer afford unnecessary resource waste or unwise land use. Obviously, under these circum-

stances the cost of highway construction must increase.

Only through carefully integrated, long-range planning can resource waste be minimized. It has long been held that highway planning and urban and rural development are local responsibilities. Too often this responsibility has not been accepted. The State and Federal Governments have cautiously maintained a hands-off attitude. The importance of the responsibility at the local level is recognized and not minimized. The State and Federal Governments, however, have not accepted their full share of responsibility in providing assistance in a transportation system that has both State and National impacts.

Road location and design have been the province of county and State highway departments with local chambers of commerce usually having a considerable influence. Agricultural, wildlife, recreational, and other interests have not been actively involved except where pressures have been brought to bear.

The broad resource picture and the needs and requirements of all resource users cannot be considered until there is adequate representation of all interests in the earliest planning stages of highway construction. There must also be support from administrative and elected officials sympathetic to the unvoiced needs of the public—needs that are perhaps unknown to the general public during the planning stages.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following actions are recommended to assure coordinated planning, intelligent resource use and orderly urban and rural development, all of which are influenced to a large extent by highway construction:

1. Begin a stepped up research program to determine future transportation requirements as related to resource use and human populations. It is suggested that the resources of universities be utilized for this research.

2. Enact Federal and State legislation requiring coordination of all agencies having responsibility for resources affected by highway construction. At present such consultation frequently takes place on a voluntary basis, but there is no legal mandate for coordinated planning.

3. Establish through legislation State highway planning boards or commissions having broad representation in all phases of land use with authority to review and reject highway design proposals.

4. Obtain legislative recognition by local, State, and Federal Governments of this principle: The costs of adequately protecting major resources—forest, range, and watershed; recreational and scenic; and wildlife—are normal costs of highway construction.

FACTS FOR YOUTH

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, three times a week there is published here in Washington a pamphlet entitled "Life Lines," an informative paper usually consisting of four pages.

Life Lines touches on a variety of topics in its editions, but always its central themes are devoted to fundamental Americanism and the development of Christian character.

As an example of the content of Life Lines I want to bring to attention today an article from the February 2 edition entitled "Facts for Youth."

This article is a reprint from the magazine, Junior Scholastic, and deals with the topic "What You Should Know About Communism—and Why." After reading this article I feel certain my colleagues join with me in commending

both Junior Scholastic and Life Lines for carrying this type of essay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

FACTS FOR YOUTH

Into the midst of nationwide debate as to whether the people of America, and in particular the young people, should be taught the truth concerning communism, there has been dropped the most effective bomb for freedom in a long time. This is not a bomb in the military sense, but in the long run we believe that it will prove to be more effective in the defense of freedom than the most expensive bombs in our Nation's military arsenal. It hasn't sent up any mushroom clouds and its fallout preserves life instead of destroying life. It is designed to help future generations grow up strong and healthy instead of deformed by the effects of radioactive fallout. Above all, it is designed to help these children grow up free. The bomb we are referring to is the truth—the truth about communism as told on the level of a sixth grader and printed in the magazine, Junior Scholastic.

We salute the editors and publishers of this magazine for grade-school students on their article, "What You Should Know About Communism—And Why," the first in a series of 15 articles. If the Communists and Communist sympathizers in America are not successful in eliminating such articles, or in forcing the editors of this magazine to water them down, we believe the future of communism in America is doomed, for future citizens are being taught the truth about the enemy that wants to enslave them.

Here is the article:

"Did you ever meet a Communist? Perhaps you have without knowing it. If you pass a Communist in the street he looks just like anybody else. He goes by and doesn't harm you.

"Or does he?

"This man, like every other Communist, has one main purpose in life: to spread communism across the world. He wants the United States to have a Communist government like Soviet Russia's. He hopes to destroy all free nations. You and your family pay a high price because some people in this world believe in communism.

"First, there is the money cost. Ask your father about his taxes. Probably he'll tell you that his U.S. income tax has gone up. Perhaps a third to a half of your family's U.S. tax bill is the cost of communism. It is the cost of billions of dollars worth of guns, missiles, ships, and planes to defend our country and our allies. The purpose of all these arms is to keep the free world strong in case of a Communist attack.

"Before many years you, too, will be paying part of this tax-against-communism.

"You have other costs to pay. Most boys will probably spend a part of their lives in the Armed Forces. That, too, is part of the cost of defending our Nation against communism.

"Will you be safer at home than in the Armed Forces? In a modern war, planes can carry nuclear bombs to any city in a few hours. Rockets can cross oceans and continents in minutes.

"Many world leaders are hopeful of avoiding war. But as long as the Communists keep up their threats against free nations, we must keep up our defenses and stay calm under constant tension. We pay a high price to stand firm against communism. But there will be a far higher price to pay if freedom loses its struggle against communism.

"Let's see how you would live under communism.

"Your church: Communists would fear at you if you went to church. They would tell you there is no God, that religion is a fake. Perhaps the Communist government would close your church altogether.

"Your school: The ideas of communism would be drilled into you from the first grade up. Your schoolbooks would be full of praise of communism and its leaders. How does communism compare with other systems? You'd never get a chance to find out, for libraries would have few if any books from the free world. Your teachers would tell you about crimes and strikes and other troubles in the free world—but not the good things of life under freedom. If your teachers thought you had doubts about communism, you would probably have a hard time getting into college.

"Your home: The Communist government would forbid you to listen to radio or TV programs from the free world. If you received mail from abroad, you would show it only to trusted friends. If you should happen to meet a foreigner, you probably wouldn't dare invite him to your home. Someone might get suspicious and tell the secret police. People suspected of opposing communism are sometimes whisked away—and often do not return.

"Your career: You might not have much to say about your career. The Communist leaders may decide that they need an extra supply of engineers or laboratory workers or plumbers. You may be one of a group picked for training in one of these jobs—and perhaps be sent to some faraway part of the country to work.

"What if you opposed communism? You might have a hard time getting any job at all except hard laboring work.

"Your government: When you were old enough to vote you would have no real choice in elections. That's because your party—the Communist party—would choose all the candidates. They would all be Communists or loyal followers of communism.

"In a Communist America, the freedoms that Americans love most would vanish. That is the price to pay if we lose the struggle against communism.

"Perhaps you are thinking: 'What can I do about all this? I'm just one young person in school. The job of winning this struggle is up to the generals and Senators and other important people in government.'

"True, the leaders of our Nation must take the lead in freedom's struggle. But every American has a part to play. In a few years you will be ready to vote and thus to help govern our country. You count as a person. Your vote will be as important as every other vote. Freedom's best hope is in the youth who will have to carry on the struggle against communism in the years ahead. You can help right now, in your own family. You can take a more useful part in discussions of world affairs if you know the real dangers of communism.

"To help you know these dangers, Junior Scholastic presents this series of articles.

"Why is it important to our Nation's future for young people to learn all they can about communism?

"1. To avoid overconfidence. Let's take the case of a football team whose members get overconfident. They're sure they can knock over their rivals without half trying. The players don't practice as hard as they should. A supposedly weaker team is going to roll right over them if they don't watch out. It's the same with a nation. If we don't know the facts about the great and growing strength of Soviet Russia and the Communist world, we may find ourselves losing the struggle against communism.

"2. To avoid fear. Take another football team. It is licked before the game starts because its members have heard so much about

the strength of the opposition. The cure for fear, as well as overconfidence, is knowing the facts. People on the other side aren't supermen.

"3. To help find ways to win the struggle. What are the other side's weak points? We need to know them to make our own plans.

"4. To gain courage and determination. By faith in our American freedoms, by knowing our own strength and understanding our rival, communism, we will gain the courage we need to face a troubled future.

"This series of articles will give you a start toward that knowledge and understanding. You will find out where the ideas of communism came from, how they have spread, how the Russian Communists gained control of their country and their neighbors. You will read what the free world is doing to meet this challenge. Most important of all, you will learn how you can help to preserve freedom against the menace of communism."

That is the text of the first of a series of 15 articles entitled "What You Should Know About Communism—And Why," from the Junior Scholastic, a magazine for students from the sixth grade up. This same series of articles in advanced form is being presented in the Senior Scholastic for students of high school age.

Knowledge is the beginning of wisdom, and wise citizens will choose freedom over tyranny every time. We congratulate Junior Scholastic for this fine article. It was presented factually and calmly in the best tradition of a free search for truth.

OUTDOOR RECREATION FOR COMING GENERATIONS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which the Congress established to develop a policy and design for providing outdoor recreation for coming generations, has now presented its report. It brought us, in the chill month of February, a welcome whiff of the great outdoors.

It has also given us an impressive array of facts and estimates on existing recreational opportunities for the American people, and a number of useful recommendations for sound action to save and extend these opportunities in the future.

I commend the members of the Commission for the breadth and scope of their work, and thank them for the many hours of labor which went into it. Several Members of this body served on the Commission, among them the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. We are especially under obligation to them.

The report dramatizes a situation we have known was shaping up for some time—that we are now a highly urban country with 63 percent of our people living on 10 percent of our land. Our big metropolitan centers become more heavily congested each day, increasing the need of the people to escape from the crowded cities to seek fresh air and relaxation in the great outdoors. Our parks, our open-air recreational areas and our beaches are no longer a luxury but a necessity.

By the year 2000 the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has

calculated our population will have doubled, and the demand for fresh air recreational facilities will have tripled. There is still considerable land available for recreational pursuits, but the trouble is that much of it is too far for city dwellers who have only a few hours for recreation, and that land which is available is being gobbled up for industrial or suburban development in some way. The primary need is for more recreational areas near metropolitan centers which are suitable for a Sunday outing.

Of secondary importance, but essential in a rounded picture of outdoor recreational opportunities, is the requirement for areas which are a 1-, 2-, or even a 3-day drive from great urban masses, and where people may go for several healing days or weeks far from the clatter of civilization. Such areas must also be sought out and preserved.

In this respect, I was gratified to note that the Commission endorses the principle on which the wilderness bill is founded, and supports as a legitimate role of the Federal Government the preservation of scenic areas, natural wonders, primitive areas, and historic sites of national significance.

I am confident that the Canyonlands National Park which I seek to authorize in the State of Utah would fall into this latter category. The National Park Service says of it:

Canyonlands would undoubtedly be one of the greatest scenic attractions in the national park system.

And furthermore states:

"Its rugged landscape contains a profusion of impressive red rock canyons, sandstone spires, arches, and other erosive features that may well be of worldwide significance.

The ORRCA report also recommends management of Federal lands for the broadest possible recreational benefits consistent with other essential uses, which I contend my canyonlands bill would do, and suggests that the Federal Government should cooperate with the States by giving financial and technical assistance, promoting interstate arrangements, and generally assuming a vigorous land cooperative leadership in a nationwide recreational effort. This is obviously a sound approach.

It is in the ORRCA recommendations on the role the States should play in making outdoor recreational opportunities available to the American people that I am particularly interested, and wish to comment today.

The report specifically counsels acquisition of land and development of sites within a State which have recreational potentials as State parks or State recreational areas. Many of these lands are close to cities, and would lend themselves to development of recreational sites suitable for a weekend or a Sunday outing.

ORRCA especially wants to see them set aside now before they are used for other purposes. The ORRCA report, therefore, recommends:

Surface rights to surplus Federal lands suitable for recreation should be transferred without cost to State or local governments with reversion clauses.

One of the first bills I introduced when I came to the Senate 3 years ago was S. 1032—86th Congress, 1st session—which would have amended the act of June 14, 1926, to provide that the 640-acre provision should not apply to the conveyance of lands for State park purposes, and that such land should be conveyed without cost. After considerable discussion, Congress passed legislation of this type, but the bill did only part of what we set out to do. The 640-acre limitation was lifted, and a State or territory was empowered to file for 6,400 acres a year for not more than three recreational sites. This was a tenfold increase, and, therefore, progress. But nothing was done to ease the financial problem to the States—the State still had to pay 50 percent of the fair market value of the land. I accepted the bill, and hoped the time would come when we could again consider the matter.

In 1960, only 1,954 acres of Federal land were transferred in the entire Nation to States and localities for park and recreational purposes under the provisions of the new law.

In the summer of 1961, Secretary of the Interior Udall, who saw that the price of the lands was stopping any real effort on the part of the States and localities to acquire Federal lands for park and recreational uses, reduced the price to \$2.50 an acre—or to an annual rent of 25 cents an acre.

This action was a definite spur to the acquisition program—in 1961 some 4,768 acres of Federal land were transferred. But this still is a modest amount in comparison with the mounting demand for outdoor recreational sites.

Mr. President, the ORRCA report shows that 90 percent of all Americans participated in some form of outdoor recreation in the summer of 1960. In total, they participated in one activity or another on 4.4 billion separate occasions. It is anticipated that by 1976 the total will be 6.9 billion, and that by the year 2000 it will be 12.4 billion.

It seems to me, in view of this forecast, we cannot be satisfied with the kind of progress we are making in establishing recreational sites. We should do everything possible to encourage the States and communities to move, and move at once. If it is necessary to provide for the transference of Federal lands to States on a no-cost basis for State parks, with a reversion clause, and with realistic limits each year, then we should take action to do so. Such transfers are good business for the Federal Government because it means the States must dedicate the land to recreation, and properly manage it to this end, and this relieves the Federal Government of the responsibility.

It is not just the highly urbanized Eastern States which have a stake in the ORRCA report, although I admit their need may be most urgent. Many States which we are inclined to think of as the wide-open spaces could also, within a few years, run low on recreational areas.

For example, my own State of Utah, which still has areas in it in which no man has ever ventured, is now the 12th most urbanized State in the Union.

It is more highly urbanized, in fact than such States as Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Florida. Seventy-five percent of our people live on less than 5 percent of our land. Recently the Utah State University adopted as the theme of its Annual Agriculture-Industry Conference "Utah's Urban-Rural Revolution."

I am glad to report that Utah is moving, through our State park and recreation commission, to acquire suitable Federal lands for State parks, and I am confident will continue to do so within the limits of its financial resources and its ability to properly develop and manage the lands it acquires. I hope other States in which there are Federal lands appropriate to recreational development will become as active as Utah. In a year or so I think we should take another look at the rate of land transferrals for State or community recreational use and if they have not gone up considerably under the Udall price reduction to \$2.50 an acre, I believe the Congress should again consider legislation which provides for transference of Federal lands to the States for park purposes without cost.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF ST. LOUIS ARGUS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the golden anniversary of one of this Nation's great minority newspapers, the St. Louis (Mo.) Argus, is being observed this month.

The St. Louis Argus printed its first edition in 1912 and has successfully weathered the financial tribulations of depressions and two World Wars. This is no mean accomplishment when one considers that during the depression of the thirties alone nearly 80 Negro newspapers suspended publication.

Today, we have advanced to the space age—and I wish to note here that St. Louis, the city of publication of the Argus, is where the space capsules are manufactured which have carried America's astronauts in their successful flights. These flights dramatically show that the world has grown smaller. Distances are measured in terms of hours rather than miles. This means domestic and international problems are now more closely related. The newspaper is more than ever a vital medium of information on which people depend.

It is this dependability that has become inherent in the Argus. It has also become a champion of all worthwhile causes, which means progress for the city of St. Louis. Howard B. Woods, executive editor of the Argus, sums up this philosophy:

We are convinced that whatever strengthens the total city also benefits every citizen.

It is in this spirit of dedicated service to the community, the State of Missouri, and our great Nation that I commend the St. Louis Argus and its entire staff on its golden anniversary.

STANDARDS FOR MÜNSTER CHEESE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was privileged today to receive from Mr. Fred

Galli, secretary-treasurer of the Wisconsin Swiss and Limburger Cheese Producers' Association, a resolution to create new standards for Muenster cheese for manufacturing.

I am aware, of course, that this resolution—as a petition for change in Federal regulations—is a matter for consideration by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The establishment of equitable and realistic standards for food products, however, is also the concern of Congress.

Although I shall be contacting HEW on this proposal, I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of the resolution printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS ON STANDARDS OF IDENTITY FOR MUENSTER CHEESE

Be it resolved by the Wisconsin Swiss and Limburger Cheese Producers Association, That the Food and Drug Administration be petitioned to create a new section to read: "Muenster Cheese for Manufacturing; Identity 19.552."

Muenster cheese for manufacturing conforms to the definition and standard of identity prescribed for Muenster cheese by section 19.550, except that milk is not pasteurized and the provision of paragraphs (d) and (e) (1) do not apply.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. Petitioner, the Wisconsin Swiss and Limburger Cheese Producers Association is a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Wisconsin, with its principal office at Monroe, Wis. Its members are milk producers and operators of cheese factories engaged in the manufacture of Swiss, Limburger, brick, and Muenster cheese.

2. The procedure for manufacturing Muenster cheese is the same as that for brick cheese, except that Muenster cheese is normally marketed soon after manufacture without being subjected to the curing and aging process used for brick cheese. In view of this fact the standard for Muenster cheese (sec. 19.550) requires that milk used in the manufacture of Muenster cheese be pasteurized and no alternative 60-day holding period is prescribed as in the case of brick cheese (sec. 19.545).

3. During 1960 approximately 34 million pounds of brick and Muenster cheese was manufactured in Wisconsin, about one-half of which, or 17 million pounds, was Muenster cheese. The quality of Muenster cheese currently manufactured has sharply increased and at the present time a substantial amount of the current production of Muenster cheese is used for manufacturing into pasteurized process cheese, pasteurized process cheese foods and pasteurized process cheese spreads. For this purpose, and for purposes of cutting and packaging, substantial quantities of Muenster cheese are now being manufactured in rindless, block shape, each cheese weighing approximately 20 and 40 pounds.

4. It is necessary to require that Muenster used for manufacturing into pasteurized process cheese, pasteurized process cheese foods or pasteurized process cheese spreads be made from pasteurized milk, since such processed cheeses are subjected, during manufacture, to heat treatment for a time and a temperature sufficient to destroy any pathogenic organisms which might be present in the Muenster cheese so used.

5. For corresponding reasons the secretary, at a prior time adopted definitions and

standards of identity for: Cheddar cheese for manufacturing (sec. 19.502); washed curd cheese for manufacturing (sec. 19.507); Colby cheese for manufacturing (sec. 19.512); granular cheese for manufacturing (sec. 19.537); and brick cheese for manufacturing (sec. 19.547). The secretary then determined that such standards for manufacturing cheese were reasonable and would promote honesty and fair dealing in the interest of consumers.

6. If the proposed definition and standard of identity for Muenster cheese for manufacturing is adopted paragraphs (a) (7) of secs. 19.750, 19.765, and 19.775 (pasteurized process cheese; pasteurized process cheese food; pasteurized process cheese spread, respectively) should be amended so as to provide (as is now provided for other cheeses manufacturing) that for the purpose of said sections Muenster cheese for manufacturing is considered as Muenster cheese.

Dated this 28th day of February 1962, at Monroe, Wis.

Respectfully submitted.

FRED GALLI,
Secretary.

SPACE MEMORIAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the significance of the U.S. breakthrough into space merits, also, in my judgment, the erection of a memorial depicting the orbit, and featuring the astronauts in a prominent place in our Nation's Capital.

For this reason, I requested a special study by the Fine Arts Commission.

I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of the letter to Chairman David E. Finley, printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I am writing to respectfully urge a special study to determine a fitting monument, statue, or other memorial to commemorate the U.S. breakthrough into space.

The successful orbiting of *Friendship 7*, manned by Col. John Glenn, represents, in my judgment, one of the greatest, most historically significant events in the progress and history of the United States.

The creation of a memorial depicting, perhaps, the orbit and featuring the pioneer astronauts is well warranted. Symbolizing a significant feature of national accomplishment, it would deserve, I believe, a prominent place in the Statuary Hall of Congress, or elsewhere in the Nation's Capital.

Following a study and acceptable recommendations, I would be happy to do all I can to encourage and support the erection of a memorial commensurate with the significance of the first successful manned orbit of the U.S. space program.

Looking forward to getting your evaluation of these recommendations, and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

FINANCING OF HEALTH CARE FOR AGED

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the AFL-CIO executive council at its recent meeting in Florida issued a statement supporting the financing of health care for the aged through the social security and railroad retirement systems. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The executive council notes with satisfaction the evidence throughout the country of the rising tide of support for President Kennedy's program to provide health insurance for the aged through social security.

The council further welcomes the fact that this ground swell of public interest has apparently inspired a reexamination of the position of those who formerly contended no new programs were needed to assist the aged in financing their health care. In this connection, the council reviewed the proposals recently advanced by the American Medical Association, American Hospital Association, Blue Cross, Blue Shield, Senator JAVITS, and the commercial insurance companies with a view to determining whether these proposals to any extent measured up to the claims of their sponsors that they make the enactment of the Anderson-King bill unnecessary or inadvisable.

After a thorough examination of these plans and announcements, we have concluded that while they represent a significant shift in the position of their proponents, they provide no ground for lessening public support for the enactment of the Anderson-King bill. On the contrary, they confirm our contention that the enactment of the Anderson-King bill is the most important and immediately necessary step toward the development of well-rounded protection for older citizens in meeting the costs of their health care.

Most of these proposals contain elements that can be developed into effective supplements to basic health insurance protection through social security. None of them is an adequate substitute for health insurance through social security and the railroad retirement programs as provided for in the administration proposal, the Anderson-King bill, S. 909 and H.R. 4222.

Proposed substitute No. 1—the proposal of Blue Cross and the American Hospital Association: We commend these organizations for their courage in resisting the pressures of the American Medical Association, in realistically recognizing the need for Government financial participation and in departing from their earlier opposition to the use of the social security mechanism for raising the necessary funds to pay the costs of hospital bills for older people.

But by rejecting the principle that people, who have contributed toward health benefits while they are working, should receive these benefits as a matter of right on retirement, American Hospital Association and Blue Cross reveal that they still have much to learn about how social insurance can best work for the people. And by insisting that Blue Cross, and not the social security system, should administer any health insurance program for the aged, they appear to have a self-serving lack of faith in the social security and railroad retirement agencies, which have worked effectively on behalf of the American people for 26 years.

Proposed substitute No. 2—the proposal of Blue Shield and American Medical Association: By mid-February 1962, the American Medical Association didn't yet have a program to offer, but it had a press release. On careful reading, it becomes apparent that all its press release really said was that, after a while, if the 69 Blue Shield plans agreed, they would offer a nationwide plan to cover doctors' bills for persons over 65, at an approximate cost of \$3 per person per month.

If the aged were to be expected to purchase a plan of this sort—which provides no

hospital or nursing home benefits—after they had paid for hospital and related coverage through a plan such as Blue Cross is advocating, the cost would be prohibitive for the vast majority of the aged. How can people over 65, whose average individual income is around \$1,000 a year, be expected to pay \$3 a month for limited medical benefits, plus \$12 a month for certain hospital benefits under Blue Cross proposal? Why should the average retired person pay one-sixth of his meager income for health insurance premiums, when health insurance benefits could be financed instead through a contribution of about \$1 a month during the breadwinner's working lifetime?

Proposed substitute No. 3: A health benefits bill introduced by Senator JAVITS (S. 2664): Based on the social security method of financing, the Javits bill has some sound elements. However, it has major weaknesses. Not all those contributing toward coverage through the social security system would be eligible for benefits. There is no provision for financing through the railroad retirement system. Some of the coverage would be provided by commercial insurance companies, thus adding needless costs and administrative complexity, and turning over power and profits to an agency over which the Government has no control and for which there would be no compensating advantages to the beneficiaries. By requiring people to choose between long-term and short-term benefits, the bill would force beneficiaries to gamble on the form their medical need would take.

Proposed substitute No. 4: The insurance industry continues to put forward claims that with the growth of their plans the social security mechanism is not necessary. However, they do not substantiate this with specific statistical information on the extent to which their plans have been accepted, and they have not yet found a way to provide protection against any substantial portion of the health bill for older people at rates within reach of those dependent on a retirement income.

Proposed substitute No. 5—the Kerr-Mills Act, which has now been on the Federal statute books for more than a year and a half: To date less than half of the States have passed the enabling legislation and appropriations necessary to implement the medical assistance to the aged program within the States. Only 16 have programs in operation as of February 1. Among these 16 States, benefits in some are as low as 6 days of hospital care only, and in several, less than one-tenth of 1 percent of those over 65 are receiving any benefits. There is fantastic variation in the benefits provided and the number of people cared for—a variation having no relationship whatsoever to the needs of the aged in the several States, but reflecting rather the ability of the States to raise increased revenues and the complexion of their legislatures. Thus, at the end of 1961, 92 cents of every dollar spent under the medical assistance to the aged provision of this measure were spent in three of the richest industrial States.

The Kerr-Mills Act could, of course, serve as a supplement to the basic social security program and as such it will always be needed. But the Kerr-Mills program cannot be relied on as the first line of defense against the medical needs of the aged. It is objectionable not only because it rests upon a means test—highly distasteful to the vast majority of self-reliant citizens but the experience of the last 18 months demonstrates in addition and conclusively that it is a complete failure as the primary governmental program to assist the aged in meeting the costs of health care. It simply has not worked.

On the basis of our examination of these proposals that have been advanced as substitutes for the Anderson-King bill, and in the light of our review of existing programs and current developments under the Kerr-Mills Act, the executive council has concluded:

1. That all interested groups have at last arrived at the common conclusion that action must be taken to meet the need of older people for a practical way to finance health costs in old age.

2. That President Kennedy's program, enabling people to contribute through social security toward health benefits they would receive as a matter of right after age 65, is the keystone to any successful method of meeting the need.

3. That the programs that have been offered as alternatives to the Kennedy health insurance program are unacceptable as alternatives, but contain elements that can be made to work usefully as supplements to the basic social security coverage.

Enactment of the Anderson-King bill would set up a basic floor of protection against medical costs for the vast majority of the aged, just as basic financial protection in old age is provided through the Social Security Act. Supplementary action would be not only possible, but stimulated by the enactment of the bill.

The aged, relieved at age 65 of the need for payment of premiums for basic protection, would be in a position to supplement their social security health insurance coverage with other insurance to cover doctors' bills and other benefits. Private health insurance could thrive in the process of meeting this supplementary need, just as private life insurance was stimulated in its growth by the enactment of the social security law 26 years ago. In this connection we would hope that the American Medical Association and Blue Shield continue their efforts to make available, at a reasonable cost, the nationwide insurance plan they recently announced.

The various States, in turn, could successfully implement or improve programs of medical assistance to the remaining needy aged through the Kerr-Mills Act. With the main burden of health cost met by social security, it would become possible for all the States to set up good medical assistance programs to meet any residual needs.

In short, these programs, operating not as substitutes, but as supplementary to the basic protection provided in the President's program, would make possible the development in America of a well-rounded comprehensive health care program for all the aged.

This is what the country needs and it needs it now.

COMPREHENSIVE MEDICAL CARE

MR. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I believe a person can be a realist and an optimist. The two attitudes are not contradictory. I say this because I am disturbed by statements made by friends of the administration's health care for the aged plan which could have a disheartening effect on thousands of persons laboring energetically to win support for it. I am well aware of the obstacles in the way of enactment of this proposal, but I believe it can be passed in this session of Congress if we do not allow ourselves to become convinced that these obstacles are insurmountable. They are a long way from being that. An editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald

of March 2 speaks directly to this point, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TO HEAL THE SICK

The President's latest message to Congress makes a powerful case for comprehensive medical care legislation. It is quite true, as the President says, that "preventable sickness, disability, and physical or mental incapacity are matters of both individual and national concern." It is equally true, to use the President's words again, that—

"Many thousands needlessly suffer from infectious diseases for which preventive measures are available. We are still 10th among the nations of the world in our infant mortality rate. Prolonged and costly illness in later years robs too many of our older citizens of pride, purpose, and savings. In many communities the treatment of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded is totally inadequate. And there are increasingly severe shortages of skilled personnel in all the vital health professions."

He proposes a program to cure these defects. He proposes that the American people use their National Government, as they have used it on so many other occasions and in so many other ways to promote the general welfare, as an instrument for stimulating medical research, developing skilled medical personnel, helping the mentally ill, and providing machinery to enable Americans to pay, through taxation, during their working years, for the medical care they will inevitably need in their old age when they are no longer able to work.

This seems to us a sensible, realistic approach to a difficult problem of national concern. But like any other proposal which departs in any degree from accustomed ways of doing things it is bound to run into the adamant opposition of those who are allergic to any innovation. Already the president of the American Medical Association—ignoring the incontrovertible facts in the President's message—has intoned that "no one supporting this proposal has yet presented any evidence that such radical legislation is needed" and has baldly asserted what is certainly not so, that the legislation "would interfere with the patient's freedom of choice of hospital and physician."

It would be childish on the part of the President to suppose that organized opposition to his proposals can be overcome by a mere message to Congress, however reasonable and eloquent. If the President wants a medical care program and not merely a political issue, he will have to roll up his sleeves and wade in for a while of a fight. He can get the program—if he organizes support for it, if he tells his Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to go up and down the country speaking for it, if he himself talks directly to the American people explaining why the program is imperative, if he mobilizes and supports the numerous American physicians who are nauseated by the AMA's selfish standpointism and are eager to rebel against it, if he tells his spokesmen on Capitol Hill that this is "must" legislation, if he encourages the formation of citizens' committees to achieve medical care, if he prods labor and liberal organizations into joining the crusade, if, in short, he leads.

President Kennedy has a great idea in his message to Congress on medical care—a kind of New Frontier, as it were, in relation to the Nation's health. Of itself, of course, the idea will set no bones and heal no ailments. But translated into action, into reality, it can confer a tremendous boon on the American people.

THE NATION'S RECREATION FACILITIES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the message sent by President Kennedy to the Congress on March 1 truly put the word "conserve" back into the conservation movement. If properly implemented by the Congress, the States, and the people, this farsighted program will completely reverse the corrosive conservation policies of the previous administration.

At a time when the Nation's population is increasing at an unprecedented rate, and when industrial growth is accelerating, we Americans must take on the stewardship of our natural resource heritage. The President's proposals revivify and strengthen the long tradition of Federal cooperation with private, State, and local operators for wise resource management.

I was particularly gratified that the President's message, and the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post, commenting on the message, especially stressed the importance of a new start in recreation. Mentioned among the new national parks which should be established was the Canyon Lands National Park in Utah. I am sponsoring a bill to authorize the creation of this park out of the fantastic scenery in one of the most remote and inaccessible areas of the West, and I hope that before this session adjourns the Congress will have an opportunity to vote on my bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of Saturday, March 3, entitled "The Great Out of Doors" be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE GREAT OUT-OF-DOORS

President Kennedy's message on conservation is an impressive outline of policy in a very important field. Interest will doubtless be centered in his proposals for broadening the Nation's recreation facilities. The chief thrust of the message comes from its appeal for new national parks to be financed by a self-liquidating arrangement.

Taking note of increased leisure and greater demands for open-air recreation, the administration is moving to provide the facilities before it is too late. The 341 million visits to Federal land and water areas in 1960 are expected to double by 1970 and to increase fivefold by the year 2000. To meet this vast demand, the President would authorize advances from the Treasury up to \$500 million as a land conservation fund. Part of the fund would be used to purchase land for the Point Reyes National Seashore in California, the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, the Ozark Rivers National Monument in Missouri, Sagamore Hill National Historic Site in New York, Canyon Lands National Park in Utah, Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan, Prairie National Park in Kansas, Padre Island National Seashore in Texas, and the national lakeshore area in northern Indiana.

The President offers a practical method of replenishing the land conservation fund through admission and user fees, sale of surplus Federal nonmilitary lands and so forth. It is reasonable to ask the people who take advantage of the national parks system to pay the cost of its maintenance and extension. But the Government cannot wait until capital accumulates from these sources to finance its acquisition of new park lands.

In many instances delay would greatly increase the cost of the land or render it unsuitable for recreation purposes. By creating the proposed fund Congress can serve the interests both of economy and of conservation.

Suggested also is a program of matching grants to encourage the States to provide more outdoor recreation. Surplus Federal lands would be turned over to the States for recreational use, where desirable, under a proposed amendment to the Federal Surplus Property Disposal Act. The President also asks once more for a study of the country's ocean, lake and river shorelines and for enactment of the wilderness bill.

In line with the recent report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, the President will create an Outdoor Recreation Advisory Council and a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Viewed as a whole, these projects are a formidable undertaking. It is a pity, however, that the White House did not include another recreational project of great importance to this area—the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Historical Park.

ALASKA'S DIVISION OF LANDS MAKES A FINE START

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the division of lands in Alaska, created as an agency of the department of natural resources by the first Alaska State Legislature in 1959, is under the able direction of Mr. Roscoe Bell, an experienced and dedicated public servant. He has just issued its first report.

The task of this agency, under Mr. Bell, is to select, and then administer, the approximately 27 percent of Alaska's 375 million acres, of not otherwise federally received land, which was granted to the 49th State by the Statehood Act. In addition, an estimated 30 to 40 million acres of tidelands and submerged lands also come under Mr. Bell's jurisdiction. The Statehood Act granted the State 25 years in which to make its selections. Excluded from this choice are some 21 million acres of national forest lands, some 20 million acres of Federal game ranges and refuges, some 6 million acres of national parks, some 3,741,465 acres of military reservations and withdrawals, some 4,072,146 acres of Indian and Eskimo reservations, made in an earlier stage of territorial development, and 207,812 acres of miscellaneous other Federal withdrawals.

A substantial handicap upon the selection process of the State's division of lands is the wholly insufficient and inadequate amount of land surveying performed when Alaska was a territory.

In a prestatehood hearing by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in 1950, Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, the able junior Senator from New Mexico, pointed out that at the rate the Federal Government had been surveying Alaska it would require 17,000 years to complete the surveys. The rate was not substantially increased during the succeeding decade.

Until the advent of statehood, all land management in Alaska was Federal, being specifically so reserved by the restrictive Territorial Organic Act of 1912. Hence, the organization of a State land management agency charged with the responsibility of selecting and administering an area and its resources as large

as the combined New England States, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, and West Virginia is a formidable assignment.

It is to the great credit of Mr. Bell and his devoted staff that in the less than 3 years that the division of lands has been established, nearly 11 million acres of the 103 million acres granted by the Statehood Act—or slightly over one-tenth of the total, have been selected. Tentative approval has been granted by the Federal Government of 1,291,643 acres. A State park and recreation system has been created as well as the establishment of 62 roadside camps and picnic grounds, and the setting aside of the lake-studded, almost virginal Wood River area of over a million acres—a region of superlative scenery, of ample hunting, fishing, and camping potentials—with multiple use as the applied operational principle.

The State's recreation areas have been divided into seven classes—scenic parks, historic sites, recreation areas, beaches, parkways, wayside, and wilderness areas—thus testifying to the division's vision of Alaska's potential as a great recreational and tourist area, a development which will be fully utilized when the marine highway, the daily ferry system operating out of Prince Rupert, gets into full operation in the summer of 1963.

These ferries, with a capacity of over a hundred cars each, will enable tourists from the States to travel through the Canadian Rockies to Prince Rupert and then proceed northward over the famed Inside Passage—a wholly protected waterway—and touching at Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Sitka, Juneau, Haines, and Skagway. From Haines they will proceed through British Columbia and Yukon Territory into western Alaska, returning either by the Alaska Highway or by the ferry route. Or they may travel into Alaska over the highway and return by the ferry.

The division of lands has also moved toward vigorous development of the natural resources on its lands—oil, timber, agricultural, and minerals. While still in its infancy, the division gives promise of usefully serving Alaska and the Nation by making hitherto untouched and undeveloped resources available to the State and Nation. It is off to a fine start in tackling a mammoth assignment.

PARTIES AND PRINCIPLES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, Raymond Moley, the able columnist for Newsweek magazine, has just written two most interesting and challenging columns entitled "Parties and Principles." The columns are based on a thoroughly documented study by a highly reliable research agency.

The Moley thesis is that there is an essential cohesion within both parties and that the study shows that "all reasonable conservatives can and should find a party home in the Republican Party. Those who remain irreconcilable cannot be charged against the Republican Party. They must remain hopeless but impotent."

I ask unanimous consent that both of these columns be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks so that they might receive the deserved attention of all Members of Congress.

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

PARTIES AND PRINCIPLES—I (By Raymond Moley)

There lingers in the minds of many Americans an assumption, born long ago, that there is no essential difference between the two political parties. They say: "How can a party stand for any principle when it has members of such divergent views as GOLDWATER and JAVITS? Or THURMOND and MORSE?" But the exceptions do not prove the assumption.

The essential cohesion within both parties is proved by a thoroughly documented study by a highly reliable private research agency, which I am privileged to summarize here. Seven years ago I commented on a study of the votes in the 83d Congress by the same agency. The present one deals with the 1961 session of the 87th Congress. This study of voting records on rollcalls is much more comprehensive than those made by the COPE, the ADA, or the ACA which consider less than 20 rollcalls. It covers 115 rollcalls in the Senate and 40 in the House.

It shows how Members voted on issues involving the centralization and enlargement of the power of the Federal Government, fiscal responsibility and spending, and the intervention of Government in labor relations and the private economy. Thus it shows the relative standing of Members in a broad spectrum from liberalism to conservatism in the sense in which those words are currently used. It does not include votes on foreign affairs except where the foregoing domestic matters are involved, nor civil rights, nor procedural matters. Unlike the studies mentioned above, it realizes that votes on vital amendments are more significant than on the final passage of bills.

IDEOLOGICAL SPECTRUM

I have divided the Members of the two Houses as they rank in the spectrum into three groups. In the Senate there are 32 Members in the more conservative group. Of these, 24 are Republicans and 8 are Democrats. In the middle group there are nine Republicans and seven Democrats. In the more liberal group there are two Republicans—JAVITS, and CASE of New Jersey—and 48 Democrats.

In the House there are 176 Members in the more conservative group—155 of whom are Republicans, and 21 Democrats. In the middle group there are 31 Members, of whom 13 are Republicans and 18 are Democrats. In the more liberal group there are 4 Republicans and 217 Democrats. Missing from the compilation are Members who served only during a part of the session.

Thus, on those issues of substantial ideological significance there is a concentration of Republicans in the conservative and of Democrats in the liberal sectors. It is very marked in this Congress, far more than in any period in modern times. And so there is a specific choice in principle between the two parties.

LIVING WITH ECCENTRICS

The lesson in this is clear to conservatives and liberals who choose to shun party allegiance. There is a lesson also for those who call themselves independent because of their claim that "there is no difference" or because they have no political principles or are just plain timid. There is a party which they can join and work and vote for. There is no valid argument for such abstentions.

Those who do abstain are gravely injuring the vitality and health and success of a two-party system.

So far as deviationist members of the two parties are concerned, the foregoing figures show how truly exceptional they are and how little they affect the party of which they are only nominal members. But a big party can live with its eccentrics just as do religious bodies, nationalities, races, college faculties, and clubs.

Because of the traditional conditions in the South, there are more deviationists in the Democratic Party than among the Republicans. This is shown in the study, although issues involving racial relations are not included.

These figures should show all reasonable conservatives that they can and should find a party home in the Republican Party. Those who remain irreconcilable cannot be charged against the Republican Party. They must remain hopeless but impotent.

Next week I shall name the leading conservative and liberal members of both parties and state certain further conclusions to be derived from this most important study.

PARTIES AND PRINCIPLES—II (By Raymond Moley)

Last week I summarized the results of a most important analysis, by a highly reliable private research agency, of the voting of Members of Congress on an ideological scale running from what is currently called conservative to liberal. It is based upon the votes on vital issues in the 1961 session of the 87th Congress. Not only in the choice of issues counted, but in its comprehensiveness this study is much more revealing than those of the AFL-CIO's COPE, the ADA, and the ACA, which considered only from 10 to 18 issues. This one is based upon 115 rollcalls in the Senate and 40 in the House.

It shows that in the more conservative group there are 32 Senators—24 Republicans, and 8 Democrats. In the middle group are 9 Republicans and 7 Democrats. In the more liberal group are 2 Republicans—CASE of New Jersey and JAVITS—along with 48 Democrats.

In the House, in the more conservative group there are 155 Republicans and 21 Democrats. In the middle group, there are 13 Republicans and 18 Democrats. In the more liberal group there are 4 Republicans and 217 Democrats.

In this article I shall explain the statistical method used in the study and also name the most conservative and most liberal individual Members.

THE METHOD

The rollcalls selected were mostly votes cast on amendments to vital bills. This was done because the real sentiments of Members are most often registered then, rather than on the final passage of bills. This because after amendments have been adopted or defeated, Members are likely to decide to take "half a loaf."

The issues selected involved the enlargement of the powers of the Federal Government, fiscal responsibility and spending, and the intervention of Government in labor-management relations and the free competitive economy. Except where foreign relations had a direct bearing on the foregoing, such votes were omitted. Also omitted were votes on civil rights and procedural matters.

In calculating the record of Members, yeas and nay votes and also absences were considered. However, this method, which really counted against the Member his failure to vote, seemed to me to be inadequate in comparing the records of Members because absences were in large part due to personal or family illness or important party or legisla-

tive business out of Washington. For example, those of Senators MORTON and GOLDWATER and Congressman MILLER were because of their party duties.

THE TOP NAMES

Therefore, in the Senate listing I have recalculated the record only according to yeas and nay votes. Thus corrected and in alphabetical order, the 15 most conservative Senators were ALLOTT, BENNETT, BUTLER, CAPEHART, CASE of South Dakota, COTTON, CURTIS, DIRKSEN, DWORSHAK, GOLDWATER, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, MILLER, MUNDT, and WILLIAMS of Delaware—all Republicans.

The most liberal were, in alphabetical order: CLARK, HART, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, LONG of Missouri, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, McNAMARA, MANSFIELD, METCALF, MORSE, MUSKIE, NEUBERGER, RANDOLPH, and SMITH of Massachusetts—all Democrats.

Since the order would not be measurably changed in the listing, I have taken the original ranking in the study for the 20 most conservative and 20 most liberal Members of the House. The most conservative were, in alphabetical order: ASHBROOK, BECKER, BEERMANN, BOLTON, BRUCE, CHURCH, CLANCY, DEVINE, HOFFMAN of Illinois, JONAS, KING of New York, McCULLOCH, MEADER, OSTERTAG, PILLION, POFF, RAY, ROBISON, SCHADEBERG, and TABER—all Republicans.

The most liberal were, alphabetically: ANFUSO, BUCKLEY, Celler, Friedel, Healey, Johnson of California, Karsten, Kastenmeier, Keogh, King of Utah, McCormack, McDowell, Multer, O'Hara of Michigan, Powell, Rabaut, Santangelo, Smith of Iowa, Ullman, and Wickersham—all Democrats.

After the 1960 election it was widely commented that the newly elected Members of the House were more conservative than their predecessors. This study bears this out in the case of 75 percent of the individuals involved.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not laid down the unfinished business. It will not be laid before the Senate until 2 o'clock. The unfinished business is H.R. 5143, an act to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

AMENDMENT OF ACT ESTABLISHING CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5143) to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

AMENDMENT TO SABINE RIVER COMPACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1190, H.R. 7855.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7855) granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to a compact ratified by the States of Louisiana and Texas and relating to the waters of the Sabine River.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an extract from the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in reporting the measure, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

H.R. 7855 by Mr. BROOKS, of Texas, would give the consent of the Congress to an amendment to the compact between the States of Louisiana and Texas relating to the waters of the Sabine River. The amendment would change the term of the Texas members of the Sabine River Compact Administration from 2 to 6 years.

NEED

At the present time, the term of the Texas members of the Sabine River Compact Administration is 2 years. The Sabine River Compact Administration has been in operation for several years and, as a result of the practical experience gained, the State of Texas has determined that longer terms for its members would provide them a better opportunity to understand the problems and to make a contribution to sound development of the water resources of the Sabine River.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING SECRETARIES OF GUAM AND VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1192, Senate bill 2774.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2774) to amend section 8 of the Organic Act of Guam, and section 15 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, to provide for appointment of acting

secretaries for such territories under certain conditions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an extract from the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs showing the purpose of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The purpose of S. 2774, introduced by Senator JACKSON as the result of an executive communication from the Secretary of the Interior, is to permit the appointment of an acting government secretary for Guam and for the Virgin Islands under certain conditions.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

(S. 2774 will authorize the Governor of either of the territories named to appoint an acting government secretary during a vacancy in that office or while the secretary is unable to act, is absent, or is acting as Governor. On numerous occasions when the Governor's office is vacant for prolonged periods, the secretary must perform the duties of that office and of his own as well. While the latter may not be of great import they are burdensome. The acting secretary will be selected from among territorial department personnel and the bill provides that he will receive no additional compensation for his work as acting secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that hearings on S. 2774 were held by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and that it was reported by the committee unanimously.

The purpose of the bill, introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], as the result of an executive communication from the Secretary of the Interior, is to permit the appointment of an acting government secretary for Guam and for the Virgin Islands under certain conditions, and there is evidently a need for the legislation.

May I say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that S. 2774 will authorize the Governor of either of the territories to appoint an acting government secretary during a vacancy in that office, or while the secretary is unable to act, is absent, or is acting as Governor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2774) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 387; 48 U.S.C. 1422b) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "The Governor or Acting Governor may from time to time designate an officer or employee of the executive branch of the government of Guam to act as secretary of Guam in case of a vacancy in the office of secretary of Guam or the disability or temporary absence of the

secretary of Guam or while the secretary is acting as Governor, and the person so designated shall have all the powers of the secretary so long as such condition continues, except for the power set forth in the first sentence of section 7 of this Act. No additional compensation shall be paid to any person acting as Governor or as secretary under this Act."

Sec. 2. Section 15 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 504; 48 U.S.C. 1596) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "The Governor or Acting Governor may from time to time designate an officer or employee of the executive department of the government of the Virgin Islands to act as government secretary for the Virgin Islands in case of a vacancy in the office of the government secretary or the disability or temporary absence of the government secretary or while said government secretary is acting as Governor, and the person so designated shall have all the powers of government secretary so long as such condition continues, except for the power set forth in section 14 of this Act. No additional compensation shall be paid to any person acting as Governor or as secretary under this Act."

PROPOSED REMOVAL OF CEILING ON AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION FOR GOVERNMENT OF TRUST TERRITORY OF PACIFIC ISLANDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1193, Senate bill 2775.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2775) to remove the ceiling on the authorization for appropriation for the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the appropriation authorization in section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), is hereby amended by increasing it from \$7,500,000 to \$15,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of S. 2775, as amended, is to provide for an increase in the present authorized appropriation for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands from \$7,500,000 to \$15 million.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is administered by the Secretary of the Interior under Executive Order 10265, as amended, in accordance with a trusteeship agreement between the United States and the Security Council of the United Nations approved by the President under authority granted by the Congress. Under the terms of the agreement, the United States exercises full administrative, judicial, and legislative authority over the former Japanese-administered territory and has undertaken obligations to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants.

In its proposed budget for fiscal year 1963, the Department is requesting approximately \$10 million—an increase of about \$2.5 million over the present limitation—to carry out its plans and programs in the territory.

There is set forth in the report a breakdown of the amounts, by activity, being sought for fiscal 1963, together with a projection of amounts to be requested for fiscal year 1964.

I ask unanimous consent that portions of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the measure be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The purpose of S. 2775, as amended, is to provide for an increase in the present authorized appropriation for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands from \$7,500,000 to \$15,000,000.

BACKGROUND

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is administered by the Secretary of the Interior under Executive Order 10265, as amended, in accordance with a trusteeship agreement between the United States and the Security Council of the United Nations approved by the President under authority granted by the Congress (61 Stat. 397). Under the terms of the agreement, the United States exercises full administrative, judicial, and legislative authority over the former Japanese-administered territory and has undertaken obligations to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants.

The entire trust territory which consists of the Marshall, Caroline, and northern Mariana Islands, comprises 96 islands and island groups with a total land area of 687 square miles. Pursuant to Executive Orders 10408 and 10470 of November 10, 1952, and July 17, 1953, respectively, the northern Marianas, excluding Rota, were transferred to the Navy. That portion of the territory under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior extends over 3 million square miles of ocean, consists of 83 islands and island groups with a land area of 564 square miles, and has a population of about 75,000.

NEED

The Department of the Interior, by executive communication of January 19, 1962, requested the introduction of legislation to remove the \$7,500,000 ceiling now applicable to appropriations for the administration of the trust territory. In recent years, according to testimony from representatives of the Office of Territories, appropriations for programs in the trust territory have averaged about \$5 million annually. This amount, in the face of steadily rising administrative costs, has permitted little more than a holding operation in the islands for which the United States has responsibility. The Department of the Interior believes that programs and facilities of the trust territory should be improved and accelerated beyond the level maintained in the past. It is felt that special emphasis should be placed on the construction of needed hospitals, utility systems, and school buildings, as well as the political and economic development of the area. A further justification for lifting the present ceiling stems from the fact that, beginning July 1, 1962, the Saipan district, which has heretofore been the responsibility of the Navy Department, will be administered by the trust territory.

COST

In its proposed budget for fiscal year 1963, the Department is requesting approximately \$10 million—an increase of about \$2.5 million over the present limitation—to carry out

its plans and programs in the territory. There is set forth below a breakdown of amounts, by activity, being sought for fiscal 1963, together with a projection of amounts to be requested for fiscal year 1964:

Projected maximum grant authorizations, trust territory, fiscal year 1964

	1963 budget	Projected 1964
Direct appropriations.....	\$179,000	\$200,000
Education.....	975,000	2,500,000
Public health.....	700,000	1,500,000
Economic and political development.....	\$36,000	1,200,000
Legal and public safety.....	210,000	210,000
Operation and maintenance.....	1,750,000	1,850,000
Transportation services.....	2,031,000	2,250,000
General administration.....	1,320,000	1,500,000
Construction.....	3,499,000	3,700,000
Saipan (district administration).....	1,500,000	1,500,000
Total.....	13,000,000	16,410,000
Less local revenues and reimbursements.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
Total.....	11,500,000	14,910,000

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1954, providing for a continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

GOVERNMENT COMPTROLLER OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1194, House bill 7666.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7666) to amend section 17(a) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands pertaining to the salary of the government comptroller.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, H.R. 7666 will amend the Virgin Islands Revised Organic Act of 1954 by placing the position of government comptroller under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for salary fixing purposes. A companion bill, S. 2088, was introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] as the result of an executive communication from the Department of the Interior.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the report filed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the measure be incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

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

PURPOSE

H.R. 7666 will amend the Virgin Islands Revised Organic Act of 1954 by placing the position of government comptroller under

the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for salary-fixing purposes. A companion bill, S. 2088, was introduced by Senator JACKSON as the result of an executive communication from the Department of the Interior.

NEED

The salary of the government comptroller, a Federal appointee, is now fixed by statute at the rate of \$12,500 per annum. (In addition he currently receives a cost-of-living differential of 17½ percent.) This salary is changeable only by law and may or may not correspond to that being paid at any given time to the incumbents of comparable positions in the Federal service.

H.R. 7666 would overcome these problems by providing that the salary of the position in question be established in accordance with the standards provided by the Classification Act of 1949 as now or hereafter amended. Thus, the incumbent would automatically receive the same salary increases in the future that are received by other Federal employees covered by that act. H.R. 7666 will not, on the other hand, change the manner of appointing the comptroller, modify his duties as fixed by statute, lengthen or shorten his 10-year term of office, or convert the position into one under civil service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

MULTIMILLION-DOLLAR WINDFALL FOR GRAIN AND FEED DEALERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, recently Secretary Freeman launched another program which will result in a multimillion-dollar windfall for the grain and feed dealers, and he attempts to justify this action with the pious hope that a part of the windfall profits will trickle down to the American poultry farmers.

He announced having negotiated lower rates with the southern railroads where-by he can now deliver corn to the feed dealers in the Southeastern States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia at prices averaging between 10 cents and 15 cents below regular market price and below the price being paid by their competitors in the surrounding areas.

Only the larger grain dealers will get the cheaper price, while smaller dealers buying single carloads will get some reduction, but not as much.

The Robinson-Patman Act was enacted by Congress to prevent large companies from selling to customers in one area at prices cheaper than to others in competitive areas. Also, this law prohibits different prices to different size dealers in the same area when such differential results in a competitive advantage.

The Secretary of Agriculture apparently figures that his agency is above the law and that they can select the areas and the dealers who will get bargains from the Federal Government.

This recent action will have two major results:

First, it will give a definite competitive advantage to the poultrymen and the feed dealers in the favored States, who,

as a result of this decision, will be able to buy the corn at prices below those available to dealers in competitive areas.

Second, sale of this corn at the reduced prices will break the local price of corn at farm levels in those States, thereby causing a substantial loss to the local corn-producing farmers.

The Federal Government's program of subsidizing the production of broilers will encourage increased production of both poultry and livestock in those areas, with the result that a few months hence the poultry farmers will again be in the same situation that they were last year when the finished product was selling at less than cost of production.

Apparently Secretary Freeman wants to keep the poultry market in a demoralized condition in the hope that they will eventually be forced to appeal to the Government for aid.

The Department has already stated that they will be glad to support the price and control the production of poultry.

The officials of some of our electric companies were recently convicted of fixing prices and rigging markets; yet this is a far more serious action which the Secretary of Agriculture is now taking, wherein he manipulates the markets in a selected area for the apparent purpose of forcing the farmers producing corn in those areas to put their next year's acreage under the Government's price-support program and to force the poultry farmers to accept Government subsidies and controls.

Furthermore, the loss which the Government and the taxpayers will sustain on the corn being sold at these bargain prices will not necessarily accrue to the farmers producing poultry and livestock. If this were a general break in market prices nationally, the effect of the lower prices would eventually be reflected in lower feed costs; but with the price of corn being reduced in one area alone, it merely means that the dealers in those areas will get a definite competitive advantage. Corn already bought for future delivery will be diverted to other areas at the higher prices and replaced with cheap Government corn. The most of the savings thereon will merely result in wider margins of profit for the dealers, since the retail prices of feed, which in an integrated industry is reflected in the finished broiler, would be gaged by competitive prices in other areas.

Secretary Freeman's theory is that by making these large windfalls, resulting from the wider margins of profit available to the feed dealers of those areas, some of it may trickle down to the farmers growing these broilers.

This is not the first instance wherein decisions of Secretary Freeman have resulted in multimillion-dollar windfalls for grain dealers, instead of profiting the farmers.

For example, last year the Secretary of Agriculture arbitrarily announced a 45-cent per bushel increase in the support price for the 1961 crop of soybeans. At the same time the Government greatly accelerated its export program of soybean oil, with the result that the cash market on soybeans spectacularly rose nearly \$1 per bushel.

For years farmers had been producing soybeans and had considered this a profitable crop, selling their beans on the free market without the need for any Government supports.

Already the higher support price of soybeans as announced last year has resulted in a 25-percent increase in the 1961 crop. Much of this increased production is going under Government supports, and warehouses are beginning to bulge with heavy inventories of Government-owned soybeans.

The New Frontier bureaucrats are now starting to advocate controls over production and getting ready to shed crocodile tears over the plight of the soybean farmers.

Last year's announced raise in the support price of soybeans, followed by the accelerated export sales, took place in the spring of 1961 long after the most of the farmers producing these soybeans had sold their 1960 crops. The bulk of the beans was then in the hands of the dealers, and it was the warehousemen and speculators who capitalized on this multimillion-dollar windfall resulting from the Agriculture Department's actions.

Many grain dealers who had large inventories of these soybeans made millions thereon, following Secretary Freeman's decision to raise the 1961 support price.

Also, last year the Secretary made another decision which resulted in a multimillion-dollar windfall to a group of grain dealers who were storing the Government's inventories of Durum wheat.

Last year there was a severe drought in the Durum-wheat-producing areas. This drought, which resulted in a sharp reduction in the 1961 production of Durum wheat, was certainly known to the Department of Agriculture. It was that agency which was surveying the area to determine the need for disaster aid for the farmers.

The Department of Agriculture had in its inventories around 5 million bushels of Durum wheat which it had obtained under the price support program of earlier years. Notwithstanding this advance knowledge of a short crop, they sold all of their Durum wheat holdings proximately \$1 per bushel. Practically all of these bargain sales were made to the warehousemen and grain dealers in the area.

Again the farmers did not benefit on this multimillion-dollar windfall. Not only did the Department of Agriculture sell this wheat on the eve of its substantial market rise—which anyone could have recognized as inevitable, in view of the drastic crop failure—but also in many instances they sold it to those grain dealers at prices below the prevailing market price on the date of sale.

Both in the case of the sale of Durum wheat at bargain prices and in the case of the arbitrary announcement raising the support price of soybeans last year, the farmers did not reap the benefit of the multimillion-dollar windfalls.

Just as in the case of his action of a couple of weeks ago of announcing a program to sell corn at reduced prices in the Southeastern States, practically all

of the multimillion-dollar windfall profits went to the grain and feed dealers.

Let there be any misunderstanding, I am not indicting the grain and feed dealers of America, but I am saying that they do not need these multimillion-dollar windfalls being passed out so freely by the Secretary of Agriculture.

For 25 years prior to my coming to Washington, D.C., I was a grain and feed dealer, and I am still associated with the industry and proud of that connection; and it is based upon my experience as a grain and feed dealer that I charge that these three decisions of Secretary Freeman were not in the best interests of the American farmers.

In fact, some of the New Frontier decisions of Secretary Freeman are so obviously resulting in wider profits for the grain dealers that Kennedy's new farm program, which he described as the A B C D program of Agriculture, is becoming a standard joke in the grain trade. They are laughingly referring to this A B C D as standing for "always bigger commissions for dealers."

CREATING ALASKA'S OFFENSIVE MILITARY POTENTIAL AND RESTORING ITS OBSOLETE DEFENSIVE STRENGTH ARE OVERDUE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the lack of military offensive capabilities in Alaska has been the subject of concern to knowledgeable Alaskans for a long time. The history of Alaska shows clearly that whatever defenses were placed there came in response to the efforts of Alaskans, through their unceasing urging upon the Federal defense agencies for adequate bases, and not because of a proper initiative and appreciation of the needs on the part of the Pentagon authorities and their predecessors.

As long ago as the 1930's and in the 1940's, Gen. H. H. (Hap) Arnold felt and subsequently stated that for reasons he was unable to understand, adequate defenses had never come to Alaska. In his book: "Global Mission," this great soldier—the only five-star general the Air Force has had—wrote:

Through to this day Alaska has never received the attention in national defense planning that it deserves. * * *

Alaska had always been and, no matter what happened in any theater of war, always remained, to me privately, a high priority. But we were never able to get the money or allocations for the Air Force that we really needed there to give us the kind of bases we required then and need more than ever now.

That is as true today as when it was written 13 years ago. It has not been changed by the advent of missiles.

Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Jr., a great soldier with an almost unequalled record for conspicuous bravery, who served in Alaska for a number of years, first as chief of the Alaskan Air Command and then, on a subsequent tour of duty, as the supreme commander from

1957 to 1961, felt so strongly on this subject that he spoke about it publicly 3 years ago, urging the installation of missile bases in Alaska. His forthright and courageous stand, in the tradition of Billy Mitchell, led to his highly regrettable retirement last June, when he was summoned to Washington and curtly told by Gen. Curt LeMay, shortly after LeMay's promotion to Chief of Staff, that he, Armstrong, must retire as of August 1, although this gallant soldier and able commander had over 2 years to serve before his normal anticipated retirement. It was a great shock to all Alaskans, who admired General Armstrong and appreciated his realistic appraisal of Alaska's and the Nation's military needs.

The weaknesses of Alaska's offensive strength are clearly set forth in an excellent article by Hanson W. Baldwin, the experienced and able military expert of the New York Times. He points out what has long been apparent, that the "Alaskan Command has no offensive capability whatsoever and no reconnaissance capability." He further points out that "its defensive capabilities are badly in need of modernization." Imagine two of our fighter pilots being obliged to jettison their wing tanks in order to fulfill their mission of watching two Russian planes on a snooping mission. I consider it disgraceful.

Mr. President, the great wisdom first uttered 27 years ago by the late and great Gen. Billy Mitchell, when he said:

Alaska is the most central place in the world for aircraft, and that is true either of Europe, Asia, or North America. I believe in the future he who holds Alaska will hold the world, and I think it is the most important strategic place in the world.

That wise and classic guide for future policy has been ignored by the present Air Force Command in the Pentagon. Two years ago, it committed unspeakable folly in abolishing Ladd Air Force Base, next to Fairbanks, the oldest modern military establishment in Alaska, and by reversing its previous decision to station up-to-date fighter planes installed there, although its Alaska warehouses were bulging with parts of such planes that had been sent up there in anticipation of this previously announced move.

It cannot be pointed out too often or too strongly that Alaska's strategic position is such that it makes Alaska invaluable to our national defense and potential offense.

Long, long ago, Mr. President, over 15 years ago, when the United States was establishing bases all around the world, I pointed out then, publicly, that many of these foreign bases were built on quicksand, figuratively speaking; that the United States was liable, at any time, to be ordered to withdraw them, either due to the infiltration of communism, rampant nationalism, or for other reasons. That has already happened. In Morocco the United States has been obliged to abandon a costly airbase because the Moroccans do not want us there. We have been told to get out of Saudi Arabia. In Spain we are paying through the nose for the privilege of installing elaborate bases there and are being obliged to pay vast additional sums

to keep Dictator Franco happy and our bases there. We have had trouble even persuading such friendly people as the Icelanders, whose ideas of freedom coincide with ours, in allowing us to keep our base there. And even within the land of our longtime ally, Great Britain, we find substantial agitation against the establishment of nuclear submarine bases and other needed military installations, and one of these days we may be told that their presence there is embarrassing. Nowhere outside of the soil of the United States are military establishments secure from action which will tend to eliminate them.

But in Alaska, where untold land is available—Alaska, that fronts on the strategic Arctic Ocean, whose shores lie within naked-eye view of Soviet Siberia—Alaska, which contains more promise and potential both for offense and for defense than any other area in the world—Alaska, which is American terrain inhabited by our patriotic citizenry—we find this shocking lack of offensive and reconnaissance potential, and obsolescence in even our defensive measures.

The fault lies chiefly in Air Force policy. The Army is doing its part nobly. It is in very considerable part due to Maj. Gen. John H. Michaelis, a brilliant officer, that operations under Arctic conditions, in which our troops lacked experience, have been seriously undertaken, and that when Ladd Field was abandoned by the Air Force, it was taken over by the Army and renamed Fort Wainwright. As for the Navy, while we have the glamorous titles of the "Alaska Sea Frontier" and the "17th Naval District," with bases at Kodiak and Adak, the rear admiral there is given no ships and only a few planes.

It is high time that our military authorities give to Alaska the attention that it needs in the interest of national defense and offense.

I strongly recommend a careful reading of Hanson Baldwin's article to my colleagues in the Senate and in the House, to the military planners in the Pentagon, and to our Commander in Chief in the White House. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

GUARDIANS IN THE NORTH—ALASKA WARNING SYSTEM FOUND GOOD, BUT AIR COMBAT UNIT FLIES OLD PLANES

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

More than 17,000 airmen of the Alaskan Air Command man the extreme outposts of freedom in North America.

The Alaskan Air Command, under Maj. Gen. Wendell W. Bowman, operates Alaska's four main military airfields, operates, administers or controls more than 40 radar sites and an intricate communication system, and provides a limited air defense and military transport system for Alaska. An antimissile warning station at Clear complements the aircraft control and warning station. A ground station—part of the Midas satellite system for the detection of the launching of an enemy missile—is under construction at Donnelly Flats, near Fairbanks.

The radar sites and communication system are superb, perhaps the best in the world.

They enable the Alaska command to perform its primary mission, early warning to the North American Continent.

But the Alaskan command has no offensive capability whatsoever and no reconnaissance capability. And its defensive capabilities are badly in need of modernization. Lt. Col. Joe Rogers commands Alaska's only air combat unit, the 317th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron reinforced by 43 aircraft.

SQUADRON'S FIGHTERS

The squadron flies the Convair F-102, an obsolescent, delta-wing all-weather fighter-interceptor. Within close radius of its bases, this plane has considerable usefulness, though both its speed and altitude are too limited to enable it to provide adequate defenses against modern bombers.

But its greatest limitation, in the vast airspace over Alaska, is its range. This is so short that, even with wing tanks (which reduce its speed to subsonic), it is extended to suboptimum to reach much beyond the peripheries of Alaska.

In fact the first interception in many years of Soviet aircraft flying off the Alaskan coast took place last December 6. The interception was a peaceful one, but important to show that it could be done. It did a great deal for Alaskan military morale, and it is considered certain its importance was not lost on the Russians.

Two Convair F-102 fighters took off from Galena and intercepted two Soviet TU-16 Badger medium bomber aircraft apparently on a routine electronics "snooping" mission. The bombers were 30,000 feet above the Arctic Ocean at a point about 120 miles north of Point Barrow.

The interceptors flew close to the Badgers for a short time, as the Russians were returning toward their bases in the Anadyr Peninsula. No shots were fired by either side; the Russians were over international waters. The U.S. interceptors, at the limit of their range, had to drop their wing tanks to return to base.

Alaska's manned fighter aircraft, which are also important for visual identification of unknown planes, are backed up by two Army Nike-Hercules missile battalions, for close-in defense of the Fairbanks and Anchorage areas.

In addition to the combat F-102's, the Alaskan Air Command flies more than 80 administrative, supply, and support aircraft. These include the old workhorse, the C-47, and the C-123, both used for air supply of outlying radar sites. These and other aircraft are obsolete. The C-47 has been grounded all over the world for wing inspection since a Montana National Guard C-47 lost one of its wings in flight. Metal fatigue has been discovered in many of these aircraft, and their scrapping or major factory-made modifications are indicated. The C-123's with narrow landing gear are extremely difficult to handle in the crosswinds often on Alaskan strips.

The Army in Alaska operates, in addition to the Nike Hercules battalions, two task forces with special equipment and organization built around the 2d Battle Group, 60th Infantry, at Fort Wainwright near Fairbanks and the 1st Battle Group, 23d Infantry at Fort Richardson, near Anchorage.

These task forces, with three mechanized rifle companies carried in armored personnel carriers, self-propelled and pack 75 mm. howitzers, and light tank companies, became far more mobile last year. Their new mobility came with the organization of an Army aviation battalion of helicopters and light fixed-wing aircraft, a total of about 80 Army aircraft.

GROUND MOBILITY

Forty powerful tracked cargo transporters, called the Nodwell, made by a Canadian company, and a number of M-116 1½-ton tracked carriers have increased ground mobility.

Maj. Gen. John H. Michaelis, Army commander in Alaska, hopes to create one airborne company of infantrymen from spaces saved in administrative, support, and overhead functions. Hundreds of men already have been shifted within the theater from administrative or support to combat or combat-support units. There are more than 12,400 Army troops in Alaska.

The Navy in Alaska is the smallest of the three services, with fewer than 4,000 uniformed personnel assigned to its 2 bases at Kodiak and Adak. Rear Adm. Henry H. Caldwell, who is soon to be relieved, is responsible to the Alaskan command, but as commander of the Alaskan Sea Frontier he is also operationally responsible to the Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet, with headquarters in Hawaii.

The Navy's principal activities are submarine and shipping patrols, carried out principally by one squadron of land-based patrol aircraft.

The principal changed in the Alaskan defense picture in the last few years or now impending follow:

The deactivation of one fighter squadron in Alaska (one remains) and transfer of Ladd Air Force Base near Fairbanks to the Army, and its redesignation as Fort Wainwright.

Transfer of the Army's Arctic Test Center from Churchill in Canada, to Fort Wainwright. This center, where engineering tests of new equipment are conducted by the Army's various technical services, may be combined under one command with the Army's Arctic Test Board at Fort Greeley, Alaska, when the pending Army reorganization is completed.

The Army's ice-free port of Whittier, 62 miles by rail south of Anchorage, has been closed, for economy reasons, for shipment of dry cargo. The installations there, except for the fuel oil storage tanks are now deemed in excess of needs, and may be sold by the Government, if there are any takers.

A project to increase the capacity of the 62-mile, 8-inch oil pipeline from Haines to Fairbanks has been approved by the Army. The number of pumping stations will be increased from 5 to 11.

Impending transfer of the microwave, landline and cable Alaska Communications System, long operated by the Army, to control of the Air Force to be operated integrally with the system of radio communications operated by the Radio Corp. of America for the Air Force. All systems will be under the Defense Communication Agency.

Communication channels to Shemya, where important intelligence installations are situated, are being improved and an automatic all-State dialing system installed. A modified automatic data presentation system for air interception work is planned.

A YUKON CLINIC

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a few months ago, four Alaskans, two of them physicians, a trained nurse, who was the wife of one of them, and an optician, traveled through the remoter parts of Alaska whose population is almost wholly native; that is, composed of descendants of Alaska's aboriginal population—Indian and Eskimo.

This team carried on clinics in eight villages and there treated the eye, ear, nose, throat, and dental ills of the inhabitants. The four participants are to be highly commended for this fine undertaking. In addition to the physical relief afforded the patients they treated, their visit and the published accounts thereof disclose graphically the health

lacks and needs of a large proportion of Alaska's remoter rural communities.

While I am not prepared to endorse or disagree with the accompanying and incidental criticisms—which would require considerable analysis to place in proper perspective—of the performance of the Alaska Native Health Service, which is a part of the U.S. Public Health Service, the article by Dr. Milo Fritz sharply draws attention to a condition of ill health which calls for more effective remedial action than has existed hitherto. In initiating these clinics, Dr. and Mrs. Fritz, and their two associates, Dr. Nancy Lyman and Mr. John Spahn, have rendered a valuable service.

Though substantial gains have been made in the last decade and a half in an area of almost total previous neglect in drastically diminishing the incidence of tuberculosis among the natives of Alaska, which may in a large degree be attributed to the crusading efforts of Dr. C. Earl Albrecht, Alaska's first full-time commissioner of health—now assistant commissioner of health of the State of Pennsylvania—who enlisted both Federal and territorial support, very much remains to be done. Nor should this purpose—to be effective—be limited to medical care. It calls for educational and economic measures which will afford greater opportunities for self-help and better livelihoods for a substantial number of American citizens who live on little better than a bare subsistence basis. Such programs as the area redevelopment and retraining projects, inaugurated by the Kennedy administration, are steps in the right direction. But the advance needs to be made on a coordinated front of resource development, vocational education and resulting jobs, environmental hygiene, improved housing, better communications—in vast Alaskan areas wholly roadless—and a realization translated into action that standards of living need substantial improvement right here at home—"home" signifying for many of our own fellow Americans.

As President Kennedy said in the opening paragraph of his message to Congress last Thursday, March 1: The strength of a nation "can be no greater than the health and vitality of its population. Preventable sickness, disability, and physical or mental incapacity are matters of both individual and national concern."

And in his concluding paragraph, he said:

Good health is a prerequisite to the enjoyment of pursuit of happiness.

And his final sentences are peculiarly applicable to the very condition with which we are here dealing—the health of our Alaskan natives:

Whenever the miracles of modern medicine are beyond the reach of any group of Americans, for whatever reason—economic, geographic, occupational or other—we must find a way to meet their needs and fulfill their hopes. For one true measure of a nation is its success in fulfilling the promise of a better life for each of its members. Let this be the measure of our Nation.

Let us hope that the President's ringing words will be followed by appropriate

action by those agencies entrusted with the pertinent responsibilities. I intend to do what I can to help bring this about.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "A Yukon Clinic," from Northwest Medicine, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

A YUKON CLINIC

(By Milo H. Fritz, M.D., Anchorage, Alaska)

In 30 providentially sunny days from June 3 through July 3, 1961, my wife, a nurse, and Mr. John Spahn, a Guild optician, and I, held an itinerant eye, nose, and throat and dental clinic in the Yukon Valley of Alaska. We were accompanied on this safari by Nancy Sydnam, a general practitioner of Anchorage. Dr. Sydnam went under the aegis of the Alaska chapter of the American Cancer Society and will report upon her observations in a separate communication. The remaining expenses were underwritten for the most part by the other three members of the group. The clinic was conducted, as the bureaucrats have it, "at no expense to the Government."

EIGHT VILLAGES SELECTED

On the basis of letters sent to 28, we chose 8 villages, arbitrarily, and held clinics in 6 of them. This account deals with the eye, ear, nose, and throat and dental aspects of the clinic. Dr. Sydnam lent her assistance and talent all along the way especially in the performance of preoperative physical examinations and crucial advice as to whether or not we should proceed with certain operations in the light of complicating physical findings. In four instances, she took time to stand by during the anesthesia and surgery of four particularly difficult cases badly in need of tonsillectomy and adenoidectomy. One of these had congenital heart disease and three others, all in the same family, had congenital methemoglobinemia.

Dr. Sydnam and my wife, using commercial transportation, arrived in Shageluk, our first stop, on the Innoko River on June 3, about 2 o'clock in the afternoon. Mr. Spahn and I flew in my four-place Piper Tri-Pacer on floats, arriving in Shageluk shortly after the ladies.

SUPPLIES

We lived in a log mission house and held our clinic in the parish hall, also of log construction. Ether, "trade goods" (lollipops), disposable paper drapes and towels, gauze, tonsil sponges, and adenoid tampons with strings attached had been sent by air freight from Anchorage to this and the other five villages in which we hoped to do surgery. On the day we left Anchorage, between the four of us we brought along dental instruments, seven sets of tonsil and adenoid instruments, as well as a suction pressure ether machine and our own clothing. We had determined earlier that electricity, 110 volts, alternating current, was available at each of the proposed stops.

The clinic motto was "Education, Participation, and Responsibility." We permitted any interested villagers to watch everything we did from dental extractions and refractions to ether anesthesia and tonsil and adenoid cases and tonsillectomies done under local anesthesia. This was the education.

In each village from eager volunteers we chose one girl to be my surgical assistant, one to scrub instruments, one to change scrub basins and keep alcohol rinse basins full, one to sit with the postoperative patients, and six boys to be ambulance crew. This constituted participation. None of these eager volunteers had passed the sixth grade in formal education, but all made up

by eagerness, willingness, and heroic ability their formal education deficiencies.

In each village we had a collapsible army cot supplied by a native family and this was used as the ambulance to carry the post-operative patients back to their cabins after recovery from the anesthesia. Supplying the cot was the responsibility of the ambulance crew along with promptness in appearing for duty. The responsibility of each parent or foster parent was for the appearance of his children at the proper time with a blanket and without having anything by mouth after midnight of the evening before or after breakfast at 8 o'clock, if the child was scheduled for operation in the afternoon. We used our four air mattresses on the floor for the patients; the ambulance cot was bed No. 5.

TEAMWORK

Dr. Sydnam did the preoperative general physicals. Mr. Spahn did the optical dispensing and ran the ether suction pressure machine. My wife trained the surgical assistants, did the logistics of briefing patients, urging promptness, and explaining the importance of having nothing to eat for 6 hours prior to surgery. She also administered the 2 hour preoperative intramuscular Thorazine and the 1 hour preoperative hypodermic injection of atropine sulphate and Demerol. We boiled the instruments and set them up for use during the 2 hours between injections and the start of operations. We used either the cook stove of a neighboring cabin or a Yukon stove outdoors for the boiling of water and of instruments, depending on which was convenient. The people supplied the wood.

On the days for surgery we did five tonsil and adenoids or tonsillectomies between 10 a.m. and noon and five more between 2 and 4 in the afternoon. The rest of the day we pulled teeth, looked over the next day's patients or did general examinations, refractions and, of course, washed the instruments we had used and cleaned up the hospital.

CONSTANT VIGILANCE

My job was to give the anesthesia and operate, calling on John to increase or decrease the amount of ether as the occasion demanded. I also did the flying and shared photographic chores with the others. Also, the plane had to be watched over in case of rising or falling water levels in the rivers, change in the strength and direction of the wind, or the appearance of logs floating down the rivers and acting as battering rams against everything that they touched. Also, screws had to be tightened or replaced and constant tinkering had to be indulged in to keep the plane in tiptop flying condition. Constant vigilance (and tinkering) is the price not only of liberty but also of trouble-free aviation.

We were in Shageluk (population 155) on the Innoko River June 3 through 10. We did 21 tonsil and adenoids, 2 tonsillectomies, extracted a few teeth and prescribed 15 pairs of spectacles. Four Zenith hearing aids were prescribed and individual ear molds were made. Four audiograms were done. We found three cases of chronic mastoiditis and two cases needing tonsil and adenoids that we had no time to do. One patient needed eye muscle surgery for strabismus.

SOME CAME BY BOAT

Almost all of the people of Holikachuk (population 122), also on the Innoko, came down by boat to Shageluk. We did nine tonsil and adenoids, four tonsillectomies, extracted many teeth and prescribed 14 pairs of glasses. Three audiograms were performed and one hearing aid was prescribed. In this village five patients still need tonsil and adenoids, two need tonsillectomies, one very badly requires a submucous resection of the nasal septum, and one a dacryocystorhinostomy. One hearing aid was prescribed.

On June 10 through 15 we were at Huslia (population 168) on the Koyukuk River. Three audiograms were made, 3 hearing aids and 13 pairs of spectacles were prescribed; 23 tonsil and adenoids, 1 adenoidectomy and 2 tonsillectomies were performed. Many teeth were extracted. Three patients still require tonsil and adenoids, three need tonsillectomies and one needs a mastoidectomy.

We were in Allakaket (population 115) on the Koyukuk River June 15 through 20. Here we did 22 tonsils and adenoids, 5 tonsillectomies, extracted a few teeth and prescribed 2 pairs of glasses. Five of the patients had come up the Koyukuk by air or boat from Hughes (population 69) for tonsils and adenoids.

ON THE YUKON

At Stevens Village (population 102) on the Yukon River we worked June 20 through 23. Many teeth were extracted, 14 tonsils and adenoids were done, 14 pairs of spectacles were prescribed, 2 patient were found who needed mastoidectomies, 1 needed a submucous resection of the nasal septum, and 1 a tonsil and adenoid.

Farther up the Yukon, June 23 through 27, we worked at Beaver (population 101). Here we did 21 tonsils and adenoids, 7 tonsillectomies and extracted many teeth. We were unable to do 3 additional tonsillectomies and 4 tonsils and adenoids. One mastoidectomy, reported to the Alaska Native Health Service in 1953, still needed to be done. One patient needs a cataract extraction and one a bilateral pterygium transplantation.

Finally, at Venetie (population 107), on the Chandalar River, we brought our clinic to a close. Before we could start we had to breathe life into one of two nonfunctioning diesel electric plants. A 12-volt storage battery from my plane saved the day and we did 17 tonsils and adenoids, 4 tonsillectomies and extracted innumerable teeth and prescribed 9 pairs of glasses. We left undone 8 mastoidectomies, 5 tonsillectomies, 2 tonsils and adenoids and 1 repair of an oronasal fistula.

NO FEELING OF CHARITY

Each patient was charged \$6 for single vision and \$8 for multifocal glasses—the rate charged by the State for the same type of spectacles. The difference between this price and the actual cost plus \$1 is made up by funds supplied through the Eye, Ear, Nose, and Throat Foundation of Alaska, Inc. Where the \$6 or \$8 worked a hardship on certain individuals, as little as 25 cents was charged. In this way no patient ever had to feel he was an object of charity.

All patients who needed eye, ear, nose, and throat work that was not done will be reported by name, age, sex, diagnosis and village to the Alaska Native Health Service, as has been done for many years.

I gave 128 general anesthetics for 127 tonsils and adenoids and 1 adenoidectomy. I removed 24 pairs of tonsils under local anesthesia and extracted a derby hat full of teeth. The indications for all tonsil and adenoid surgery were advanced middle ear and mastoid disease. The indications for dental work were advanced caries and chronic severe pain. Glasses were prescribed to improve vision or restore it to normal.

ALASKA NATIVE HEALTH SERVICE

Ours is a compassionate and generous Nation. Unable to help our own people on an individual basis, we, through our Congress, established in Alaska the Alaska Native Health Service to do it for us—supplying this agency of our Government \$11 million a year to care for 35,000 natives.

Middle ear and mastoid disease are crippling thousands and killing scores of our fellow citizens in Alaska because the Alaska Native Health Service will not institute a training program for their young surgeons

in the proper performance of tonsillectomies or tonsils and adenoids. It refuses to establish a continuous tonsil and adenoid program in its six hospitals because it is "too dangerous." It will not supply the instruments for doing tonsils and adenoids and tonsillectomies to these hospitals even though the cost would be less than \$2,000. It will not supply nurse anesthetists to give anesthesia for these vital but simple operations.

A CLINIC TO ST. MARY'S

During March 1961, I performed at no expense to the Government, 71 tonsils and adenoids or tonsillectomies at St. Mary's Mission giving about 50 ether anesthetics myself. This was done in 5 days. Forty of these seventy-one patients had been reported to the Alaska Native Health Service as being badly in need of tonsils and adenoids or tonsillectomies 1 year previously. The Alaska Native Health Service in the ensuing year had done two of these cases. In anger and disgust and with the loyal help of the mission staff, 71 operations were performed. The entire episode was described editorially in Northwest Medicine as "A Clinic to St. Mary's," copies of which were distributed by the editor to newspapers throughout the country. In addition, a copy of the editorial was sent to each member of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association, each member of the U.S. Congress in Washington, D.C., and to each member of the legislature of the State of Alaska.

At first there was no reaction at all from the U.S. Public Health Service. Eventually the Service categorically denied that any of its officers had promised the removal of the tonsils and adenoids of the 40 children at St. Mary's Mission. A thermofax copy of the letter regarding this promise was forwarded to the editor of the Washington Report on Medical Sciences in which the U.S. Public Health Service refutation appeared. Next in this same publication a faceless and unidentified official of the U.S. Public Health Service said that in the fiscal year 1961 the Alaska Native Health Service had done 600 tonsils and adenoids. I would like to underscore the total inadequacy of this effort by pointing out that 40 medical officers with 6 hospitals in 1 year and an \$11 million budget were able to do 611 operations where thousands needed to be performed, while 1 individual in 5 weeks with no hospital, giving his own anesthetics and spending his own money, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$6,000, was able to do 227 operations.

INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC

The purpose of this communication is not to publicize my own ability, such as it is, as an otolaryngologist. Its purpose is to point out to the interested and enlightened public the absolute falsity of the Alaska Native Health Service claim that this kind of surgery cannot be done safely in six well-equipped hospitals with adequate personnel who could easily be trained here and with nurse anesthetists that are either available or can easily be trained in the administration of a safe, ether anesthetic.

I also wish to point out that this procedure of too little, too late and the arrogant dismissal of suggestions from consultants who understand this situation, as apparently the officials of the U.S. Public Health Service do not understand it, must not be permitted to obscure the obvious fact that young medical officers in this service must be trained and must forthwith begin a realistic attack on a disease that results in aural crippling and deafness to so large a number of individuals. After all, the officials of the U.S. Public Health Service and the Alaska Native Health Service are not sufficient unto themselves. They have not been given a mandate by the people to pursue their own course in all the

specialties of medicine without advice from the outside. Because of the natural deficiencies in any organization they retain consultants of whom I was one until May of this year when I resigned in order to carry on what has been described. Nevertheless, this year and for many years preceding, they have disregarded and ignored the suggestions outlined and reiterated in this paper.

It is not unfair or inappropriate at this time to point out to those who feel the Federal Government should practice medicine just how inefficient, calloused and arrogant officials can become, protected as they are by a monolithic bureaucracy and an astronomical budget for which no well-publicized accounting is ever made.

Many letters from all sorts of individuals throughout our Nation were received as a result of the editorial, "A Clinic to St. Mary's." It was very comforting to find that our citizens are indeed concerned over the plight of the native people of Alaska. I would respectfully suggest to the interested readers of this contribution that they write not to me but to their representatives in the Senate and House of Representatives in Washington, urging that this simple program be undertaken at once and prosecuted with vigor for as many years as it takes to eradicate this easily preventable affliction from crippling or killing more of our fellow citizens. Let all who read consider: "A nation that neglects its children has forgotten God."

"CROSSROADS TO ADVENTURE IN ALASKA" — ANCHORAGE'S FUR RENDEZVOUS IN THE 49TH STATE'S METROPOLIS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Anchorage, Alaska's metropolis and transportation crossroads of the northern hemisphere, is celebrating its annual fur rendezvous. This midwinter carnival was first established in 1955 and has become gayer and more glamorous with each passing year.

Its handsome current 74-page program printed on glossy paper and entitled "Crossroads to Adventure in Alaska" is profusely illustrated with scenic, human interest, and action photographs, which reveal the amazing variety of sport and entertainment. The rendezvous program contains also a foreword entitled "This Is Anchorage—All-America City."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Anchorage is a busy city. Bolsterous shopping centers sprout where once cabins stood. A bold, new university splits yesterday's wilderness. The machinery of a modern port buds, now beckoning the world's shipping. A proud ski resort explodes away the cold isolation of a mountain peak. Steel and glass structures swiftly replace the old frames and false fronts. Everywhere progress carves the changing face of the future.

But for all the youthful dynamism, Anchorage is a city softly mature. With less than half a century trailing in her past, she boasts more in media, cultural activity, transportation, and general community consciousness than cities twice her size.

For serving Anchorage are two daily newspapers, six radio stations, two television stations, a community chorus, a civic ballet, a symphony orchestra, little theater groups, and the full gamut of sports activities. International air routes spoke out over her

head; arteries of pavement radiate from her heart; iron rails thread the wilderness from her busy foothold; and waves of communication break from her breast to the reaches of all Alaska.

Yes, Anchorage is a busy city. A city full of busy people. Here are dreamers, mavericks, restless ones—people from all corners of the world—who want to be a part of a program unbound by tradition. Here, too, are the sourdoughs, the pioneers of Alaska. And here with all of them are the makings of a new and plastic tradition unique in the world.

Fringed on the north and west by the waters of Cook Inlet and on the east by the untamed Chugach Mountains, Anchorage lies on a rolling coastal plain with a climate much like southern Norway. The city is a button of activity surrounded by a vastness of Alaska's awesome beauty. Downtown Anchorage, as focused from Fourth Avenue, is a colony of fashionable shops; haughty office buildings and plush hotels at one end, exciting night spots at the other. During the week, Fourth Avenue buzzes with the business of traders, shoppers, and visitors. Sunday is a quiet day and the avenue slows to the pace of strollers. When dark, a jungle of neon flares and Anchorage's blaring night life takes command. Mingled with the businessmen, servicemen, and travelers are construction men and sourdoughs in for a visit from the bush.

And Anchorage is prime access to thousands of square miles of hunting-fishing paradise. The season's opening is cue for a rendezvous of the world's sportsmen, Alaska's registered guides and outfitters. Major fishing derbies are within easy reach; bush pilots' schedules are jammed with trips to the wild country. And the huntsmen's record books are replete with examples of Alaska's big game offering—Dall sheep, mountain goat, all species of bear, moose, caribou, deer.

Anchorage is also headquarters for the State's newest, brightest industry—oil. Drills probe the nearby Kenai Peninsula, and tankers ply south from Nikiska Beach with a 28,000-barrel-per-day production of Alaska crude.

Yes, Anchorage is a busy city, a city in hot pursuit of a wonder-filled future.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that committees of the Senate be authorized to file reports during the recess of the Senate between today and Thursday next.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination sent to the Senate by the President of the United States and reported today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the nomination will be stated.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President's nomination to fill the vacancy on the Railroad Retirement Board has been reported unanimously by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor

and Public Welfare. It has been cleared on both sides of the aisle. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arlon E. Lyon, of California, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

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.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

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

McNAMARA WARNS OF WASTE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the New York Times of March 5 reports in a front-page article by Jack Raymond reporting the considered view of the Secretary of Defense that a program to go into production now with the controversial B-70 high-speed manned bomber would be a "serious waste of the Nation's resources." Mr. Raymond is the Times' top Pentagon reporter, with an outstanding record for careful, accurate coverage of military affairs. This article, based as it is on the Secretary's answers to specific questions, can be considered authoritative. This is, of course, the Secretary's response to the unanimous action of the House Armed Services Committee on Thursday in ordering the Pentagon to spend \$491 million more than the administration had intended on the B-70 program.

Secretary McNamara's position on the B-70 program is that "it does not appear wise at this time" to make a final commitment on what is estimated to be a \$10 billion investment for the supersonic, high-altitude manned bomber. He repeated his previously stated position that if future circumstances would appear to make production of the B-70 desirable, the program could then be put into effect. But he believes that for the present it is wiser to proceed with the completion of the prototype development stage before moving into full production.

It is on this particular point that Secretary McNamara's opinions carry special authority. His many years of experience in manufacturing as a production expert give him an excellent grasp on questions of this kind. He is outstandingly qualified to evaluate the costs and benefits of such a program.

Secretary McNamara has earned the high regard of many individuals with responsibility for our Nation's defense, including Senators and Representatives. His views on this serious question will, I know, be an important factor in the decision on appropriating funds this year for the B-70 program.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Raymond's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

McNAMARA WARNS OF WASTE IN PLAN FOR FLEET OF B-70'S—ASSERTS IT IS NOT WISE NOW TO GO BEYOND PRODUCTION OF THREE PROTOTYPE BOMBERS

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, March 4.—Adoption of an Air Force plan to produce the controversial B-70 bomber in quantity would be a "serious waste of the Nation's resources," Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara said today.

In response to questions, he expressed the opinion that it "does not appear wise at this time" to make a final commitment on what he estimated would be a \$10 billion production program for the proposed supersonic high-altitude bomber.

The Secretary pointed out, as he has in the past, that the administration's plans would permit a production program in the future "if circumstances appear to make this desirable."

Mr. McNamara commented on the bomber program in view of a sudden revival of agitation for a production plan that previously had been rejected by the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations.

PLAN REJECTED BY KENNEDY

Present plans are limited to developing plane prototypes. Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, made a personal appeal for production of the B-70 as a weapons system in a White House visit a few weeks ago. But President Kennedy turned him down.

The Air Force won support in Congress, however.

The House Armed Services Committee unanimously voted on Thursday to "direct" the Pentagon to spend \$491 million more than the administration had intended on the B-70 program. The extra money would permit development of the airplane as a weapons system, in accordance with Air Force wishes, rather than limiting it to three prototypes.

The B-70 bomber, recently redesignated officially as the RS-70 for reconnaissance strike, has had a long history of delays and reprogramming during which more than \$1 billion has been laid out for it. Preliminary studies on the plane were begun in 1953. It was pictured as a high altitude bomber that could travel 3 times the speed of sound, or some 2,200 miles an hour. It was given the name of Valkyrie.

PRIME CONTRACTOR CHOSEN

Following a competition in which the Boeing Aircraft Co. and North American Aviation Corp. were the leaders, North American was selected as the prime contractor in 1957. The first contract was issued with the idea of having the first plane by June 1962, and a wing of 45 operational bombers early in 1966.

In January 1958, Gen. Thomas D. White, then Air Force Chief of Staff, ordered an acceleration of the program to provide the first wing by about 18 months earlier than originally scheduled. But President Eisenhower, in a budget review, ordered a reduction in the funding. This put off the production schedule by 1 year.

The program to develop the B-70 as a weapons system was terminated by the Eisenhower administration a year later. The Pentagon was directed to develop a single prototype aircraft.

In the ensuing public and private debate, Congress sided with the Air Force and appropriated more money for the plane than the administration had sought, but President Eisenhower refused to spend it.

OBsolescence FORESEEN

General Eisenhower, in an argument that has since been picked up by the Kennedy administration, contended that the plane would not come into inventory until U.S. missile strength would make it obsolete.

The Kennedy administration increased the investment in the B-70 to permit the development to three prototype airplanes. However, it also rejected congressional appropriations to start a full-scale production line. A powerful Air Force campaign last year, including emphasis on Soviet advances in manned aircraft, failed to reverse the administration position.

This year the administration requested \$1,200,000 to continue developing the plane simply for test purposes.

But General LeMay, in testimony before Congress, advocated a \$5 million expenditure. He pointed to existing plans to shut down production this year on B-52 and B-58 bombers. Thus, without the B-70, the United States would have no manned bombers earmarked for future production.

Secretary McNamara discussed the B-70 program with General LeMay and Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert yesterday morning. In an interview later, Mr. McNamara said:

"The program which I recommended to the President and which he has presented to Congress proposes the expenditure of \$1,300 million for the development of the B-70. In accordance with this program, the first B-70 will fly in December 1962, the second in September 1963, and the third in June 1964."

SAYS CHOICE REMAINS

"This program provides us with the option of introducing the plane into full production in the future if circumstances appear to make this desirable. The 1963 military program and budget provides for over 1,000 Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles, plus 41 submarines with over 650 Polaris missiles, plus more than 1,000 B-52, B-47, and B-58 bombers.

"In view of the size of these forces, it does not appear wise at this time to make a final commitment to a \$10 billion B-70 production program. To do so would, in my opinion, be a serious waste of the Nation's resources."

The Secretary's session with the Air Force leaders was reported to be amicable. Afterward, Mr. McNamara and Mr. Zuckert, a friend and associate of many years, played squash in the Pentagon gym. The 50-year-old Air Force Secretary, 5 years older than his superior, won the match.

Once again official sources emphatically denied rumors that General LeMay and the administration were at such odds over the B-70 program and other strategic weapons programs that his resignation was pending.

The Secretary did not comment on the House Armed Services Committee's action in seeking to direct the Pentagon to spend on the B-70. In keeping with past practice, he reserved comment until congressional action was final.

WISCONSIN PURE MILK COOPERATIVE SUPPORTS PRESIDENT'S FARM BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last week the Senate Agriculture Committee conducted hearings on the President's farm bill, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. In those hearings an excellent and concise statement was furnished by Mr. William Eckles, manager of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative of Fond du Lac, Wis., which cooperative, incidentally, has a membership of over 15,000 dairy farmers.

Mr. Eckles devoted special attention to the provisions of the bill affecting the dairy industry. He strongly supported enactment of the resolution recommended by the President to maintain dairy price supports at their present level until the end of the year, to give dairy farmers time to work out a program to cope with the sudden sharp rise in surpluses, due principally to the unexpected, unprecedented drop in consumption this past year.

He also suggested five specific amendments, on important matters of detail in the President's proposed dairy program, which would make it a more satisfactory and equitable means of enabling producers to set their output at levels which can be marketed at fair prices.

The statement furnished by Bill Eckles concludes: "We urge adoption of the 'food and agriculture program of 1962' with the aforementioned suggested changes."

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE, FOND DU LAC, WIS., IN SUPPORT OF BILL S. 2786—THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1962

This organization, made up of over 15,000 Wisconsin dairy farmers, supports the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962.

The organization considers it a privilege to submit its views on this all-important subject. Agriculture is the basic industry of the country, and its prosperity is the basis of the Nation's economic well-being. If agriculture is in a depression, other branches of our economy will soon be in trouble with unemployment and depressed business activity.

The proposals to use and properly manage an abundant agriculture in needed quantities without undue waste and expense is sound, logical, and sensible.

The conservation of our resources that are presently unneeded for future people of this and other countries is sound and a worthy investment. Their use in providing recreational and conservation projects until needed for food and fiber production are worthy projects.

The development of resources in rural areas is an activity of great future value. People kept occupied, employed, and located in rural areas, will not burden unemployment rolls and replace urban people as employees.

Agriculture's abundant production has not to date been fully usable. Great population growth will not, in the near future, use the products of American farms.

High storage costs or carrying big stockpiles are uneconomical to taxpayers and the Government. Overproduction depresses

prices and farm returns unless Government supports prices at reasonable levels.

A sounder program than overproduction stockpiled at great expense or ruinously low prices because of reduced Government expenditures for supports, seems to be a managed production and marketing program for agricultural products.

We will direct our primary concern to the dairy programs of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. This is the business closest to this organization.

We strongly believe milk and dairy products are sufficiently essential as foods to merit special consideration.

We urge continuation of the present support program at \$3.40 per hundredweight until this Congress can develop a program that would be voted upon by dairy farmers of the Nation. The program should give the milk producers an opportunity to balance supplies with needs in turn for a higher income.

We urge special care in developing a dairy program. Dairying is a long-term, expensive, confining, agricultural pursuit.

We would request that Congress consider amendments to the dairy provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 as proposed that would:

1. Assure protection from imports while farmers are living with quotas or allotments to balance dairy and milk marketings and consumption. It seems very illogical for American dairy farmers to be subject to limitations if low-grade, cheaply produced foreign products are permitted to come in.

2. Permit the retention of dairy production in areas to which it is obviously best adapted. The movement of quotas or allotments from one area to another should be carefully supervised and controlled, so that they did not move to uneconomic regions. The movement of quotas or allotments into the hands of speculators or non-bona fide dairy farmers must be prevented.

3. Provide a level of supports that are more specific than the present draft provides. The 75-percent floor in effect for several years would seem a logical base from which price levels would operate. We believe the dairy program should be assured of this floor, because of the importance of milk and dairy products as the most essential and basic food. We also believe the 90-percent ceiling should be removed. Records of the USDA indicate that dairy farm labor returns are far below other pursuits. Parity of income would be a better objective.

4. Prohibit the declaration of deficit or short production areas, except in cases of extreme emergencies. We know of no area where sufficient milk is not available to supply the fluid product needs of the area. Manufactured products can be easily moved to these areas from regions of most economic domestic production.

5. Provide for quotas or allotments on all milk producers who market milk or butterfat products from their farms. The setting of a volume below which the production or marketing allotments would not apply, would be invitations to hundreds of small operations even within the same families to evade the requirements. Commercial dairy farm operators are entitled to protection from the scads of small exempt operations that would tend to develop if any exceptions are allowed.

The principle of giving a producer of a commodity, in this case milk, an individual voice in the program he desires, is reasonable.

We urge the adoption of the "Food and Agriculture Program of 1962" with the aforementioned suggested changes.

Producers of milk and butterfat are entitled to a vote on a program prior to its adoption.

We recommend the adoption of the legislation with a retention of the present price

levels and program, until this long-term program could go to dairy farmers for their approval or disapproval.

REBUTTAL OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE EXTREME RIGHTWING

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last Friday, March 2, the New York Times published an excellent summary from a booklet entitled "Communism: Threat to Freedom," by the Reverend John F. Cronin, which was published by the National Catholic Welfare Conference. In my judgment, the pamphlet deserves the careful attention of all of us who are interested in national unity and a sound approach to national and international social and political problems. It is an effective rebuttal of the philosophy of the extreme rightwing, which has been so vocal in the public prints during the past year or so. I congratulate the Catholic Church and the Reverend John F. Cronin for having sponsored so effective a statement of true Americanism, and I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the booklet be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

EXCERPTS FROM CATHOLIC BOOKLET ON THE RIGHTWING

The Communist Party in the United States dates from 1919. During the 43 years of its existence here, it has varied in strength and effectiveness. For 15 years, 1935-50, it prospered both in terms of numbers and influence. After 1950, a sharp decline set in. By the 1960's, it reached its lowest ebb in terms of membership, finances, and influence on American opinion and policy.

The Communists that remain are by no means inactive. But compared with their activities and influence 20 years ago, Communists today are weak and impotent. Yet, in the 1960's, strong reaction against domestic communism is sweeping the land. Well financed and attended crusades, which would have been manna from heaven in 1946, are increasingly evident. Speakers and writers for such groups are vigorously fighting problems that were mostly solved by 1950, and neglecting the far greater dangers of Communist subversion in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and the general world Communist offensive.

In many parts of the country, hysteria and suspicion are becoming increasingly evident. A virulent form of disunity is weakening us in the world struggle against communism, and performing this disservice in the name of militant anticommunism. Many Americans are confused and bewildered by the whole trend.

FALSE PROPHETS MISLEAD

It is easy to dismiss such events by name calling. But such an approach is unfair to millions of Americans who desperately want to do something about communism. They have been misled by false prophets, but these ordinary Americans are not extremists or crackpots.

Their basic problem is frustration and even fear. They have seen the Soviet Union apparently gaining in its struggle to communize the world. Those who would have Americans concentrate on a minor threat of domestic subversion and ignore subversion and Communist pressures in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America are misleading the American people. Whatever their motives, they are effectively aiding the Communist cause.

They are most effective when they can quote "experts" to bolster their cause.

There are three types of "experts" whose credentials should be scrutinized with care. They are former agents of the FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation), former informants for the FBI, and persons who have had first-hand contact with the Communist Party, either as members or victims.

Many of the more vocal anti-Communist groups have connected communism with social philosophies they find unpopular. Many, for example, use the argument expressed by a former high Government official in late 1961. It runs this way: Liberalism (or the Fair Deal or the New Frontier) is the same as the welfare state. The welfare state is socialism. And the Communists say that they are Socialists. Hence, liberalism is communism.

BAD LOGIC IS DISCERNED

Actually this statement is bad logic and worse history. As logic, it would make the encyclical of Pope John XXIII, *Mater et Magistra* (Christianity and Social Progress), a defense of communism. The encyclical advocates or does not approve many specific items rejected by extremist groups (the use of the income tax to equalize burdens, and to undeveloped natives, Government action to smooth out economic change, social insurance, and to agriculture, housing subsidies, etc.).

The violent and bitter struggle for racial equality in the United States has often prompted charges that Communists were behind these activities.

Actually, it is an amazing fact that the Communists have had such little success among the Negroes.

In fact, Negro leaders and the overwhelming majority of Negro people have rejected Communist influence and have insisted that they are true Americans. Whenever Communist influence is detected by the NAACP (National Association for Advancement of Colored People) or CORE, it is promptly removed.

Protestant churches, especially the National Council of Churches, have also been a target for attack. Behind these attacks one usually finds opposition to the "social gospel" or to alleged modernist trends in organized protestantism.

PROTESTANT CLERGY DEFENDED

Communist influence among the Protestant clergy today is virtually nonexistent.

Some anti-Communist sources are also anti-Semitic. These groups are small and have little influence except among bigots. The organized Jewish community in the United States is strongly opposed to communism.

Groups opposed to the United Nations often use alleged Communist infiltration or even control as a weapon in attacking this organization.

Some of these opponents are basically isolationist and use the Communist charge as a handy weapon. Catholics who deny our international responsibilities do so in the face of repeated papal assertions of our moral obligation to seek world order, world prosperity and world peace.

The labor movement, and certain labor leaders, have also been the targets of special pleaders. Yet the CIO Congress of Industrial Organizations, wing of the labor movement expelled its Communist unions well before the general public became excited about the problem. Both wings have been working for years to fight for free labor unions, and against Communist unions, in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

DISTORTIONS ARE OUTLINED

Offenses charged to Communist infiltration also include fluoridation of water, promoting mental health, and organized peddling of smut. Yet our organized dental

profession supports fluoridation of water. The medical profession endorses sound mental-health programs. And organized pornography is a commercial venture, with no proven link to the Communist Party.

The menace of communism is much too real and much too worldwide for the American people to tolerate and support the distorted and misleading charges outlined above. Simple honesty and respect for truth should be adequate reasons for avoiding these efforts. But they are more than dishonest, they are also divisive. They sow distrust in our Nation at a time when national unity is imperative. They weaken our democracy by spreading suspicions of treason in Government and asking Americans to use Communist tactics against fellow Americans. If carried far enough, these movements would paralyze American diplomacy. When every discussion with the Communist powers is considered a sign of weakness or even treason, then we are left with only two stark alternatives: surrender or war. Surely our commonsense should tell us that we should seek some middle course between these extremes.

A mature and strong people have the inner strength to live with occasional frustration and failure. It does not cry disloyalty every time its will is thwarted. When honest mistakes of judgment are made, it seeks to correct them through the democratic process. Temper tantrums resulting from frustrations are not welcomed even in young children. In adults, they are signs of serious immaturity. There is much to be done to combat the menace of world communism. It is time for Americans to close ranks and to fight the real enemy on the real battleground with real weapons. If we fail in this, we shall be so weakened internally that Communist conquest will be inevitable.

For the average citizen who asks: What can I do to fight communism? The answer might well be: Devote all your strength and energy, in concert with your fellow Americans, to build national unity and moral strength. Practice your religion, and make it a vital force in your community. Even in dealing either moral evils, concentrate less on denunciation and more on giving leadership and example. Be a man of integrity in your work. Make your family outstanding by the quality of parental love and discipline you show. Unite with your neighbors for a high moral standard in your community. Work for racial justice and harmony. Do your part to make this a better and stronger Nation, and we shall not fear what the Communists plot and scheme against us.

Above all, we must have a broader vision of world needs.

DISARMAMENT HOPES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we are all hopeful, if not too sanguine, that the conference about to meet in Geneva on the subject of disarmament and peace will result in some meaningful progress in that disputed area. An excellent column on this subject written by the well-known commentator, Peter Edson, appeared in the Washington Daily News on Thursday, March 1. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

DISARMAMENT HOPES

(By Peter Edson)

One stated goal for the 18-power United Nations Disarmament Conference opening in Geneva March 14 is to keep it going till something constructive comes out of it.

The American delegation at the outset will be headed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Director William C. Foster of the new, independent Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and chief U.S. atomic test-ban negotiator Arthur H. Dean. The full delegation with many technicians, advisers, and experts will go prepared for everything but not knowing what to expect.

President Kennedy and British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan will not be there, insuring that the talks will not start off as a summit conference, which Russian Chairman Nikita Khrushchev wants it to be. Khrushchev and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko may or may not be there. If they're not, Russia's test-ban and disarmament monkeywrench thrower, Seymour K. Tsarapkin, is apt to be their head man.

What the other delegations will do—including the eight new neutral members added since the 10-nation West-East disarmament conference was wrecked by the Russians in 1960—is equally up in the air. Still, the outlook is not hopeless.

Both Russia and the Western Powers now openly admit that in a nuclear war there can be no winner—only mutual destruction.

The cost of nuclear weapons and missile delivery is so great that neither side can really afford it and both admit the money should be used for more constructive purposes.

The U.S. delegation goes to Geneva with some new, startling proposals which it hopes the Russians will accept.

One is to open initial zones of inspection for both sides, these zones to be gradually enlarged. This was included in the Soviet plan submitted last September 27.

Another is for the use of sampling techniques for spot checks on compliance and agreed-upon stages of disarmament. This involves some risk, but it opens the door to inspection.

After a period of general debate in plenary session, to educate the new members, the United States hopes that several working committees can be set up to tackle other specific areas.

How to limit vehicles for nuclear weapons delivery. How to establish exchange of information on existing armaments, subject to verification by ground control posts on both sides.

Specific proposals may be submitted on reduction of nuclear materials production, reduction of the dangers of surprise attack, limitation on distribution of nuclear materials and weapons know-how to other countries.

The greatest handicap to reaching an agreement at Geneva is that it may be necessary to settle the Berlin, Vietnam, and other crises before there can be any disarmament.

Also, no disarmament agreement can be made effective unless it is made binding on Communist China.

THE ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF DISARMAMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the morning newspapers, particularly the New York Times, published a summary of a most important study prepared for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, entitled "Economic Impacts of Disarmament." This is the result of the work of a panel presided over by Mr. Emil Benoit, associate professor of international business at Columbia University.

This study deserves the consideration of all Members of the Congress and of the American public generally. I ask unanimous consent that the broad conclusions of the panel, put in summary form and appearing on pages 2 and 3 of

the study, be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY PANEL

(a) That disarmament of the type, and at the pace which the panel considers to be implied by the U.S. program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, submitted to the United Nations on September 25, 1961—after allowance for proposed expansion in National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and civilian Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) programs and the requirements of disarmament inspection and international peace enforcement—should create small danger of provoking immediate depression in our economy, assuming sensible adjustment policies and vigorous Government leadership to dispel adverse effects on business and consumer anticipations and to provide reassurance that aggregate demand will not be allowed to decline precipitantly;

(b) That a steady decline in defense spending spread over several years may prove a significant drag on the economy and pose serious problems for policymakers. These problems can be mastered by the application of appropriate policies, the chief obstacles to which would be political resistance rather than deficiencies in our economic knowledge;

(c) That structural problems in particular industries or areas are unavoidable and could be serious for the individuals, companies, and communities prominently affected;

(d) That the alleviation of these structural difficulties may require a variety of adjustment programs, some providing assistance for the retraining, temporary support, and relocation of individuals and reconversion and diversification of enterprises, some promoting the importation of new industries into areas hard hit by the closing of defense plants and installations, and some, perhaps, seeking new publicly supported uses of national importance for part of our existing defense resources, particularly our capabilities in research and development;

(e) That included in the latter category might be research and development programs on technological bottlenecks impeding international economic development, which could also make a significant contribution to one of our major foreign policy objectives;

(f) That the impact of disarmament would only accentuate structural problems which already exist and which will have to be solved anyhow if the Nation is to produce up to its full potentialities;

(g) That if these problems are overcome, achievement of major national goals will be greatly facilitated by the use of the human and material resources released from the defense program;

(h) That within wide limits the Nation can afford to have as high or as low a level of defense expenditure as is deemed politically desirable and should feel no constraint on the economic side in adjusting defense expenditures to whatever level seems best to accord with our political objectives. However, advance planning by Government at all levels and by business firms, labor unions, and other private organizations is required if the economy is to adjust smoothly to significant changes in the level of defense spending, particularly such as would result from general and complete disarmament.

THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE PROGRAM

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in recent months there has been considerable

public discussion regarding our Reserve and National Guard program. These discussions have followed the mobilization of our military Reserve Forces in connection with the Berlin crisis.

In all, some 150,000 members of the Army and Air National Guard, and Army, Navy, and Air Force Reserve were called to active duty, as President Kennedy has said, "to prevent a war, not to fight a war." But if war had been thrust upon us, they would have been ready.

The quick mobilization of our forces created severe problems. There were some inequities. Some administrative and supply deficiencies came to light. These were corrected in very short order. There were, in addition, some complaints on the part of a relatively few of those called to duty, especially those who had some genuine hardship or personal family problems.

These cases received widespread publicity, but in spite of the few cases which received public attention, there is no doubt that this has been the most successful mobilization, by far, in our Nation's history.

The tragedy of the situation is that a shadow has been cast unfairly on the overwhelming majority of the individuals called—who have worked hard and have carried out their assigned missions and orders effectively and without complaint. I believe that the public should have more information regarding the splendid job our reservists and national guardsmen have done. We have a sound military Reserve program, one which has met the test of time and has furnished the required trained men to meet any emergency, all over the world.

And so today, I want to address my remarks to this end.

I have given this problem considerable study and have made a personal investigation of the facts. It has been my privilege to talk with many of the people who have been called, both officers and enlisted men. Their record speaks for itself. These are outstanding men, dedicated to the task to be performed and loyal to their Nation. I do not think they should be done an injustice, nor that the Reserve and National Guard program should be endangered. In fact, I am convinced that we should put additional emphasis on the maintenance of a ready, trained Reserve Force. Throughout our history, we have maintained this program to our great advantage during times of unforeseen emergencies.

Many times I am asked if I see any prospect of a decrease in the cost of our vast military programs in the near future. I am compelled to answer each time that, in view of the mounting costs of modern weapons, including missiles, I do not see any chance to decrease it soon. The only way to prevent greatly increasing the cost is through a better emphasis on our Reserve and National Guard programs, whereby we utilize the talent and training of men who have already been in the military service, and have been basically trained already, and are prepared to move forward on short notice.

Among the units called, I am proud to say, my home State of Mississippi was very well represented.

Our 153d Air National Guard Tactical Reconnaissance Squadron, with 406 officers and enlisted men, is now serving on active duty at its home station in Meridian. I am very familiar with the outstanding record of this squadron, which has long been one of the Nation's leading Air Guard Squadrons. It was rated combat-ready long before it was mobilized. While it was not deployed to Europe as some of the other Air Guard Squadrons were—and much to its disappointment—it is thoroughly familiar with its overseas deployment route, having flown simulated routes from time to time. It could, with no exaggeration, be deployed on 24 hours' notice.

For the Army, Mississippi has provided 21 separate units. Sixteen of these are Army National Guard units and five are Army Reserve units. These units are now scattered throughout the United States, strengthening our Army in this time of crisis. They are truly a cross-section of our State, with home stations at Bay Saint Louis, Bruce, Calhoun City, Charleston, Clarksdale, Gulfport, Houston, Jackson, McComb, Meridian, Natchez, Pascagoula, Poplarville, Vicksburg, Webb, West Point, and Yazoo City. In all, 1,802 members of the Mississippi National Guard have answered the call to active duty, and more than 300 members of the Army Reserve.

Mr. President, I am glad to say that every Mississippi unit has passed the Army training tests, given to those called to active duty to test their combat readiness. This is an outstanding record and reflects the effectiveness of our National Guard program, under the able leadership of our State adjutant general, Maj. Gen. William P. Wilson.

Our naval reservists from Mississippi have responded in admirable fashion. A number of Navy men were called to active duty, including a naval reconnaissance squadron made up primarily of Mississippians, assigned to duty at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, where they are playing an important role in carrying out our commitments in the Caribbean area. Other Mississippi naval reservists have important assignments.

We are proud of these Mississippi units, just as I am sure my colleagues and their constituents are proud of the units ordered to duty from their home States.

I mention these units from my State not in contrast and not because they are superior to those from other States, but because they are units of which I have personal knowledge. I personally know many of the officers and enlisted men who comprise the units. I even know something about their homelife, and the sacrifices they have made in carrying out their regular training and also when they were called to active duty. I have great pride in them, not only because they are from my home State, but also because they are worthy units of this great Reserve and National Guard program. As I have said, I am sure there are other units just as worthy

in other States. However, it certainly makes one's blood tingle to know some of the very high quality units we do have, and the men in them.

These units were called because we faced a grave national crisis—perhaps the gravest crisis since World War II. Premier Khrushchev was threatening to sign a unilateral peace treaty with the East German puppet government, and thereby, with a single stroke of the pen, end our established rights of access to Berlin. We as a nation were determined to defend these rights—and the freedom of West Berlin—at any cost, even if that cost meant war.

As a result of this impending crisis, President Kennedy asked the Congress for emergency authorization to build up our Armed Forces, short of declaring a national emergency. The Congress responded within a week, authorizing a mobilization of up to 250,000 members of the Reserve components from the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

This callup and the response thereto was a major deterrent factor, and was heard last August and September and October in the Kremlin. I believe this is what turned the tide with reference to the Berlin crisis. No solution has been found to the Berlin crisis, but the active agitation and threats and the imminence of more serious trouble certainly have subsided. It was not due merely to what the President did and what the Congress did, but also, certainly, to what these units did. There was a fine response from these Reserve and National Guard units all over the Nation. These men were taken away from their homes from their firesides, from their professions, from their callings and skills and jobs; away from their families. Instead of a sour response, or complaints across the board, we had as a whole the finest type of response from these men, and an indication of loyalty and dedication and determination to do their part.

That was shared not only by them, but by their families and their business associates, as well. I think it was a great psychological factor in addition to the force that was behind the military numbers involved. That fact within itself was the real deterrent; it was the real noise which got through and was heard by the Kremlin.

One of the most impressive aspects of this callup was the mobilization of our Air Reserve Forces, including almost 21,000 Air National Guardsmen and 6,000 Air Force reservists. This was accomplished with very little public notice, but has resulted in a very substantial increase in our conventional fighter strength in Europe. The Air Guard has added the equivalent of seven tactical fighter wings, one tactical reconnaissance wing, and two global air transport wings to the active Air Force, while the Air Force Reserve's two wings of five troop carrier squadrons are now serving with the Tactical Air Command.

The highlight of the Air National Guard mobilization was the greatest overseas deployment of jet fighters in our history. Within 1 month of their recall last October 1, combat-ready pilots

of the Air National Guard flew more than 200 jet fighters from their home communities to bases in Europe.

Think of that, Mr. President. More than 200 jet fighters were flown by these guardsmen from the places where they lived, where they were members of the community, where they trained, and were flown directly to the bases in Western Europe.

These men were part-time pilots, who had had very little overwater flying experience. They were called upon to fly across the North Atlantic in wintry weather. Because of the range limitations of their aircraft, it was necessary for them to go via the Azores or via the Greenland-Iceland-Scotland route, each route calling for highly skilled navigation and cruise-control techniques. Under such circumstances, it is a remarkable tribute to their skill and training that every plane reached its assigned destination without a single mishap.

I emphasize again that this happened within 1 month after the recall on October 1.

On November 1, when the first of these planes was landing in Europe, the Air Force recalled three more Air National Guard squadrons, equipped with the supersonic F-104 Starfighter. Within 3 days, advance detachments from these squadrons were on their way to bases in Spain and Germany.

The F-104 does not have the range capability to cross the Atlantic under its own power, so the planes were dismantled, loaded into big transports of the Military Air Transport Service and ferried to Europe. So quickly and efficiently did these units accomplish the move that by November 24—hardly 3 weeks after they were mobilized—Air Guard F-104 pilots began flying alert missions from bases in Europe.

Mr. President, it is noteworthy that within 24 days after the call at the community level was answered, these men were actually flying alert missions from bases in Europe, even though the planes could not be flown there but had to be dismantled, loaded into transports, and carried overseas.

In accomplishing this deployment in such a manner, these Air Guardsmen proved themselves worthy of the highest praise from the Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene M. Zuckert, who emphasized their importance in these words:

My warmest salute to the men of your command on their highly successful deployment to Europe. The manner in which the deployment was conducted so soon after recall could only be the result of sustained superior performance. It is my desire that every man in your organization knows of the pride the whole Air Force feels in this accomplishment, which reflects the high standard set and maintained in Air National Guard training.

In the Naval Reserve, nearly 8,000 officers and men were called. They came on duty with little fanfare or publicity, and this may well be a tribute to the men themselves, and to the Navy as a whole, for the smoothness with which they accomplished the whole exercise.

A total of 13 destroyers and 27 destroyer escorts were returned to sea for antisubmarine warfare missions. These ships have been completely integrated with the destroyer forces Atlantic and destroyer forces Pacific and are now on duty in the Mediterranean, the North Sea, and the Far East.

In addition to these, 18 antisubmarine air squadrons were activated. These are now stationed in the continental United States and are conducting regular antisubmarine patrols.

It was in connection with the Army's mobilization of Reserve components that most of the adverse publicity occurred. As I have stated, there were some shortcomings on the part of the Army and some complaints on the part of the reservists themselves. But they represented only such a small percentage of those recalled. The widespread publicity regarding a relatively few incidents has created a distorted impression that our Reserve program is ineffective. This is unfortunate, indeed, and wholly unjustified by the facts.

Actually, the real condition is exactly to the contrary.

General Van Fleet, serving as the personal representative to the Secretary of the Army, visited many of the training camps and found things running smoothly, with both readiness and morale running very high. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], who is now in the Chamber, and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] came back with similar reports after having visited units from their States. And just days ago the Army Chief of Staff, Gen. George H. Decker, returned from an inspection tour with this report:

Results of my visit were most gratifying. Morale is uniformly excellent, officers and men have a high sense of purpose, are extremely proud of their units and are resentful of the unfavorable reflection on them caused by the complaints of a few. They are working hard to complete successfully their intensified training program and the Army training tests administered at the conclusion of that period of training. Some shortages of equipment still exist but these are being corrected as fast as Army resources will permit. Shortages in some items, such as self-propelled artillery, aircraft, and communications equipment will exist for some time. Unit commanders have advised me that thus far equipment shortages have had no significant adverse effect on training.

The most impressive fact concerning the Reserve forces on active duty is the high quality of personnel of all ranks. I was most favorably impressed by their keenness of mind, their professional skill and their devotion to duty. I am convinced that they fully understand the reasons behind their callup and that the vast majority have accepted the interruption of their normal lives gracefully.

Mr. President, I repeat, for emphasis, that that was a statement of high commendation from Gen. George H. Decker, who is now the Army Chief of Staff.

But over and above that, it is important to remember what these units have actually accomplished: that the immediate expansion of the Army—and its training base—was possible only because

it was possible to call up, in September, approximately 46,000 trained members of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve both as individuals and as members of some 190 units, including the 100th Reserve Training Division of Kentucky. Later, in October, the additional callup of two full National Guard divisions—the 32d Infantry of Wisconsin and the 49th Armored of Texas—together with 249 smaller Guard and Reserve units, made available the ready forces required to reconstitute our strategic Reserve should it have been necessary to deploy the Regular divisions of STRAC on an emergency overseas mission. This amounted to indispensable national security insurance at a most critical moment.

I should like to repeat that statement: This amounted to indispensable national security insurance at a most critical moment.

The same can be said of all Reserve component units and individuals—regardless of their branch of service—who have been called. Some have chosen to exaggerate the shortcomings; but the indisputable facts are these: The units are performing like professionals, and they have helped prevent a war.

To emphasize this fact, I should like to quote a statement made by the Secretary of Defense at the time of a visit, 2 months ago, to one of our units in Europe:

I think you should realize how extremely important this movement has been. Chancellor Adenauer wrote President Kennedy that, in his opinion, the prime factor influencing Khrushchev in his slowdown on the Berlin crisis was the swift, decisive buildup of American forces.

Mr. President, that is a most significant statement. I repeat with emphasis that all that the President did, all that the Congress did, and all that all others did, had their place; but the greatest importance lay in the fact that these men were trained, that they were ready in units, and that they were ready to go on short notice. And they did go. Their families responded in the same dedicated fashion in which they did. Their communities had going-away, farewell parties for them, and entered with wholehearted spirit into the entire matter; and these troops were ready for combat service when they reached their destination. There has been no parallel to this in all our history, and I believe that is the sound that got through to the Kremlin.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Mississippi on the very fine statement he is making.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. His statement needs to be made. Much has been said about the Reserve program—some of it fair,

and some of it unfair. I think the truth of the matter is that, overall, the contributions made by your Reserves—coming, as they did, at a critical time—were absolutely invaluable. It is the first time we have used the military power represented in our Reserve program to achieve foreign-policy objectives.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. The question has often been asked, When are the Reserves going to be used? Many persons think our Reserve power is to be used only in a hot war; but I think the series of events of the past few months has demonstrated that our Reserves can play a most invaluable role in the broad area of national security.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who has studied this matter over the years, is, in my judgment, rendering a great service in pulling together all the arguments for and against, and in giving the country a factual account of what really was accomplished. This is most important, particularly in view of some unfortunate publicity which occurred during that period of time. So I wish to thank the Senator from Mississippi very much, indeed, for what he is doing.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Washington for his kind remarks. I also commend him for his unvarying support throughout the years as a member of the Armed Services Committee, of the proper kind of Reserve program, as well as in connection with other important assignments he has in the Congress. He can properly evaluate, and also can appreciate, the situation in this crisis and the importance of what the members of the Reserve and National Guard units did in connection with getting us through it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to join the Senator from Washington commending the Senator from Mississippi on his very useful statement. It is an extremely important statement to my State.

As the Senator from Mississippi has indicated, the fact is that the 32d Reserve Division, Wisconsin National Guard, was called up. Our State is mighty proud of the Red Arrow Division; and, as Senators know, it has made a brilliant combat record.

The Senator has stressed the sacrifice which these men and their families and communities have made. As the Senator indicated in the course of his remarks, I had a chance to go to Washington State, to visit the 32d Division, Wisconsin National Guard. That division has indeed the very strong morale to which the Senator from Mississippi has very properly referred.

I believe that the points the Senator from Mississippi is making in the course of his speech have not been sufficiently stressed elsewhere. It is true that the Secretary of Defense has spoken of this situation, and the President of the United States has said something about it; but it is most important to know that these men played a major part in con-

nection with our handling of the Berlin crisis. The sacrifices they and their families have made have been most useful, and they have served our country well.

I am also grateful to the Senator from Mississippi for making so well balanced a statement. He has pointed out that there were shortcomings on the part of the Army, that the shortcomings were significant, and that the Army has taken steps to correct them, and that they have been acknowledged. The Senator from Mississippi has also pointed out that some shortages of equipment existed, and still exist, and that the Army is trying hard to correct them.

I believe that his statement is, altogether, a most welcome and useful one; and I commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for it. The people of Wisconsin will, I know, be very grateful for what he has stated in the course of his speech—for instance for statements such as the following:

The units are performing like professionals, and they have helped prevent a war.

And also the statement by the Secretary of Defense:

I think you should realize how extremely important this movement has been. Chancellor Adenauer wrote President Kennedy that, in his opinion, the prime factor influencing Khrushchev in his slowdown on the Berlin crisis was the swift, decisive buildup of American forces.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi that I am delighted that he, as a distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee, and as one of the truly outstanding experts in the Senate on our Armed Forces, has made this statement this afternoon. I am sure members of the 32d Division will read it with gratitude and with care.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his remarks, and also for the constant interest he has shown in this problem throughout the time when the Wisconsin unit was directly involved.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I, too, am very glad the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, one of the great members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has made his statement about the service of the Reserves and the National Guard.

As I am sure the Senator from Mississippi knows, the first Reserve division called up was the 100th Reserve Division, of Kentucky, under the command of Maj. Gen. Dillman Rash. It has been serving with great ability and distinction at Camp Chaffee, Ark.

In addition to making this reference to the Kentucky division which is rendering important service—a division of which all Kentuckians are very proud—I wish to say that I am glad the Senator from Mississippi has stressed the fact that these divisions of the National Guard are ready at times of crisis and emergency. Certainly it is important for all to realize that the fact that they

were ready undoubtedly had a great deterrent effect at the time of the deepening of the Berlin crisis.

I am also glad that the Senator's statement in regard to the service of the Reserve divisions has afforded an opportunity to review the successes and also the shortcomings in connection with their training, preparation, and service. I know the Senator from Mississippi will pursue that subject very carefully, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, as will other Members.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his remarks, and also for his interest in these programs. He is familiar with them; and Kentuckians always do their share, and a little more.

It has been stated that the services had their weak spots and knew them; and I am glad to see that they are taking steps to remedy that situation.

I am sure the Reserve program at all times is both a necessity and a success, and also that in the future its valuable service can be repeated in even finer fashion.

I also wish to emphasize that I was familiar with the business dislocations, the job dislocations, and the number of persons whose jobs were affected because some key persons in those companies were called away, with resultant jeopardy to many small businesses—for instance, when the manager, perhaps a captain in one of these units, was called to duty. There were terrific repercussions in the communities, as well as in the families. I believe there was only one lack in that connection, and it was because of the fact that in some cases the individuals concerned did not realize that they were playing very important and very necessary parts. When that fact was fully understood, the difficulty was cleared up. When we got through, we had cleared up a great many doubts in the minds of certain persons.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude.

We in America, where the concept of Ready Reserve Forces has been developed into a vital element of our military strength, can well be proud of the patriotic citizens who give much of their spare time to keep themselves prepared for duty when they are needed.

We all hate to see the words of a few blown up out of all proportion to reflect unfavorably on the dedicated and hard-working citizen-soldiers.

Here in the Congress, in the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee, and in other committees of the Senate and House which share the responsibility for providing the necessary resources for our National Guard and Reserve Forces, we have consistently worked to strengthen and vitalize the Reserve components as well as our Active Forces. We are aware of their great value to the Nation at comparatively small cost. I am sure I represent the sentiment of the Congress when I say that we pledge ourselves to assure continued strength and readiness of these units and individuals, many of whom have three times in one genera-

tion laid aside their civilian pursuits to bear arms in defense of our freedom.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate the able Senator from Mississippi for his intelligent and constructive comments on the Reserves and National Guard. He knows of this at least as well as anybody in the Senate. I especially commend him for calling attention to the heavy sacrifice many of these men have undergone as a result of their service. As the Senator has so well stated, many of them have three times in one generation laid aside their civilian pursuits. We all know what that can do to a man's future. He gets started, then goes in the service, comes back into civilian life again, gets started again, then goes into the service again. Then for the third time he does the same. With the obligations a man owes to his family, he is faced with the problem of starting up each time.

I believe the fact there have been so few complaints is based on two reasons. First, as the President pointed out, these men are really a part of our Military Establishment, just as much as those who were on active duty stationed abroad. Second, the men themselves have shown willingness and patriotism in handling the job, both in this country and foreign countries.

I wish to associate myself with the most admirable talk presented to the Senate this morning by one of the great authorities in this body on national defense. It is a fine address. I know each and every member of Reserve or National Guard units in Missouri, or Massachusetts, or Delaware, or any other State represented on the floor at this time, as well as Mississippi, will be grateful to the Senator for having pointed out this morning the truths with respect to our national defense needs.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Missouri for his remarks and for his continued splendid, knowledgeable support of this program in all its tribulations. The Senator has had a molding hand, as well as an encouraging voice, in the program of the Reserves and National Guard, all the way through, and there have been serious problems.

I do not think there is any doubt now that the program has established and proven itself and will move forward. I know the Senator from Missouri, in his very fine way, will have a heavy hand in the program, in keeping it on a sound foundation and moving it forward in a proper way.

May I emphasize again that we do not look with any sustained hope to reducing the cost of our military programs. The costs are going up. Missiles cost more. Complicated weapons cost more. But here is a case where we can at least continue to stabilize it on a manpower basis. In fact, I think the only avenue by which we can hope to make reductions over the years is to have a larger emphasis on our Reserve program.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BOGGS. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his extremely fine presentation this afternoon. I think it has been a great service to the country. It was a very splendid statement, indeed, and I thank him for calling the attention of the Senate to the successful mobilization of our National Guard and Reserve units in connection with the Berlin crisis.

I am glad the Senator has touched so ably on the readiness and willingness of the guardsmen and reservists to serve their country despite the hardships and personal family problems which arise from action of this type.

I am glad the Senator has pointed out that, although a great deal of publicity was given to some individuals or units where there have been these problems and congressional offices have received many letters from persons relating to their having to cope with hardships and family problems which necessarily resulted from a callup of this kind, in our State, as well as in all others, the great majority of guardsmen and reservists accepted the hardships as a part of their dedication to maintaining a strong America.

We in Delaware are extremely proud of the men and officers of the Headquarters and Headquarters Company of the 109th Ordnance Battalion from Middletown, Del., the 1049th Transportation Company from New Castle, the 805th Station Hospital Unit from Wilmington, and the 116th Mobile Surgical Hospital Unit from Delaware, as well as many individuals who were called to active duty by the President in his order of the 19th of September 1961.

These men, in the finest tradition of the National Guard and Reserve, have carried out their responsibilities as citizen-soldiers in this present emergency, and I concur wholeheartedly in the position of the Senator from Mississippi that their readiness and willingness and ability to serve contributed greatly to the lessening of the tension in the Berlin crisis.

I am happy to join with the Senator from Mississippi in commending all the National Guard and Reserve units and individuals who have given of their spare time and have kept themselves prepared for duty when they are needed and who have so willingly answered the call for service.

I urge, along with the Senator from Mississippi, continued support for a strong National Guard and an effective Reserve program.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Delaware for a very fine statement. Certainly he has supported the Reserve and National Guard program before, and I know he will continue to do so in the future.

May I add an additional word? I want to commend the Regular services for the time and attention they have given to the Reserve programs over the years. With the greatest emphasis of which I am capable, I wish to say I think it is their duty to emphasize it even more in the future.

I commend the individual officers in the Regular services who are assigned to training and administration of all the Reserve units. Such a program carries with it many problems. Many of them have worked very diligently and deserve a great deal of credit. I think their song is seldom sung and that they should be given recognition and credit for their part in the program.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks about the Reserves.

Mr. YARBOROUGH subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] made a very forceful statement about the need for continuing a strong military Reserve Forces program, and he pointed out certain unfortunate publicity that was received by the Reserves in the callup last fall.

I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his very fine and forceful statement, and for the tribute he made to our organized Reserves. One of the divisions which was called up, the 49th Armored Division, was from my home State of Texas. I was present last fall at Dallas when the headquarters and other units were called up. The morale of that division was very high. The number of complaints was smaller than was the number of complaints in the infantry division with which I served in World War II. There was a minimum number of complaints when we consider that there was no shooting war and the men were free to write to the press. The complaints were minimal, and were not large in number, as has sometimes been represented.

In practically all the cases with which I am familiar, the complainants were not the regular members of the Reserve, who had been doing their training for months, but were men who had just been called up for service and then put in the Reserve. Those who complained did not give a true picture of the morale of the trained Reserve, because they were newly inducted men. I have heard numerous times from the 49th Armored Division to that effect. I feel that opinion from the division is representative of the Reserves all over the country. Their morale and dedication have been high.

I think the Senator from Mississippi has performed a valuable service. I think it would be tragic if the country cut down on the Reserve Forces. The Senator from Mississippi, who is on the Armed Services Committee, is very familiar with the program, and he has performed a service for the country in making his statement.

NEED FOR SCIENCE MINDEDNESS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, Astronaut John Glenn has kindled the enthusiasm of America. His orbital flight should be an inspiration for the youth of America, and a cause toward which their effort and energy can be directed, with benefit to all mankind.

Colonel Glenn and the other American astronauts have blazed a pathway into outer space. It is up to the youth of America, those of this and future generations, to follow.

A new sea is to be charted. New worlds await discovery. The whole universe remains to be explored and developed. To do this, a new generation of scientists, engineers, and technicians are needed. I am confident our young people need only the leadership to guide them in preparing themselves. And I am confident our high schools, colleges, and universities of this great Nation will join hands to stimulate this necessary wider interest in science.

An editorial which appeared in the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News on February 27, 1962, treats this subject in a most creditable fashion. I am pleased to commend its reading to the Members of the Congress.

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

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

NEEDED: SCIENCE MINDEDNESS

This country will need many John Glenns—with a full supporting cast of scientists, engineers, and technicians—for the great tasks of space exploration which have only now begun.

Today some 30,000 Americans in Government, industry, and the research field are said to be more or less directly engaged in our space effort.

Before this decade is out, it is estimated by U.S. space officials that more than 100,000 individuals will be involved.

In the words of Dr. M. H. Trytten, the National Academy of Sciences Director of Scientific Personnel, the job of finding and training these thousands of specialists "takes on the color of a mobilization effort."

He and many others concerned over the rising, unfulfilled demand for specialists believe the mobilizing must start among quite young Americans. The questions are how to stir their interest and search out their talents.

Recently Dr. Glenn Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, suggested some strides might be made by reminding youngsters they don't have to be geniuses to jump into space science or any other variety.

Some science educators caution, however, that the road to competence is sufficiently long so that young people with a scientific or technical bent ought to begin studying math, physics, and chemistry at a tender age.

Dr. John S. Richardson, expert in science education at Ohio State University, would go further and say that young Americans with possible goals in space and related fields should try quickly for the broadest possible scientific grounding.

His argument is that space activities compel specialists to break the traditional bounds of astronomy, chemistry, physics, biology, and the various divisions of engineering. They need mastery of all the standard disciplines so they can cross lines freely as demanded by their intricate and totally original problems.

Richardson adds that U.S. schools and colleges must of course do their part by altering the scientific curriculum to permit the free-flowing interplay the space age requires.

Yet with all their abundant concern, science educators confess they don't really know how to mobilize in mounting numbers the young technical talent the Nation needs.

Young men once longed for the adventure of the sea. President Kennedy says space is the "new ocean" and Americans must sail on it. He might gladly pin medals on those educators who can induce today's youth, by the tens of thousands, to "sail" as space mariners and man the vital shore stations in support.

PROPOSED PURCHASE OF UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in a few weeks the Senate will consider whether to authorize the President to purchase \$100 million worth of United Nations bonds.

Our decision will be reached on the basis of information obtained during the hearings, by the Committee on Foreign Relations on the bond issue.

It will be influenced largely by the recommendations of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and our general inclination to support the President's recommendations in the field of foreign policy, unless his recommendations run counter to what we conceive to be our own good judgment, or that of our constituents.

Therefore, it seems to me that it might be helpful to my colleagues in the Senate to set forth in summary form some of the interesting items of information that have developed during hearings held over the past few weeks.

I hope Members will find this summary of critical views helpful to them in forming their own opinions.

Support for the views I express will be found in the hearings soon to be published.

First. Although the sole issue before the Congress is whether to authorize the purchase of \$100 million of United Nations bonds, and although the President himself might have utilized Act for International Development authority to purchase such bonds—as he did so rely in the early days of support of the Congo operation—the administration decided to seek congressional support not on the narrow issue of finance but on the issue of support of the United Nations.

In other words, a vote for the bond issue is to be a vote of confidence in the United Nations; a vote against the bond issue is to be a vote against the United Nations.

As the President said in his message:

Failure to act would serve the interests of the Soviet Union.

The administration asks Senators to decide whether they are with us, against us—"but for Heaven's sake, don't ask any questions about financial operations of the United Nations."

The testimony of the administration followed this pattern. For 2 days we heard the highest ranking witnesses tell us of the accomplishments of the United Nations, and talk of matters not in issue. Finally, on the third day, we got to the expert testimony.

But here again, we heard long testimony on the general state of the United Nations and how payments of the regular, annual assessments are up to date—a matter which no one had questioned anyway.

When I wanted to know the current status of collections on the Congo arrears, the information could not be supplied except at a later date, for the record.

Second. Perhaps I can be easily confused. Some persons seemed to think so. But I must say that my colleagues will need many hours to review the testimony we have taken to get any clear un-

derstanding of the financial situation underlying this bond proposal.

Take, for example, the matter of for what the proceeds are to be used. Everyone must have thought the bonds were to be used to pay the United Nations debts.

At least, the President must have thought so as his message to the Congress spoke of the need "to relieve the present cash deficit by paying off current bills and debts" and "to cover anticipated expenses for the United Nations operation in the Congo and for the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East through the end of the present fiscal year"—that is, June 1962.

A few days later, Secretary Rusk thought the proceeds of the sale were to be used to meet "the currently estimated costs of peace and security operations from July 1, 1962, to December 31, 1963," with past debts to be paid out of arrearages it was hoped would be collected.

The next day, Ambassador Stevenson just did not seem to be too clear for what the \$200 million was to be used; and then finally when we got to the experts, we ran into more confusion—the general conclusion being that the bond proceeds would be used for purposes that the working capital fund might be used for, which would encompass payment of debts as well as forward financing. Anyway, this thorough mixup ill serves the purposes of the proponents of the bond issue.

Third. I have serious doubt that the President was fully informed regarding the financial background of this proposal.

My reason for so believing is that on January 22 I asked the Department of State to give the committee information as to the debts of the United Nations, and for what. It seemed to me this was a basic item of information the President should have had before him. If the President did have that information on January 10, it took the Department of State until January 31 to get it to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

When we did get the figures, we were cautioned not to use them because they were subject to "negotiation," the inference being that some nations had charged the United Nations too much and an effort would be made to get them to reduce their bills.

But strangely, when by purest chance, the figure the United Nations allegedly owed Canada got into the press—\$5.27 million—it turned out to be more than twice as much as the Canadians at that time felt was owed to them—\$2.5 million.

A similar situation developed with respect to the amounts allegedly owed by the United Nations to the United States. The United Nations thought it owed the United States \$32 million, whereas Department of Defense figures obtained independently put the figure at \$19.8 million.

Ever since I began raising questions about these figures, there has been a vast scurrying around to reconcile them. One of the witnesses told how impossible it is to keep books for an on-going operation like the Congo.

But finally the Executive got a reconciliation of sorts, which will appear in the hearings.

Fourth. There are many other things upon which I could speak, Mr. President. I will comment on only one or two.

There is little evidence in the record to indicate that the administration has given careful consideration to the long-term implications of action on this bond issue and on its support for a request to the World Court for an advisory opinion.

The administration chooses to disregard the day when its chickens may come home to roost.

This bond issue is a 1-year palliative, although it would establish a precedent for future borrowings. Within 18 months it will be necessary to consider a new angle on the financing of the United Nations. I hope that when further financing is considered, there will be more candor in dealing with Congress, and more evidence of careful consideration of the long-term implications of any proposal that may be submitted.

I have been disturbed by attempts by the proponents of the bond issue to influence the Senate on this issue. We have been systematically and timely informed of bond pledges of other nations. We have been subjected to an influx of witnesses apparently urged to testify favorably on the bond proposal. And we have been barraged by public affairs programs on radio and television—programs which have presented only partial pictures of the scene.

In short, there has been an effort to promote the bond issue on the irrelevant ground of whether we support the United Nations or not.

It has been impossible to obtain accurate financial information. There have been times when, even if I were in favor of the bond issue, I would be tempted to vote against it simply because of the conflicting testimony presented to the committee, and the misleading tables of figures presented for our consideration.

Fifth. In an earlier statement, I suggested that the unwillingness of many United Nations members to contribute to the UNEF and the Congo operation was promoting a fiscal "double standard" and that such a standard on the fiscal side, as well as the political side, was in danger of destroying the United Nations. I still adhere to this view.

One of my main complaints against the position taken by representatives of the proponents of the bond issue is that their softness in dealing with the United Nations financial problems will have three most serious consequences.

First, the bond issue merely puts off the day of reckoning; and it does not put it off very far;

Second, the proposed U.S. purchase of 50 percent, and not less than 50 percent, of the bonds would encourage many other states to believe that Uncle Sam will carry the load, if they will not; and

Third, and most important, instead of strengthening the United Nations by this process, we are contributing to its decay by helping to destroy its multilateral character.

Secretary of State Rusk told the committee of the extent of United Nations support for the financial plans of the Organization, with particular emphasis on the bond issue.

He said:

All three parts of the plan received the overwhelming support of the General Assembly by margins of about 5 to 1. Only the Soviet bloc, Cuba, and two other members voted against the bond issue.

Mr. Rusk's statement leaves an erroneous impression. What he failed to state was that while the vote was about 5 to 1, actually 13 states voted against the resolution and 33 states abstained or were absent. Thus, there were 58 states in favor of the bond issue, and 46 did not support it.

But this is only part of the story. The record shows that although 58 states voted for the bond issue only 32 states have paid their 1960 Congo assessments in full and only 19 have paid their 1961 assessments while 64 states have never paid a single dime toward the cost of the Congo operations.

Since the data to which I have referred were supplied, I believe four other states have paid up, now making 23 of the present 105 members of the U.N. that have paid their assessments for the Congo operations.

Incidentally, the General Assembly resolution of September 20, 1960, relating to action in the Congo was passed by a vote of 70 to 0. There were only 82 members of the United Nations at that time.

In other words, Mr. President, the facts are that only a bare majority of the United Nations membership voted for the bond issue as a way out of a financial dilemma created by the failure of 70 percent of the membership to pay the Congo assessments of 1960 and 80 percent failure thus far on the 1961 assessments.

The conclusion I draw from these figures is that a goodly number of the members of the United Nations are willing to vote for projects they are not willing to make even token payments to support.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the sickness of the United Nations is not caused solely by its enemies, but in part, at least, by its friends—the people and the nations who stand ready to bail the United Nations out of financial trouble instead of insisting that every member shoulder his share of principle—even by the financial sharing of only a token nature.

I know there are many who will throw up their hands in horror and ask, "But what can we do?" I have heard that statement a great many times: "What else can we do?"

There are several things that might have been done, and it is still not too late. For one, we might have suggested that only those states willing to contribute to the Congo operation should have a voice in determining policy toward the Congo. This will shock proponents of the universalist approach to the maintenance of peace, but I feel strongly that states that live under the law, must live by the law.

If this kind of arrangement cannot be worked out under the United Nations, then there certainly is a growing need for a concert of like-minded nations willing to support in action what they will vote in principle.

A second solution the United Nations might consider is whether it might not cut down on some of its other expenditures in order to support the Congo and the Gaza operations.

If the technical assistance program funds were to be reduced in order to meet the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations, there might be added inducements for recalcitrant nations to assume a share of the peacekeeping costs.

I would hope that such action would not have to be taken, but if we did tell member nations that if they refused to pay part of their just assessments, their benefits would be correspondingly reduced, I think we would find them more willing to pay their dues.

A final possibility, of course, is that the United Nations give up as a bad job its efforts to bring order to the Congo. They might call on the United States as they did in Korea. We all hope that that will not come to pass either, but it should be recognized that the United States and some of its allies would be perfectly willing and capable of assisting in the Congo if the United Nations, because of lack of support by considerably more than half its membership, were unwilling to give more than lip-service to the Congo operation.

Let me say again, Mr. President, that I strongly support the United Nations. I want to see it succeed.

I am willing to have the United States pay its share and, in some instances, I am willing to see that share amount to 50 percent or even more of certain costs.

But I will not be a party to actions which will little by little destroy the fiber of the Organization. This is what I fear would be the effect of this bonding proposal.

Now, Mr. President, the United Nations is in financial difficulties regardless of what put it there. The legality of special assessments to pay the cost of military forces in the Congo and the Holy Land have been challenged. The United Nations has requested the International Court of Justice at The Hague for an opinion in the matter. The great majority of the member states will withhold the payment of their assessments until such an opinion will have been rendered. Such an opinion is expected by late spring or summer.

If the assessments are found binding by the Court, then most members will pay up and the need for other means of financing will be abated. It is most important that we do not rush into a long-term bonding program until the Court has given its opinion.

In the meantime, if further promiscuous indebtedness is not to be incurred, it will be necessary to provide more funds for current costs of the United Nations operations.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am proposing that the United States and other willing nations provide temporary loans

to the United Nations to carry it through the present period of need.

On behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and myself, I now offer an amendment to S. 2768 and ask that it be printed.

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

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. AIKEN. I also ask to have this amendment printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, without fiscal-year limitation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not to exceed \$100,000,000 which shall be available for the making of a loan to the United Nations. Such loan shall be for a period not to exceed two years, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be substantially equal to the average rate, as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan, on outstanding marketable public debt obligations of the United States of comparable maturities.

"Sec. 2. Amounts received from the repayment of principal and payment of interest due on such loan shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing a loan to the United Nations and the appropriation of funds therefor."

Mr. AIKEN. This amendment would authorize the President to make a loan to the United Nations of not to exceed \$100 million for a period of not over 2 years and at a rate of interest which will reflect the actual cost of the money to the United States. I doubt if even half the amount authorized by this amendment would be necessary, but I am willing to set the ceiling high enough so there can be no question of its sufficiency.

This proposal is extremely generous, Mr. President, and its acceptance by Congress would indicate beyond question the whole-hearted backing of the United States for the United Nations. At the same time, it will emphasize the determination of the United States that the United Nations must abandon its double standards and put its financial house in order if we are to continue our generous support in the future.

ADDRESS BY HARLAN CLEVELAND, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS, ON THE UNITED NATIONS BOND ISSUE

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the American people are coming to realize that the United Nations is a powerful instrument for peace. They are being convinced partly by events—which have a powerful logic of their own—and partly by the eloquence

and persuasiveness of leaders of this Nation.

No man is working harder in this patient job of education than the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Mr. Harlan Cleveland. Recently, he delivered in Rochester, N.Y., a speech entitled "Crisis and Clarity." This speech is the best statement I have seen of why the United States and the U.N. must move ahead together.

I hope the efforts of Mr. Cleveland and others will be rewarded by approval of the United Nations bond issue. This will be Congress's chance to vote confidence in this institution, our best hope for peace.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cleveland's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CRISIS AND CLARITY

Address by the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, before the Rochester City Club luncheon, Wednesday, January 31, 1962, Rochester, N.Y.

In between your lunch and your back-to-work movement, you have asked me to say how the United Nations fits into U.S. foreign policy. It is a timely question. For the Nation is beginning to debate whether to loan the United Nations a sum that a major soap company might spend on TV advertising in a year—and thus no mean investment.

Somebody suggested last week that the U.N. required "surgery rather than poultice." What is proposed in the U.N. bond issue is, of course, not a poultice but a transfusion. As for surgery, we might better say of the United Nations organization, which works for us today in several of the world's crisis spots, what General Marshall once said in another context: "You don't operate on a man while he's carrying a piano upstairs."

To answer your question requires, first, a glance at our aims, then a quick look at the kinds of trouble these aims get us into, and then a thoughtful look at the place of the U.N. in this scheme of things.

Our aims can be readily, almost too automatically, put into verbal capsules:

We are helping to bind the "north" into a workable and prosperous community of free industrial nations.

We are helping to develop the world's "south" so it can be partners with the older industrial powers.

We are helping to build enduring bridges between north and south through aid, trade, and a shared sense of responsibility for rapid but peaceful change.

We are by these means helping to make the free world hum with the cheerful and contagious noises of success, and subvert oppression elsewhere by demonstrating that free choice works better, and feels better, than coercion.

II

The crises and opportunities we face from day to day in the Department of State fall generally into four kinds. Each is important; but some are more important to us and some are more important to others.

First are the immediate confrontations of the great powers—directly, Berlin, Korea, nuclear testing and, indirectly, Vietnam.

Second, there are latent confrontations of the great powers: situations which could lead to a toe-to-toe power rivalry if we don't do something to prevent it. Laos, Congo, and the Caribbean are the obvious current examples.

Third, there are other people's disputes. Perhaps West New Guinea is in our minds this afternoon; but it could as well be Kashmir, or the Arab-Israel war. We are in the middle on most of these kinds of disputes, and many more besides—because the middle is where power is plugged into world politics, and we cannot escape the consequences of our own power. Our interest in all such disputes has this in common: They all hold latent dangers of spreading into larger conflicts. We could not escape the later, larger conflicts, so we have to try to limit or help settle the earlier, smaller ones.

In a fourth category, we can line up the whole constructive task of building the kind of world community we want to live in. We help in many ways to build free institutions inside other peoples' societies, and we help to fashion an intricate web of relations between and among these societies—trade pacts, public and private exchange of persons, technical and scientific conferences, political dialog, and, where necessary, military arrangements.

III

Where does the United Nations fit in? From our point of view (and what other point of view is there for us?) the United Nations fits in as an important instrument of our foreign policy. What makes it complicated, of course, is that it serves also as an instrument of the foreign policies of 103 other nations.

As Adlai Stevenson said the other day, the U.N. was built for trouble and thrives on it. This year, the U.N. is doing such important and troublesome things that Americans have taken to arguing about it among themselves. Why does it suddenly seem so important? Simply because the United Nations has something significant to do with each of our four categories of foreign-policy trouble:

Even in the immediate and direct confrontations of great powers, the U.N. has a useful, if limited, role. It serves as a court of world judgment, not to be ignored merely because it is unenforceable in power terms. In this forum of world opinion we find it useful to state our case for the education of "nth countries" whose strength is the intangible power of a talkative kibitzer. The U.N. has also served as a diplomatic arena in which to explore solutions to great-power differences; the Jessup-Malik agreement to end the Berlin blockade was worked out in the U.N.'s corridors, and so was the recent agreement to get disarmament talks going again.

When it comes to the latent confrontations, the U.N. can become (as it is in the Congo) an operational "third party," to provide policing force and nation-building help where it would be too dangerous to world peace for the great powers to provide the needed police or aid in competition with each other.

What I have called "other people's disputes" find the United Nations working in its peacemaking role—factfinding, conciliating and mediating, and thus avoiding the need for the United States to take a direct hand as "third party." The Secretary General of the United Nations is trying this week to conciliate the Indonesians and the Dutch on West New Guinea.

Getting national leaders to play it cool—to talk out their differences and not to rumble—is a prime function of the world organization. For in a world of nuclear weapons the unleashing of force—at any level—is a dangerous matter. In the heavy water of international politics, every leader must act to avoid a chain reaction.

On every continent men and governments have inherited old quarrels, some embedded in the accidents of a colonial past, others deriving simply from the history of nations and regions. In a number of cases, it is un-

safe to let the status quo persist. Explosive sentiments and political pressures build up on each side. The temptation grows to have it out, come what may.

The world in which we live thus places upon us all—individual citizens as well as those who bear political responsibility—the challenge of stretching the human capacity for conciliation and compromise and of removing systematically from the world scene these old festering quarrels—quarrels which not only threaten us all with war but divert the energy and attention of men from the constructive tasks which lie to hand.

We need on the world scene an interval of conciliation, a time when men—conscious that others are doing the same—seek to free themselves from painful memories and antagonisms and release their strength for the acts of creation which their situation demands. In such an interval a much greater effort should be made to alter, by negotiation and peaceful change, situations whose continuation is unsafe for us all.

That is why, as Adlai Stevenson made clear in the General Assembly debate on Angola last week, we hope all members of the U.N. will turn to this problem with renewed interest and attention—conscious that the very fate of their institution hinges on heightened restraint in the use of force and a heightened effort to solve international problems by negotiation.

Finally, in the broad task of community building, the United Nations is heavily engaged in technical, economic, scientific, financial, educational, and social welfare programs, on which close to 90 percent of all United Nations (and Specialized Agency) personnel are in fact engaged. Here again, the U.N. provides a useful if limited substitute for competitive aid from East and West, which can tear a young country apart (as the Soviets and other outside forces have tried to do in the Congo), rather than help build it as a viable nation.

IV

Because we happen to be talking about the United Nations, let us not fall into the doctrinal error which is too common among the U.N.'s friends as well as its foes. People keep talking about the U.N. as if it were the only international peace-making and community-building enterprise in which we are or should be involved. There are of course others, and they are crucially important too.

The Atlantic Community was born first as a concept. But the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty, the Organization for European Cooperation and Development, have put institutional flesh on its bones. And the prospective partnership between the European Common Market and the great common market of North America, is for many of us, the most exciting single job of institution-building now in progress.

The Organization of American States is also engaged in building with new enthusiasm a very special community, based on the long tradition of hemispheric solidarity newly reinforced by the Alliance for Progress and the menace of a frankly Communist beachhead in the Caribbean.

Our problem is not to choose one or another of these interlocking concerts of nations—the regional, the Atlantic, and the almost global. Rather our task is to work through each grouping for such purposes, and at such times, as seems appropriate from the standpoint of our own national interest.

V

About the U.N., which is our focus today, we must ask ourselves: Is peace so certain; are we so secure; are our alliances so strong; can we escape so many disputes; do we have so many dependable bucket brigades; are we and our hundred-odd neighbors such paragons of righteousness; is our skin so thin, our conscience so dulled and our aspirations

for our world so modest that we can afford to dispense with the peacekeeping and nation-building capacities of the United Nations?

Evidently not. But, in any event the U.N., like the mountain, is there. The United States cannot ignore it. The real question about the U.N. is this: Will its unique capacities be used or will they be wasted?

Whether we waste or use this imperfect world instrument, will be determined not so much by how valuable an instrument it is or why there are grumblings about it, but by what kind of people we are.

The ultimate source of U.S. policy lies in the consent of the people. Without this consent, the United States cannot join in a trading partnership with the 200 million customers of Western Europe or build the Atlantic alliance into a community, or bridge the great North-South division of the world, or meet the Sino-Soviet bloc on our own terms.

Where does consent come from? From leadership certainly, but ultimately from the kind of people we are.

In his state of the Union message President Kennedy said of the United Nations: "It should have in the future, as it has had in the past since its inception, no stronger or more faithful member than the United States of America." I believe there is strong public consent for this affirmation.

VI

People are stirred by the U.N. issue this year. For the first time in its short history, the present and future actions of the United Nations have become a major issue of American politics.

The Korean war was controversial enough. But that war, in which we fought under a U.N. flag as U.N. executive agent for aim prescribed in U.N. resolutions, was nevertheless viewed by most Americans as essentially an American show. But now, after several generations of sentimental talk about organizing world peace and enforcing the rule of law, 2 really significant peacekeeping forces of a truly international character have been placed and maintained in the field; 5,000 men, drawn from 7 countries, to keep watch over the Gaza strip and the Israeli-Egyptian border; and 16,000 men in the Congo, drawn from 21 countries and backed by a U.S. Air Force airlift.

The U.N. is thus a proper subject for political controversy because it is doing more things, on a larger scale, more vital to our national interest, than ever before—and because the going is getting rough.

We have discovered that international peacekeeping is practical and realistic—on a small scale to be sure, but big enough to restrain a small international war, as in the Middle East, and prevent a large civil war, as in the Congo.

What happened in the Congo was that we Americans helped put the U.N. in so as to avoid our having to enter Central Africa with our own power to counter an active Soviet thrust there.

The essential aim of our policy—invented by a Republican administration but supported and carried on by a Democratic administration—was to enable a moderate central government to be established to govern the whole of the Congo. No moderate government could survive unless it prevented the secession of Tshombe's corner of Katanga and knocked the props from under the Communist-supported separatists led by Gizenga in the north. The government of Joseph Kasavubu and Cyrille Adoula is gradually making the grade. This is good news: It is quite directly a result of U.S. policy, the policy of the moderate Congolese leaders, and the policy of the United Nations.

In the Congo, moderation required bold actions, since the going was uphill all the way. It was bound, at best, to look rather

messy. The U.N.'s role, while quite legal is without precedent. The names of the protagonists are still strange to most Americans, the geography is fuzzy in our minds, our own Government's policy the subject of considerable crossfire at home and abroad. But if the chronic Congo crisis seems a bit disorderly as you watch it develop from week to week, ask yourselves whether you really would have preferred the alternative of putting our own military forces into Central Africa.

Peacekeeping, then, turns out to be practical. But it also turns out to be hard on the nerves. It was more comfortable to think of peace as a cartoonist's image, a lovely fresh young maiden in a pure white gown, mouthing sweet nothings while clutching her olive branch and adjusting her halo. But when this ethereal creature had to whip out her sixshooter and use it to defend her right to walk a policeman's beat on the streets of Elisabethville, most Americans did a double take.

Perhaps we will need several months to decide—as I believe events are already helping us to decide—that what was wrong with this picture was not the U.N.'s actions (or U.S. support of them), but our own obsolescent image of what international peacekeeping would mean.

VII

Peacekeeping by the U.N.—in the Middle East and the Congo and potentially elsewhere—quite obviously matters to us. It engages and promotes our national interests, and therefore arouses our national concern. Is there a danger that this Girl of the Golden West might turn her sixshooter against us?

The answer is "No." But it is not a passive no—a complacent assurance that the world's troubles will pass us by. The answer is an activist no, the kind that says the U.N. will work for our kind of world rather than against it because we are willing to work hard to build just that kind of organization. In pursuing this aim, we have three major factors going for us:

First, the Charter of the United Nations is our kind of charter.

The charter is, indeed, an eloquent restatement for our time of the doctrines Jefferson and his colleagues wrote for their time in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. It does not say we have nothing to lose but our chains. It says we have everything to gain from building the institutions of freedom. That is why we can live with the charter; and why the Soviets, as they repeatedly show by their actions, cannot.

Second, the U.N.'s capacity to act depends crucially on our support.

The U.N. has developed an executive arm, to operate on behalf of this charter. The League of Nations was mostly a conference center: its Secretariat was organized primarily to set up meetings among its members. The United Nations Secretariat organizes meetings too—an appalling number of them. But the U.N. Secretariat also acts in its own right when the U.N.'s members tell it to do so.

What often goes unnoticed is this: the Soviets boycott nearly all the main executive operations of the United Nations. In the world of symbolism the U.N.'s actions are taken in the name of global universality. But in the real world, the U.N. in action is the non-Soviet world in action.

The United States, Britain, other Commonwealth countries, Nationalist China, Japan, France, and other European countries are assessed 69.6 percent of the U.N.'s regular budget. The same countries support 73.6 percent of the U.N. Emergency Force, and 97.8 percent of the Palestine refugee program. The same countries, minus France and Belgium, support 80.3 percent of the Congo operation. The Soviets quite

naturally do not want to pay for the U.N.'s peacekeeping operations, it would be a strange world in which the burglars cheerfully contributed to the upkeep of the police force.

Without the support of the Western powers, and particularly of the United States, the U.N. would quite suddenly lose its capacity to act and revert to being a conference center. Its executive arm could not be used against us because it would largely cease to exist.

Let those who complain about our paying a very sizable share of the U.N.'s cost ask themselves whether they really want it otherwise.

Third: In the General Assembly and the Security Council, the United States is nearly always in the majority, usually decisively so.

"One country, one vote" does present a potential danger, that leaders from many small countries will not measure up responsibly to the important responsibilities they vote on but do not have the physical and financial power to carry into action. It is true that the Africans and Asian delegates sometimes go overboard—by our standards—on a symbolic issue involving colonialism, racial discrimination, or nuclear issues. But it is also true that the Afro-Asians are seldom a cohesive bloc. The leaders of each nation feel strongly about their independence, and their independent spirit has frustrated every effort to mold the Afro-Asians into a homogeneous unit under extremist leadership. With the Europeans and Latin Americans and the others mixed in, it is a rare occasion indeed when a two-thirds majority of General Assembly votes can be mobilized against us.

On the record, when it comes to action by the U.N.—as contrasted to talking at the U.N.—the newly independent nations have turned out to be impressively sober.

The 15th General Assembly, in 1960, was supposed to be the low point—sure sign of the deterioration of the Assembly into swirling majorities—a noisy circus for shoe-pounding, heckling, and chicken feathers. In the end Chairman Khrushchev—after 6 wasted weeks away from the Kremlin for a wrecking foray on the bank of the East River—gave up and went home.

The 16th General Assembly convened against a dark backdrop—the Bizerte crisis, the wall in Berlin, the resumption of nuclear testing, the Belgrade Conference, fighting in Katanga, the death of Dag Hammarskjöld, and aggressive Soviet pronouncements that now was the time for radical surgery in the U.N.—meaning the troika. Some of our own starker pundits solemnly prepared the last rites: The U.N. was ready once again for the grave.

But when the Assembly adjourned for Christmas (a quaint custom in which the non-Christian world has acquiesced without a murmur), the U.N. was still there—still holding its record as the most extravagantly lauded and most frequently buried institution of our time, still imperfect, but somehow a little bit stronger and a lot more durable than most people thought.

In the midst of the crisis of succession, the President of the United States addressed the General Assembly. He focused on the integrity of the Secretariat. He called for a fresh start on disarmament—for new efforts to preserve outer space for peaceful purposes—for economic and social progress in a U.N. decade of development. What happened?

A new Secretary General—not a three-headed troika—was appointed, and his office was maintained unimpaired.

Disarmament talks got underway again, with the important addition to the scenery of a major emphasis on building international peace-keeping machinery while dismantling national warmaking capacity.

The U.N. took on a whole new function, to develop and supervise an international outer space program.

The U.N. decade of development was proclaimed and some of the first actions—a new international food for peace program and a 1963 Conference on Science and Technology for the Less Developed Areas—were started.

And for good measure, the Assembly confounded the prophets of doom by decisively beating down a renewed effort by the Soviets to get an admission ticket for their boisterous allies in Peking.

In spite of the successes of the season just past, it is becoming harder to get our way in the U.N.—as it is in the world as a whole. Our leadership in the U.N.—and in the world at large—requires more funds, more military strength, and more organized brainwork—and above all, more astute politics on our part than ever before.

It's rough, but we cannot quit. We could not let go if we wanted to. Besides, we are not made that way. "God Almighty hates a quitter," said a great Republican President half a century ago. The verb seems out of keeping with the Almighty, but the sentiment appeals to us as authentically American.

Some of our compatriots may seem to lack a lively interest in, or a deep knowledge of, the complex issues of world politics. A few of our compatriots may even lack that trust in their fellow Americans that holds a community together and produces these miracles of cooperation that make us the world's premier power.

But moments of crisis are moments of clarity, and in moments of clarity the Americans are never afraid of each other, nor yet of the unknown; they are only afraid of inaction. The cynical voices, and the fearful ones, share the distinction of having been forgotten in each of the grander moments of American history.

There is this year, some say, a crisis of confidence in the United Nations. If so, the central issue will, with your help, become crystal clear and the American reaction will once again be in character. The arguments you will be hearing about whether we should buy some U.N. bonds, will all boil down to a simple issue, clarified by the sense of crisis. The question before the house—both Houses—is whether during the next 18 months the United States is willing to lend, at 2-percent interest, \$100 million to the United Nations, for peacekeeping and nation building.

You, the leaders of Rochester, and your fellow Americans in a hundred other centers of opinion making, will largely decide whether to loan the United Nations an amount nearly as large as the several States collect from the sale of hunting and fishing licenses. If the issue is whether the United States exercises its leadership in the United Nations or abandons the U.N.'s leadership to others, can there be any real doubt of the outcome?

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

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

ANTI-COMMUNIST FREEDOM DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on January 23 the Assembly of Captive European Nations commemorated the

eighth anniversary of the Anti-Communist Freedom Day. Eight years ago on January 23, 1954, over 22,000 Chinese and Korean prisoners, who were in the custody of United Nations forces in Korea, refused to return to Communist tyranny. Their decision reflects the fact that communism can only survive where it is upheld by force and brutality. It will never win under conditions of free choice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of the declaration introduced in New York, as well as an account of the comments made at that time.

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

THE EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF FREEDOM DAY
(Declaration introduced at the 96th extraordinary meeting of the plenary assembly, held in New York City on January 23, 1962, Aleksander Kutt, Estonia, rapporteur)

Eight years ago, on January 23, 1954, over 22,000 Chinese and Korean prisoners of war in the custody of the United Nations forces in Korea, refused to return to their Communist-enslaved homelands. Their decision to choose freedom, despite systematic attempts by Red agents to brainwash and to coerce them, was a major defeat for international communism and a victory for the forces of liberty everywhere.

To commemorate the valor of the 22,000, the Republic of China designated January 23, 1954, as "Anti-Communist Freedom Day." But the inspirational force of their courage was felt far beyond China's borders, and Freedom Day is now celebrated by many organizations all over the world. The Assembly of Captive European Nations takes pride in joining, as in the previous years, in the commemoration of this unique event.

The worldwide response to the Anti-Communist Freedom Day underscores the global character of today's struggle between the forces of liberty and tyranny. The peoples of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania have always been heartened by the achievements of their allies—the captive Asian people—in their liberation struggle. And, in turn, Communists themselves have acknowledged the lasting impact of such events as the Hungarian national revolution on the enslaved peoples of China, Korea, Tibet, and North Vietnam. Therefore, the captive peoples of Europe and Asia are especially aware that there is only one front in today's struggle; they are deeply convinced that fragmenting the issues and hoping to solve them one by one—be it Berlin, or Laos—will not yield results.

The Anti-Communist Freedom Day is also a most effective rebuttal of the tendencies in the non-Communist world to lend undeserved prestige to the Red Chinese regime by admitting it into the United Nations. The choice for freedom which the Chinese prisoners made 8 years ago is the choice of the population in mainland China, who are waiting for an opportunity to rise against their oppressors. Communist terror nor their tactical retreats, such as the slowdown in forming the communes, may postpone the day of the rising but will not be able to prevent it.

The eighth anniversary of Freedom Day takes place at a time of grave perils and great opportunities for the forces of liberty. The Communists are mounting belligerent attacks against the free world and are tightening repression within their empire. Yet at the same time the Communist empire is torn by doctrinal strife and sapped by the

unceasing resistance in the subjugated countries. The captive peoples of Europe and Asia are convinced that at this juncture it would be a fatal mistake for the West to attempt to improve international tensions by avoiding the so-called cold war issues. They strongly believe that, on the contrary, the solution lies in boldly facing them. The captive peoples also hold it to be their duty to warn the countries of Africa and Asia, especially the newly independent ones, against their tendency to disregard the Soviet brand of colonialism, whose maintenance and expansion threatens their own security and their very existence as independent nations.

On this eighth Freedom Day the captive peoples of Europe and Asia demand from the free nations that they show firmness and unity in repelling the Communist offensive, and that they mount a political, ideological, and economic offensive of their own, based on the right of the captive peoples to self-determination. In such an offensive and in the spirit of solidarity between the free and the captive peoples of Europe and Asia lies the main hope for the global victory of liberty.

ACEN PLENARY HONORS ANTI-COMMUNIST FREEDOM DAY

The Plenary of the Assembly of Captive European Nations held an extraordinary meeting this afternoon at Carnegie Endowment International Center in New York to commemorate the eighth Anniversary of Anti-Communist Freedom Day. This annual event is in memory of the heroic act of some 22,000 Chinese and Korean prisoners of war in the custody of U.N. forces in Korea, who 8 years ago today chose freedom despite strong Communist pressure to repatriate them.

Guest speakers included representatives of Korea, China, and Cuba. ACEN issued an anniversary declaration and sent telegrams to the Presidents of the United States, the Republic of China, and the Republic of Korea.

ADDRESSES

ACEN Chairman, Ferenc Nagy, in his speech emphasized the importance of the event because, as he put it, the choice of freedom of the Chinese and Korean prisoners "demonstrated with irrefutable clarity on whose side the oppressed Chinese and Koreans stand when they are given a free choice. As we all remember, the Hungarian people expressed the same truth in their revolution of 1956." The speaker called the recent blocking by the West of the Red Chinese bid to enter the U.N. purely defensive. Defensive strategy, he said, is of little use against the grand design of Communist imperialism for world domination. He concluded:

"The Communist empire is today in the throes of ideological strife. To cope with the de-Stalinization ferment, the Communist leaders are stepping up integration in the captive areas and making warlike postures abroad. Khrushchev is not only hoping that the West will fall to take advantage of the difficulties in the Soviet empire, but is also intimating that the West bolster him, as a lesser evil, by granting him concessions. Will the West remain inactive and ball out Khrushchev? Or will the free world seize the opportunities offered by the flux in the Soviet empire and go over into a political ideological and economic counteroffensive? If the free world chooses the second course—as we fervently hope—it will have the full-hearted support of the European and Asian captive peoples. As for us, we shall best commemorate Freedom Day by rededicating ourselves to the cause of the liberty of our homelands and by further strengthening the

bonds of unity between captive Europe and captive Asia."

Mr. Soo Young Lee, Ambassador, Permanent Observer of Korea to the U.N., said that "the Communist evil has been illustrated over and over and over again during these past several decades by barbarous acts of cruelty and monstrous instances of deception." He singled out the fact that the Communist leaders who on every occasion stress brotherhood and justice "are, in fact, the world's worst exemplars of special privilege, selfish aggrandizement, and exploitation." The Korean spokesman said that tyranny is not static, nor withering away, but is constantly and persistently expanding, and that imperialism "is today threatening to encompass the entire globe." He stressed that the fight for survival has now become the common cause of all free humanity. He concluded by urging that free peoples everywhere unite to insure the success of freedom for all.

Mr. Yu-chi Hsueh, Minister, Deputy Permanent Representative of China to the U.N., recalled in detail the events of 8 years ago when, despite Communist persuasion and coercion, the U.N. prisoners of war refused to return to communism.

The spokesman went on to describe in particular the economic disaster Communist tyranny has brought in the past year to the people under its yoke. He attributed this to the fact that their economy was built on slavery. He ridiculed official Chinese statements that in 1963 there would be "another leap forward" in Chinese agriculture. This optimism was totally unwarranted, he said, and he saw no end in grain shortages on the Mainland. He ended with these words: "Let us reaffirm our unity in purpose and solidarity in action; and let us work even harder and with greater vigor for our final victory."

Dr. Andres Valdespino, Representative of the Cuban Revolutionary Council, began by explaining that Mr. Miro Cardona could not come, as he was attending the OAS Conference in Uruguay. The Cuban speaker said that several years ago nobody would have believed that Cuba, so far from the Soviet orbit, would be under Communist domination. He regretted the fact that some Latin American countries are still reluctant to vote for sanctions against Cuba. But isolating the island is of no help, because communism's aims are worldwide. He attributed the Communist takeover in Cuba to Castro's betrayal of the revolution. Mr. Valdespino said that if Cuba should achieve its freedom before East Europe could his land would continue relentlessly its anti-Communist struggle.

Mr. Christopher Emmet, Chairman of the American Friends of Captive Nations, began by affirming that his organization is fighting for the freedom of all captive nations, including those in Asia. After recalling the event of 8 years ago and regretting that it did not get the publicity it deserved at the time, Mr. Emmet spoke of the tragedy of the many prisoners of war who were forced to return to Communist lands at the end of World War II.

FREEDOM DAY DECLARATION

Mr. Aleksander Kutt, Estonia, the Rapporteur, read the anniversary declaration which emphasized that "the captive peoples of Europe and Asia are especially aware that there is only one front in today's struggle; they are deeply convinced that fragmenting the issues and hoping to solve them one by one—be it Berlin or Laos—will not yield results." The ACEN Declaration registered the fact of Communist belligerency against the free world while tightening repression within their own empire. It also referred to the doctrinal strife in the Communist orbit which is "sapped by the unceasing resistance

in the subjugated countries." Instead of committing the fatal mistake of attempting to improve international tensions by avoiding the so-called cold-war issues, the West should boldly face them.

In conclusion, the declaration appealed to the free nations to show firmness and unity in repelling the Communist offensive on the political, ideological, and economic levels, based on the right of the captive peoples to self-determination. "In such an offensive and in a spirit of solidarity between the free and the captive peoples of Europe and Asia lies the main hope for the global victory of liberty."

ACEN SPEAKERS

Dr. Stefan Osusky, Czechoslovakia, former Cabinet Minister, recalled in great detail the events that led to Hitlerism and the role played by Chamberlain resulting in the sell-out of his homeland. He wondered whether the victorious Western nations in dealing with their Communist foes, have learned their lesson from Mr. Neville Chamberlain's tragic example.

He emphasized that liberty, democracy, and peace are in fact endangered in the U.N. and outside the U.N., not only by the Soviet Union and Red China, but mainly by the absence of a deliberate and avowed moral purpose implying the call for common observance of the rule of law, of loyalty to the ideas and principles for the implementation of which the U.N. was created.

Prof. Augustin Popa emphasized that the cause of freedom has far more followers in the world than the Communist creed. The secret of Communist victories lies in the fact that they are organized for war and victory, while the West indulges in wishful thinking and refuses to acknowledge the fact that it is at war. The Rumanian spokesman advocated Freedom Day being made a worldwide event in the future.

TELEGRAMS

The ACEN chairman sent the following telegram to the President of the United States:

"The Assembly of Captive European Nations meeting in New York, in the presence of representatives of the Republics of China and Korea, and of the freedom forces in Cuba, to commemorate the historic choice by 22,000 Chinese and Korean prisoners of war in Korea 8 years ago, send you respectful greetings, Mr. President. We respectfully express our conviction that the present doctrinal strife and the popular ferment in the Soviet empire present the West with a new opportunity to reactivate the issue of the captive countries. We therefore trust that your recent call, Mr. President, on the United Nations to debate colonialism in full and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every part of the globe will soon be followed by concrete American initiatives. We are confident that the free nations will show firmness and unity in repelling the global Communist offensive, and that they will mount a political, ideological, and economic offensive of their own, based on the right of the captive peoples to self-determination. And we assure you, Mr. President, of the solidarity of the captive European peoples with the cause of the free world as long as the free world actively supports their inalienable right to self-determination."

Telegrams of greetings with assurances of solidarity between captive Europe and Asia were also sent to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and Mr. Po Sun Yun, President of the Republic of Korea.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING sent the following telegram:

"I regret exceedingly that my Senate duties prevent me from accepting your kind invitation to take part in the ceremonies of

this meaningful commemoration. All peoples who are free, and all who aspire to the return of their lost freedom, are deeply indebted to the Assembly of Captive European Nations for making this epochal day and making it live in the hearts and minds of men. The tragic story of freedom's denial to our brothers must be kept vivid in our memories, for Communist tyranny is the foe of all freemen, not solely of those who stand in the darkness of enslavement. Their agonizing captivity must be for us not only a source of sorrow, but a source of inspiration and challenge. As a part of the great brotherhood of freemen, we must be worthy of the courage and the hope of those valorous peoples manacled by the brutal forces of communism. Behind the dark curtains of oppression brave men and women keep the candle of hope ever burning. Let us, the free, keep the fire of our devotion to their cause ever burning as well. They are brothers to us. Let us be brothers to them."

DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FOR NEW YORK

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I am compelled to leave the Chamber to attend a rather important function to which I was invited previously. I am most interested in the comments that will be made by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I regret that I shall not be present on the floor to listen to them and to participate in the discussion of the subject matter which the Senator from New York intends to pursue. I merely wish to say on this occasion that I shall look forward to a very early date when I shall be able to make comment with respect to the subject matter which my able friend desires to discuss on this occasion.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I shall be very much interested in the comments which the distinguished Senator from California will make. I assure him that I shall in no way attack his State or him personally in my remarks. I regret that he has another engagement and will not be able to stay on the floor. Having tried a good many lawsuits, I recognize that in some of the things that I am about to say I have a very distinguished adversary for whose ability I have the utmost respect.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend from New York. Let the RECORD clearly show that there is no more able Senator in the Senate than the Senator who is about to speak.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Defense Department figures released last week show an increasing imbalance in defense work. California is now getting 23.9 percent, New York only 10.2 percent. More than one-third of Air Force money was spent in California over the last 6 months of 1961.

Nevertheless, I am pleased to note that Defense Department preliminary figures for the last 6 months of 1961 indicate an increase in New York's share from 8.1 percent to 10.2 percent of total dollar value of procurement.

Over the 3-month period from July to September 1961 New York only got 8.1 percent, but over the 6-month period of July to December, New York received 10.2 percent. This amounted to \$1.134 billion. Although this gain is still well

below New York's level for the last 3 fiscal years, and only about half of the percentage which New Yorkers pay in Federal taxes, it does show that perhaps the Defense Department is becoming aware of the need to channel more work into the East.

The basic imbalance remains, however, as California has gone up from 23.7 percent to 23.9 percent of the total over the same period. The next States after New York with 10.2 percent are Massachusetts with 5.1 percent and Texas with 5 percent. California's disproportionate share is, therefore, getting more and more disproportionate all the time.

The time has come for the Defense Department to make a specific study of the tendency that may exist in certain procurement stations to pay special attention to local businesses and give scant notice to firms that are more remote. There is a real need for more statistics and evidence as to how often the local firm, with personal contacts, gets the business, while those which are not right next door hardly get a hearing. I should particularly like to see a breakdown on the distribution of defense contracts awarded by the Air Force Space Systems Division, the Air Force Ballistic Systems Division, and the Army Corps of Engineers Ballistic Missile Construction Office, all in Los Angeles.

Frankly, Mr. President, a number of New York executives have spoken to me about the fly-by-night character of some of these establishments which mushroom around the military contracting stations in some areas. I think this matter should be investigated. If the figures document my suspicions, which I seriously believe they will do, then the Defense Department needs to take a good second look at its procurement methods. It is time to check carefully to find out what is going on.

I have heard many arguments about the favorable weather in the South and West. I am sure that after all the postponements of Colonel Glenn's flight, no one from NASA will boast about Cape Canaveral's weather again. Good weather may be necessary for space flights, but it is not necessary for the production and fabrication of parts and equipment. Experience, teamwork, and skilled employees are most important—and certainly no one State or area has a monopoly on these.

Mr. President, this persisting imbalance has been particularly apparent in the Air Force. Over the same 6-month period—that is, July through December 1961—California received 34 percent of Air Force procurement dollars while New York received only 10 percent. For that reason I am especially happy that Air Force Secretary Zuckert is personally aware of this problem and has promised to do what he can to rectify it.

Secretary Zuckert, in recent correspondence with me, has indicated that in some programs "it is important for New York firms to make their capabilities known to our procurement agencies." He also assures me that the agencies have now been "alerted to extend every opportunity to New York firms who wish to participate in this program." I know

New York firms will be anxious to follow this up, especially if they know they will have fair consideration from all procurement officers on the west coast as well as on the east coast.

Two of the principal Air Force procurement stations, with heavy responsibilities in the missile and space field are the Air Force Ballistic Systems Division and the Air Force Space Systems Division, both located in Los Angeles. I am very grateful that Secretary Zuckert has alerted both these divisions to New York's interest in their procurements and I will be following the results with great interest.

Mr. President, only 2 weeks ago I received a letter from the Deputy Administrator of NASA indicating that not only does NASA expect to double its dollar procurement for New York State during the next fiscal year, but also that it is making a special effort to inform itself of the capability of firms all over the country. NASA, I understand, is seriously investigating with leading Eastern educational institutions and others how to provide better channels for information on its needs for every area and region of the country. NASA's deliberate efforts to spread the scope of procurement are to be commended and I certainly hope the Air Force and other Defense agencies will be ready to follow NASA's lead in deliberately undertaking the policies and methods designed to spread its procurement more fairly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my correspondence with Secretary Zuckert, as well as the text of my letter to Defense Secretary McNamara asking for an investigation of defense procurement figures and distribution, appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair.) Is there objection?

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

JANUARY 23, 1962.

The Honorable EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: New Yorkers are very much concerned over the recent decline in New York defense procurement to only 8.1 percent of the national total for the period from July through September 1961. Figures for procurement by the Air Force only, however, are even lower than that, as, during this period, New York received less than 5.8 percent of Air Force procurement dollars.

A disproportionately high share of Air Force procurement, on the other hand, is concentrated on the west coast. I believe it would be very much in the National interest for this work to be distributed on a more equitable geographic basis.

One field of aerospace effort, for example, in which I believe the East can make a substantial contribution is the development of solid propellant boosters. Necessary steel and furnace facilities are concentrated in the East. I therefore strongly urge the Air Force to expand its efforts for a better distribution of procurement and even to undertake a specific program to inform itself of the industrial capability of the Northeast with special reference to the solid fuel rocket booster program. This program will have increasing importance, and it would seem to

me unnecessary to spend the taxpayers' money to duplicate on the west coast facilities already existing in the East.

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. KEATING.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1962.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: This is in response to your letter of January 23 in which you suggested that we place contracts with a larger number of firms in the State of New York. We made an interim reply on February 16.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. Thomas D. Morris, wrote you on this matter in December 1961, pointing out that his office had made a special study of the matter. He emphasized that the Department of Defense is making a strenuous effort to strengthen the competitive factors in procurement, and to expand the use of incentive systems. Our procurement objectives are of course to obtain for the Government the best quality products at the least cost to the taxpayer. While awarding contracts on a strictly geographical basis is not consistent with these objectives, there are steps we can take to assist.

One of these steps is the Department of Defense program to place contracts in labor surplus areas, where this can be done without paying a price differential to firms in labor surplus areas. Another step is our active program to encourage prime contractors to broaden their base of subcontracting to include those companies which have capability useful to the prime contract and those firms in labor surplus areas. In pursuing this subcontracting policy every consideration is given to firms in labor surplus areas, including preferential award of negotiated procurement and partial set-aside.

In seeking Air Force contracts, it is important that firms give emphasis to being competitive both as to price and to product quality.

With regard to the development of solid propellant boosters, it is important for New York firms to make their capabilities known to our procurement agencies. It is suggested that the companies interested in this field get in touch with the Air Force Ballistic Systems Division and the Air Force Space Systems Division, both of whom can be addressed at Air Force Unit Post Office, Los Angeles, Calif. We have informed both agencies of your interest in this matter and have alerted them to extend every opportunity to New York firms who wish to participate in this program.

I am hopeful that New York firms will in the future be more successful in competition for contracts in our aerospace programs.

Sincerely,

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,
Secretary of the Air Force.

MARCH 2, 1962.

The Honorable ROBERT S. McNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of the increasing imbalance of defense contracts and the concentration of work on the west coast, I most respectfully urge you to undertake an investigation to determine whether all procurement divisions, and especially those on the west coast, are making a conscientious effort to solicit and review bids from all parts of the country, not just neighboring areas.

I would be especially interested in statistics from the Air Force Ballistic Systems Division, Air Force Space Systems Division, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in Los Angeles, indicating what percentage of the work is awarded locally and what percentage is awarded to other areas. Any additional in-

formation as to the measures being taken to publicize upcoming procurements widely would also be appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. KEATING.

EDUCATION FOR GI AN URGENT MUST

MR. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, ours is a country that has traditionally and wisely concerned itself with the welfare and training of veterans of the Armed Forces, who have responded to the call of their country.

However, veterans who have served our country since the Korean war have not been accorded that justice to themselves and to the people to which the Nation is dedicated. A veterans' bill of rights to provide them an opportunity to make up for lost time in the field of education and thereby to be prepared for the economic battle of life is now a national necessity.

Those who have had their pursuit of education delayed, interrupted, or prevented altogether by a call to arms during the cold war are deserving of better treatment than this Government has given them.

The cold war GI bill would provide these forgotten men with an opportunity to advance their education in such a way as to provide a stronger basic national strength and a cash profit to the Government at the same time.

Because of the experience of the Government with the GI law as it pertained to World War II and Korean war veterans, it has been proved that such training has raised the earning capacity of the 50 percent of the veterans who took the GI training so as to more than pay for the cost of the education. Not only will such training have paid the bills for the education of World War II and Korean war veterans; it will have paid for itself completely by 1970.

The national security depends more and more every day upon what we have always referred to as American ingenuity, and American know-how. Nobody else is going to look out for the United States. We must do it ourselves and I am confident that in so doing we will remain aware that education is the mightiest weapon we possess.

The men who push all our sciences, including the development of nuclear power, are trained men. I am confident that the records will show that an impressive percentage of them were trained, at least in part, under the GI bill of World War II and the GI bill of the Korean conflict.

Mr. President, I digress to point out again what has often been said in the Senate, namely, the opinions of Dr. Teller and Admiral Rickover that but for the veterans trained under the GI bill of rights, the Russians would be ahead of us in science by now.

The National Science Foundation survey, that comprehensive, bulky volume filed within the past 60 days, shows that in 1959, 190,000 scientists, engineers, and other scientific personnel were graduated from universities and colleges in the Soviet Union, compared with 90,000 who

were graduated in the United States in the same year in the same disciplines.

The report analyzes the types of courses given in the Russian universities and indicates that the training given in engineering and scientific subjects is not inferior to the courses given in the United States, and that the 190,000 persons who were graduated from Russian universities in 1 year in those disciplines, each graduate according to his training, have had training at least equivalent to that of the 90,000 graduates of universities in the United States.

The passage of a GI bill for cold war veterans has been too long delayed for the good of the country. Now it is out on the calendar of the Senate. It is time it became law.

Recently, I received a letter from the national commander of the AMVETS, Mr. Edwin P. Fifielski, who advised me that in the opinion of the AMVETS, this cold war group of veterans is deserving of special consideration with regard to education and rehabilitation. There is no question that the AMVETS are right.

It has been proved that World War II veterans who trained under the GI bill are more than repaying their country in actual cash value, through increased taxes paid from increased earning power.

Today, our unemployment situation is not good. What dangers of increased unemployment would we face if the veterans who attended school under a GI bill had not secured special training and education fitting them for jobs that now are available? I believe it quite possible that the bread lines and the soup lines would reach up and down the main streets of America if these 22 million veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict had not had assistance in furthering their education after these wars.

How many of our doctors and schoolteachers at work today were trained under the GI bills? We know that many of them were. Yet, do we have enough doctors and enough schoolteachers? We know the answer is that we do not.

Actually, Mr. President, up to 1955, 110,000 medical personnel in the United States had received training under these bills; and they include doctors, dentists, registered nurses, and other medical personnel. We know that, in addition, up to that time more than 140,000 schoolteachers, and also several hundred thousand scientists and engineers, were trained under the GI bills. But, despite that, we still do not have enough doctors, other medical personnel, teachers, engineers, and scientists.

What will the picture be a few years from now? Will the young men and the generation of today pay the price for the failure of an apathetic government to recognize that education is an absolute essential for the survival of this country as we know and love it? All of us are seeking higher goals than mere bare, raw survival. This is an opportunity bill—not just for the veterans, but for the Nation.

Mr. President, support for the cold-war GI bill has spread throughout the country. To illustrate this growth of support, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed in the *Record* a letter, dated February 20, 1962, from

National Commander Edwin P. Fifielski, of the AMVETS, who describes the cold war veteran as a "new breed," and points out that many of them served their country in more hazardous capacities than did many shooting war veterans.

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

AMVETS NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1962.
The Honorable RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I have been advised that S. 349 is now on the Senate Calendar and will be considered by the Senate during the period of February 20 to March 1. At our 1960 and 1961 national conventions, AMVETS adopted resolutions calling for an education and training program for cold war veterans along the same lines as for World War II and the Korean conflict veterans. S. 349 is, generally, in keeping with these resolutions.

The men who served since the end of the Korean conflict pose a peculiar problem not heretofore encountered by this Nation. Previously the peacetime ex-serviceman was not exposed to the same hazards of service as the wartime serviceman nor was he motivated in the same manner to enter service. Generally speaking, the peacetime veteran volunteered in the Armed Forces because it offered him the career of his choice. The distinction between wartime and peacetime service was therefore clear, and different benefits were granted to each group.

The status of this "new breed" of cold war servicemen is not so well defined. While they may not, strictly speaking, be called wartime veterans, neither can they be placed in a strict peacetime category. The majority of these men were either drafted or they are serving under compulsion of the draft. There can be little doubt that for most, their civilian pursuits were interrupted and for many, their service has been more hazardous than that experienced by some of our wartime veterans.

The benefits reaped by this Nation as a result of the education and rehabilitation program developed after the start of World War II has been tremendous. Men and women have been educated in a thousand skills and sciences which today serve the entire Nation. The injured in mind and body have been rehabilitated in useful fields and occupations. In all, past experience has shown the value of this type of program.

In the opinion of AMVETS, this cold war group of veterans is deserving of special consideration with regard to education and rehabilitation and we urge your support of S. 349.

Sincerely,

EDWIN P. FIFIELSKI,
National Commander.

TRIBUTE TO SAM RAYBURN, OF TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America have written me a letter containing a resolution in tribute to Sam Rayburn, of Texas, Speaker of the House of Representatives, whose death was mourned nationally.

The tribute is a moving one; and knowing the respect and admiration felt for Speaker Rayburn in both Houses of Congress and throughout the United States, I believe the letter should be placed in the National Archives of our country.

Mr. President, nothing better illustrates the esteem in which Sam Rayburn

was held and the broad sympathy and fairness to all parts of the country on the part of Mr. Sam, a member of the Baptist Church, than this wonderful tribute which he has received from the Catholic War Veterans of the United States. It indicates the unity of all our people in their desire for better government in our country.

In their tribute they state:

Whereas Mr. Sam, as called by his friends, was a friend of Catholic War Veterans, and an advocate of their cause, and friend of all Veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Catholic War Veterans pay tribute to Mr. Sam, and that a special prayer be said for the repose of his soul; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senate of the United States, and to the Sam Rayburn Memorial Library, of Bonham, Tex.

And to others.

In the resolution it is also stated that—

Whereas in the passing of Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, our country has lost a great advocate on the American way of life; and

Whereas a loss to our country is a loss to the Catholic War Veterans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1962.

Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I am happy to forward to you the following resolution passed at a recent meeting of the national board of officers of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America:

"Whereas in the passing of Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, our country lost a great advocate of the American way of life; and

"Whereas a loss to our country is a loss to the Catholic War Veterans; and

"Whereas Mr. Sam, as called by his friends, was a friend of Catholic War Veterans, and an advocate of their cause and friend of all veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Catholic War Veterans pay tribute to Mr. Sam and that a special prayer be said for the repose of his soul; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Catholic War Veterans be sent to the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senate and to the Sam Rayburn Memorial Library of Bonham, Tex., to the Texas delegation in our Congress, and to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States, and that this meeting adjourn in his memory."

I know that sentiments expressed in this resolution are those of our entire membership throughout the country.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES W. HAFEY,
Executive Director.

WALTER LIPPMANN WRITES ON REPUBLICAN PROBLEM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, lately some rather irresponsible statements have been made in the country about the Government and about what

the executive and judicial branches of the Government are doing, and particularly about the administration. Some persons claim the administration has been spending us into bankruptcy, and has had extravagant programs which the country cannot afford or cannot stand. It has been rather obvious that some of the irresponsible extremists who give noisy lip service to patriotism, while trying to undermine the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of our United States, are not getting along too well together. This is not altogether surprising, since about all they ever say is "No," and since almost all their considerable talent is consumed in attempts to say "No" in new ways, worthy of bold new headlines.

It might also be noted that the principal success of the extremist advocates has been in getting headlines—thus justifying a suspicion that headlines are their principal goal.

The distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, dealt with one interesting aspect of the extremist view in his column—published on February 22, 1962, in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times—entitled "Republican Doctrine Clashes With Facts." The article is very informed and very informative. It points out that the programs which have been advocated by this administration are not "spending the country into bankruptcy," but that, on the contrary, even if we were to spend on social security and other services the amounts recommended by this administration, we still would not be spending as much on those services, in connection with public programs for the welfare of the people, as the amounts being spent today, in terms of percentage, by Belgium, Canada, France, the United Kingdom, Sweden, and West Germany. In the article Mr. Lippmann also points out that in the year 1959, the most recent year for which adequate comparative figures are available, the United States total spending—Federal, State, and local—was but 28.3 percent of the gross national product; and that the percentage of the gross national product which will be spent by our country, even if every program recommended by this administration is enacted into law, will still be smaller than the percentage spent by the other countries referred to.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article written by Walter Lippmann be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times,
Feb. 22, 1962]

REPUBLICAN DOCTRINE CLASHES WITH FACTS
(By Walter Lippmann)

The soul searching which went on among the Republican orators on Lincoln's Birthday did not bring forth that new image which they were all seeking. Somewhere there is a block. It prevents the Republican Party from getting to a position which is both conservative and popular.

The block, I venture to suggest, is that the Republican position has been moved so far to the right that the party has con-

ceded to the Kennedy administration not only the left but the whole vast dominant center.

This has left the Republican leaders with no elbow room, and they are squeezed into a corner where they can only say no. This cannot make for popularity and for votes in a country where the population is growing prodigiously, where the way of life is changing rapidly, where the people, conscious of the huge productive capacity of our economy, are demanding that their crowded life in the cities be made more comfortable and more civilized.

The displacement of the Republican leaders from the center to the right has many causes. One of them, for example, is the control of the party organization by the old codgers, who have safe seats and keep on being reelected. There is another reason which is that in recent years Republican doctrine has been shaped by theorists who are out of touch with the modern world. Indeed, it would not be an exaggeration to say that it has been shaped by theorists who do not know what they are talking about.

These theorists have produced a formula which discombobulates Republican thinking. It is that liberalism and progressivism are the high road to socialism, and that socialism is the high road to communism.

The extremists use the formula to say that the United States started down the road to communism when the income tax was legalized in 1913. But even the moderates, General Eisenhower, for example, are deeply suspicious of social security and the welfare state and of aid to education, and above all of the modern conception of the compensatory economy.

The difficulty about making a new image is that the Republican theorists have created such a false image of the Kennedy Democratic Party that there is no effective way they can oppose it. Applied to the Kennedy administration the formula of the theorists of the right, that progressivism leads to socialism and socialism to communism, is absurd. It is silly. Though Kennedy is a progressive and a liberal, he is also a profound conservative, and only the befuddled theorists find that strange and hard to understand.

Their central theme, which is also a central illusion, is that this country is "spending" its way out of freedom into socialism and communism. But is it? I have some figures here which come from Prof. F. M. Bator, a leading authority on the problems of Government spending.

A big rich country spends more, of course, than a small poor country. The proper basis of comparison, therefore, is the volume of Government spending against the size of the economy. Professor Bator's figures show that Government spending in the United States is not out of line with spending in other advanced industrial nations.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine is the most recent year for which adequate comparative figures are available. In that year in the United States total public spending (Federal, State, local) was 28.3 percent of the gross national product. As this includes national defense, public education, highways, police, hospitals, and whatnot, can it really be said that spending less than 30 percent publicly puts us on the road to, or anywhere near the road to, socialism and communism? Can it really be said when of this 30 percent which is spent publicly over half goes to purchases from private firms producing for profit?

As a matter of fact, in public spending we are behind Belgium (29.3 percent), Canada (30 percent), France (33.5 percent), United Kingdom (34.9 percent), Sweden (35.7 percent). In West Germany the latest figures are for 1957. That was before the big rise of German defense spending and at that time the percentage of public spending was slightly bigger than ours (28.6 percent).

Yet West Germany is regarded by many as the shining example of a free capitalistic economy.

But, it will be said, while defense spending is necessary, the real creeping socialism is the money spent for social security, veterans' benefits, Government interest, and cash subsidies. For the United States the ratio of such payments to gross national product was 7 percent in 1959.

The Canadian ratio was 8.7 percent. The United Kingdom's ratio was 11.2 percent. The West German (in 1957) was 12.1 percent, the Belgian 13.6 percent, the French 16.5 percent.

There are other comparative figures which could be cited. All of them point to the conclusion that as compared with the advanced industrial nations of the world the ratio of our public spending is conservative. There is no hard factual basis for the theory that we have turned our back on the free economy and are on the high road to socialism and communism.

The latter-day Republican propaganda does not work for the very simple reason that it is not true.

THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES EXERT A POWERFUL THRUST OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this year we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Morrill Land Grant College Act, which in 1862 was signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln. Under that act, many land-grant colleges of the country were founded. These colleges have proven their capability for remaining close to the people and to their needs; and that development has exerted a great forward thrust in public education in the United States.

Today, Mr. President, a century later, we need another forward thrust of that sort; and if it is to be obtained at this time, the power and the strength of the Federal Government must be exerted in that connection.

Mr. President, the Texas A. & M. College is a land-grant college created under the Morrill Land Grant College Act of 1862. It has contributed long and ably to the vigorous and dynamic growth of Texas and the Nation. It has produced leaders in times of peace and in times of war. In fact, in World War II there were in the U.S. Army more officers who were graduates of Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College than there were graduates of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point—simply because the enrollment at Texas A. & M. College was not restricted, and thus was large.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Texas A. & M. College was the first tax-supported State college in Texas which opened its doors to students—thus demonstrating that this college stands as a symbol of proof that the concept of education as a national problem is neither new nor dangerous, as many opponents of Federal aid to education constantly and erroneously contend.

Recently, John T. Caldwell, chancellor of North Carolina State College, and president of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, wrote for the Christian Science Monitor an article in which he stated:

These institutions are living examples that Federal aid to education can serve the national interest without sacrifice of local self-

government or institutional integrity. Indeed the United States today would be immeasurably poorer but for this imaginative Federal action one century ago and its continued support in partnership with the States.

Mr. President, I have never seen or heard of a "Texas Aggie," nor do I expect to meet one in my time, who felt other than the deepest pride in his school.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Christian Science Monitor of Thursday, February 1, 1962, entitled "The Land-Grant Colleges: Powerful Thrust of Democracy."

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor of Feb. 1, 1962]

THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES: POWERFUL THRUST OF DEMOCRACY

(By John T. Caldwell, chancellor, North Carolina State College; president, Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges)

The land-grant colleges and universities of the United States were born out of a high estimate of education as an instrument of individual and social progress. They were born with a broad concept of the many different kinds of abilities human beings possess and the value of cultivating them all to the utmost. They have been committed from their beginning in 1862 to the wide dissemination and use of knowledge. They were born from faith in the American people and their great destiny.

How magnificent a concept. No wonder newly developing nations of the world and even old nations undergoing self-appraisal now are scrutinizing higher education in the United States for useful hints to themselves.

The centennial year of the land-grant institutions occurs at a moment when the United States is taking a close look, even an anxious look, at the magnitude and urgency of its own educational task.

In 1862 a national population of 32 million boasted 203 colleges and perhaps 25,000 college graduates, three-fourths of 1 percent, such as they were. Today a rapidly increasing population of 180 million is served by more than 2,000 institutions of higher education enrolling 3,891,000 students and counting millions of alumni. One-fifth of the students are in land-grant colleges and universities. These colleges which were "born to grow" are doing it, dramatically.

IMPACT MEASURED

Today—100 years after the act of Congress creating them—there are 68 land-grant universities and colleges. Some are one with the State university (as in Minnesota), some are separate (as in Mississippi), some function as part of a private institution (as Cornell). Although they comprise in number fewer than one-twentieth of all colleges and universities in the United States, their enrollment is one-fifth of the total. They grant 22 percent of all the bachelor's degrees conferred, 25 percent of the master's degrees, and 38 percent of the doctorates. In engineering 40 percent of all degrees at the bachelor's level are granted by the land-grant institutions, 42 percent of all master's, and 53 percent of the Ph. D.'s. In the vitally important fields of mathematics and the physical sciences 35 percent and 42 percent, respectively, of the Ph. D.'s are earned in land-grant colleges. As would be expected, the graduates in agriculture are produced heavily by these institutions: 80 percent of the bachelors, 97 percent of the masters, and all of the doctorates. One-fourth of the

doctorates in the arts and languages, in business and commerce, and in professional education are conferred by the land-grant institutions.

Twenty-one of the thirty-six living American Nobel Prize winners who studied in this country earned land-grant degrees.

The enormously productive agriculture of the United States rests directly upon the research and educational effectiveness of the land-grant system. Today 1 American farmworker feeds 23 other people, a marvel in the world and a prerequisite to other advancement. The agricultural experiment stations (dating from the 1887 Hatch Act) and the Cooperative Extension Service in agriculture and home economics (dating from the Smith-Lever Act in 1914) are integral parts of the land-grant enterprise. The county agent is a man of distinction in American higher education and in rural life. He has also become a peacemaker in combining technical ability with skill in human relations to helping other developing economies of our world.

BASIS PUT TO TEST

Even now, however, the land-grant outlook and philosophy are being tested.

Will these institutions have the resources to grow and to maintain quality at the same time? This is a test of the public will and priority of public purpose.

Do they have the ability to use effectively the resources provided by the people and in a manner which will satisfy an intelligent taxpayer? This is mainly a test of management competence.

Can they provide maximum opportunity for the most brilliant minds while at the same time and often on the same campus provide for the student of lesser but solid ability who has much to gain from higher learning which will be returned in enlarged service to his fellow men? This is a test of educational skill.

Can these institutions meet the insistent demands for applied research and yet have time and money for the constant replenishment of our fundamental knowledge of the why and the wherefore of life and energy and behavior? This is a test of both academic character and public understanding.

Can the tremendous achievements of the land-grant colleges in agriculture be duplicated in facing up to the technological and social problems of an urban population? Will the effective skills typical of our extension philosophy be applied to urban living? This is a test of institutional adaptability and determination to face up to new educational needs and to obtain support for meeting them.

The land-grant colleges face the test of internationalism, meeting the manifold requirements of the Government for forging helpful relationships in depth with the people of the world and their problems—now ours. Not just can they but will they see the needs beyond the immediacy of local enterprise within the respective States and apply their skills and resources to a worldwide campus? This indeed is a test of public vision.

CONCEPT PLACED ON SCALES

All these tests are indeed being met—even brilliantly—in places. Another test, however, has not been resolved. It is a test of the whole concept of public higher education. It is a test more of the taxpayer public than of the institutions themselves. The United States is being tested on whether it wants its land-grant and other public institutions to continue to serve generously and deliberately the educational needs of all the people for the benefit of society. No student loan program or a student scholarship program yet proposed substitutes for low-cost public higher education.

Sometimes the public colleges are told to raise their charges to students for tuition

to meet their budgetary requirements. The issue is complex. But surely it would be a subversion of the history and purposes and enormous achievements of the public institutions to force them now to remold their open character in imitation of the private and church-related institutions, many of whom desperately need to reduce their charges to students. The availability of low-cost, public higher education in the United States indeed is a measure of contemporary democracy, of political responsibility, and of commonsense.

The powerful thrust of democracy in American higher education so evident today is part and parcel with the forces which produced the land-grant movement.

Education in all ages and places has reflected the controlling notions of what the society itself ought to be or become. The older, stratified societies, aristocratically controlled, or colonially governed, built educational systems accordingly, systems which were restricted in outlook both for the non-privileged individual and for the society's future.

OPPORTUNITY UNFOLDED

Education in this new land was sooner or later destined to reflect its generous concept of the place of the individual and its constantly expanding ambitions for economic and cultural growth, locally and nationally. In retrospect, however, the reflection seems to have been slow in coming. For during the colonial period and the immediately ensuing preoccupation with nationmaking, the aristocratic and classical character of education inherited from England and the Continent and which had prevailed for 200 years was dominant.

Then followed a combination of forces operating to open up educational opportunity. Jacksonian democracy, a general intellectual awakening, the step-up of science, industry, and invention, agricultural ferment, and even concern over the dissipation of Federal landholdings, combined to produce dissatisfaction with existing education and pressures for improvement. One of the outcomes was the Morrill Act of 1862. Vetted earlier by President Buchanan, Justin Morrill's bill was signed into law by President Lincoln July 2, 1862.

This Land-Grant College Act brought into possibility, on the pattern of Michigan's new State Agricultural College (1855), a nationwide pattern of colleges, at least one in each State, "where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classic studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."

The Government granted each State agreeing to the terms 30,000 acres of Federal land for each Senator and Representative in Congress, which acreage was to be sold to provide a capital fund on the investment of which the State would pay in perpetuity 5 percent annually to support the college.

DEMOCRATIC IN CHARACTER

Whether measured in student enrollment, off-campus instruction, and technical assistance, or research of fundamental value to human welfare, this group of institutions has made the Morrill Act probably the most significant single piece of social legislation in U.S. history. Their characteristics are clear.

These colleges are democratic in character. No one of them has ever assumed that it should limit the opportunities of its campus to a narrowly conceived aristocracy of position, intellect, or money. They have assumed on the other hand that as the Na-

tion grew, as knowledge expanded, as the range of competencies required by the society was extended, it was their job to serve these expanded needs of the people. This view persists.

These colleges reflect the spirit of Francis Bacon, who had urged three centuries earlier, but with little success, that knowledge should be found and used to improve the lot of mankind.

The land-grant colleges have never been "ivory towers." They have never been far removed from the people they serve and the needs which have nurtured their growth.

The land-grant colleges and universities illustrate dramatically that the people, the public, through their constituted organs of government, hold the major responsibility for the advancement of knowledge and the education of citizens. These colleges are public, tax-supported institutions. Though their resources are supplemented in important respects by private grants and support, the basic responsibility for their support and the basic commitment of the colleges belong to the people exercised through public channels.

EXAMPLES FOR FEDERAL AID

These institutions are living examples that Federal aid to education can serve the national interest with enormously valuable results and without sacrifice of local self-government or institutional integrity. Indeed the United States today would be immeasurably poorer but for this imaginative Federal action one century ago and its continued support in partnership with the States.

They have assumed also the task of developing high standards as a necessary corollary to serving responsibly the special needs of our time. Counseled admissions and placement, honors programs, more demanding curriculums, strengthened facilities, and deepened research commitments characterize the contemporary public university.

Finally, they have not neglected to defend the great principles which universities have always had to defend, such as freedom for the mind. They know now, as intelligent men have always known and as freemen always must know, that the risks of freedom to think and write and learn and speak are fewer and less dangerous than the risks of suppression.

The centennial year of the land-grant colleges and universities of the United States finds them living more intimately than ever with the busy world they helped to create. Nuclear reactors, radio telescopes, mass spectrometers, experimental swine shelters, greenhouses, nursery schools, art studies, language laboratories, television stations, theaters, computers, filmed documents—the full range of human knowledge, curiosity, and endeavor, mark the contemporary mission of this educational system.

CONTRIBUTION TO NATION

Without these colleges, which were originally founded especially to teach "agriculture and the mechanic arts," American agriculture would have developed anyway to some extent; industry would have expanded; the defense establishment would have trained a fair number of officers for its reserve and active cadres. No doubt some American pure scientists would have teamed with other innovators and inventors to produce some applied results even useful to the farmer. But let us make no bones about it. The United States would not enjoy the culture nor have the productive capacity that it does today—in farm, forest, skyscraper, or factory—without the contributions of research and the wide dissemination of knowledge to which the resources of the land-grant educational system have been devoted.

The land-grant colleges and universities exist to help unfold the glories of man's possibilities and not to settle for less, to

make it possible for all men to look out upon a universe better understood, more kind, more just, more abundant than when these colleges entered the scene 100 years ago.

To this end they are rededicated and beg the sustaining company of all the Nation in the journey ahead.

SOVIET FARM PROBLEMS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, today the Communist Party Central Committee is meeting in Moscow for the avowed purpose of adopting remedies for the shortcomings that have arisen in agricultural production and the objectives of the party.

Accordingly, I think the article that appeared in today's Wall Street Journal entitled "Soviet Farm Ills," written by Joe Western, is very timely. It traces the objectives and deficiencies that have occurred in Soviet agricultural production. The article points out some of the reasons why these deficiencies have occurred. Included in the reasons, I think it highly significant to point out, is one designated lack of adequate incentives for farmers to boost their production.

The Soviet farmers have lost their freedoms in all areas except one, and that one is in their little farm plots adjacent to their homes. In their little plots they have the benefit of their own production; they have the incentive to produce.

The Wall Street Journal article significantly points out that, although these little plots comprise 5 percent of all Soviet farmland, nevertheless they yield half of the nation's meat, milk, green vegetables, and most of its eggs and potatoes.

I think it is well to point out these facts in light of the so-called supply management program which the President and Secretary of Agriculture have asked Congress to pass, because under this program farmers are faced with a choice of loss of freedom on the one hand and, for all practical purposes, loss of their farms on the other.

I think it is time for us to recognize that one reason why American agriculture has been so productive is that our farmers have had freedom and have had the incentive to produce. I am afraid the program that has been requested for Congress would set us back considerably, would deprive our farmers of incentives, and that the day would come when we would find ourselves in the same situation in which the Soviets find themselves today.

Another point is that in the message on agriculture which the President sent to Congress, any proposed program of stepped-up research for agricultural production use in connection with industrial matters was noticeable by its absence.

The other day, in Omaha, Nebr., Mr. J. Leroy Welsh, of Omaha, a former member of the President's Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products, made a speech in which he pointed out that while he was Chairman of the Commission, he personally prepared an evaluation of farm research being done around the country, had it printed in pamphlet form, and person-

ally gave it to many Members of the Congress. He said:

It is almost criminal the way Congress ignored that report and its recommendations. That was in 1957, and they haven't yet taken the first step toward solving the farm problem.

I echo Mr. Welsh's sentiment, because for a long time I have been pointing out that the opportunity to solve the farm surplus problem lies in the area of research and development of increased uses of agricultural products for industrial programs.

I think this administration should give more attention to that approach in solving the farm surplus problem, and yet we have not seen one recommendation made along those lines.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the article from the Wall Street Journal to which I have referred.

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

SOVIET FARM ILLS—KHRUSHCHEV'S BIG DRIVE TO EXPAND PRODUCTION SUFFERS MANY SETBACKS—MEAT, GRAIN TARGETS MISSED; DROUGHTS, INEFFICIENCY, AND FEUD OVER METHODS HURT—PROBLEMS FOR TODAY'S PARLEY

(By Joe Western)

WASHINGTON.—Even as Nikita Khrushchev's Communist Party Central Committee assemblies in Moscow today with the avowed aim of remedying shortcomings in Soviet agriculture, the best-informed U.S. onlookers are becoming increasingly convinced that Red-grown food and fiber won't bury the free world any time in the foreseeable future.

Early harbingers are hinting that this could be the fourth straight year to bring a bumper crop of Kremlin disappointment. Latest weather reports are convincing free-world analysts that parts of the vital grain-producing Ukraine and of the Siberian new lands are very dry. Much more than normal rainfall, they believe, will be needed to put the soil in shape for adequate spring planting and crop production—even after the recent rainstorms that swept from Germany into Russia.

By the account of the Communist Party newspaper Pravda itself, many Russian farmers aren't prepared for spring planting, only a few weeks away. One reason, it's implied, is passive resistance to new farming methods proposed by Mr. Khrushchev, notably a plan to throw into annual crop production some marginal land normally kept in grass for soil-building purposes. The Moscow meeting starting today is expected to adopt such a plan.

WARNING FROM SCIENTISTS

Indeed, U.S. officials report, some of Mr. K's own scientists are warning him that he's bucking Mother Nature in trying to expand livestock feed production rather indiscriminately. Feed crops, he's been told, can deplete the soil quickly, especially in the arid "new lands" of Kazakhstan in southwestern Siberia, making the land vulnerable to dust storms. Furthermore, Soviet scientists have cautioned, shortages of moisture in such places make it hard to ripen feed grains successfully.

Basically, Washington experts report, Premier Khrushchev's 1959-born effort to expand and reshape Soviet agriculture is bumping into serious obstacles. Chronically unfavorable weather across large stretches of Russian farmland, limited acreages of truly fertile soil, lack of adequate incentives for farmers

to boost production, blundering inefficiency in the Red bureaucracy and a tendency of Soviet officials to follow the party line blindly no matter how meager the results.

Some gains are expected, all right, sooner or later. U.S. Government analysts figure Russia may gradually succeed in its new emphasis on raising crop yields per acre rather than pushing plantings deeper into Siberia's virgin lands; more fertilizer and better use of machinery may help do the trick. And Washington officials expect Mr. K. will use the Moscow meeting to renew his farm production drive, probably trying to bully farmers into accepting tougher state controls.

DEPENDENCE ON PRIVATE PLOTS

But if Russia's ruler should meddle too deeply in the still-important private sector of Soviet agriculture, U.S. officials emphasize, he'd risk disaster. For Russia still depends heavily on the output of tiny farmer-owned private plots, worked on the side by members of collective farms; though making up less than 5 percent of all Soviet farmland, the private plots yield nearly half the nation's meat, milk, and green vegetables and most of its eggs and potatoes.

So far, American farm experts conclude, Russian agriculture has made only token advances toward the ambitious goals of the current 7-year plan, trumpeted so loudly by Mr. K. at its unfolding in 1959.

The reverberations have been manifold: Soviet farm output these past few years has lagged behind population increases; while there's nothing like Chinese-style starvation, the Russian diet remains heavy in bread and potatoes and rather light on meat and milk. Farm exports have been sluggish; the U.S.S.R. may find it hard to spare all the food and feed grains its satellites need, and trouble in earning free-world currency with farm-goods sales is hindering Moscow's efforts to buy West European machinery to spur industrialization. Finally, the uninspiring example set by Soviet agriculture in contrast with Western abundance may hamper export of the Red faith to newly developing nations. "Everything we see," notes a U.S. official, "indicates Khrushchev wants to prove that Communist-style agriculture is the best system for them to adopt."

TARNISHED VISION

The 7-year plan, aimed at outstripping U.S. farm abundance, brightly envisioned a total 1959-through-1965 production increase of 70 percent, with especially steep gains in meat and milk. But that vision seems somewhat tarnished now.

Assuming Soviet farm output just before World War II equaled an index figure of 100, the 1965 goal would be 200—and U.S. Agriculture Department specialists figure last year's performance was only 130. While that marked a gain from the 126 of the year before, it still fell short of record 1958, the year before the master plan was thrown into gear.

Total grain deliveries from Russian farms to the government did amount last year to 54 million metric tons, roughly 7 million more than in 1960. But they fell far short of the official 1961 goal of 63 million tons and trailed the 1958 record as well. Much of the lag was in livestock feed grains, the raw materials of the meat and milk Mr. Khrushchev is eyeing so eagerly. Last year's production of corn, oats and barley, Russia's major feed grains, totaled 34 million tons, 4 million less than the 1958 harvest.

For lack of more feed, Soviet production of meat is floundering along year after year at just under 14 billion pounds a year, less than half the goal for 1965. Even this low level is being bolstered by distress slaughter of feed-short livestock. Soviet officials admit livestock numbers did not increase during 1961, in contrast to other recent years. "If feed production cannot be greatly improved, meat production will really begin slumping

In a very few years," an analyst says. Because grain is short, Russia's livestock raisers have turned to other feed, including potatoes and pumpkins, that Americans consider less than ideal for meat-making.

LAGGING MILK FLOW

Russia's milk flow, too, lags behind schedule. Early estimates indicate 1961 production was little or no higher than the 112.5 billion pounds of the year before. That in turn marked a slip from the 113.3 billion pounds of 1959, the first year of the 7-year plan. The 1965 goal is over 200 billion pounds.

By contrast, the United States turned out far more meat and milk last year—30 billion pounds of meat and 125 billion pounds of milk—for a considerably smaller population; the United States has around 185 million mouths to feed, while the Russian population is approaching 220 million. Figured per capita, American farm production now stands more than 20 percent above the pre-World War II mark; Russia's corresponding gain is 13 percent.

Even more startling is the fact that since World War II Russia has increased its sown acreage by 50 percent, but has succeeded in lifting total farm production only 30 percent; the United States has decreased planted acres by 13 percent in the same space of time, yet has increased output 35 percent.

Soviet food supplies are suffering an extra blow from agriculture's setbacks elsewhere in the Red world. Last year, to no one's surprise, stricken China had to halt all exports of food and fiber to Russia.

Not only has Russia lost these imports, but farm failures within its empire—in East Germany, for instance—are stimulating export demand it may not be able to meet; ordinarily 75 percent of Soviet farm exports go to other Iron Curtain countries. Russia's total grain shipments abroad fell to 6.8 million metric tons in 1960 from more than 7 million in 1959—and may have slipped again last year. Most of the wheat the U.S.S.R. has been shipping out, U.S. experts report, came out of the leftover from the big 1958 harvest, not from any more recent crops.

EXASPERATING U.S. COMPARISONS

Kremlin exasperation over farm troubles is heightened by the realization that this country's far larger output comes from an agricultural plant that's operating at only about half its potential capacity, and that the U.S. food-and-fiber outpouring is attained through the efforts of only about 15 million farmworkers, as against more than 100 million toiling on the Russian land.

By the Communists' own account, of course, inefficiency, ignorance and mismanagement deserve much of the blame for farm failures. Mass firings of farm officials and reshuffling of responsibilities late in 1960 have plainly failed to solve these troubles.

In a Moscow speech to farm managers last November Premier Khrushchev complained they made ambitious production plans lightly and then explained failures by saying: "That year the wind blew that way and this year it blew this way." He declared: "We need less sweat and more brains. We have the machines and we have other material resources. We must learn how to use them."

Beyond this, Mr. Khrushchev's plans for boosting feed crops are meeting resistance from some of his own underlings. He wants especially to increase production of corn and sugarbeets, with their high feed value; he'd substitute them for lower-value oats or for soil-building grasses used in crop rotation plans, despite some scientists' fears of soil depletion.

HOW DOES DAISY VOTE?

Said he in a recent speech: "Give the cows a good silage of corn, sugarbeets, hay and straw and ask: 'Well now, Daisy, and what fodder do you vote for?' I am con-

vinced, comrades, that the cow will immediately go up to the sugarbeets." Second choice, he contended, would be corn.

For oats, Mr. Khrushchev has nothing but scorn. He has told one group of farm officials: "I would say as a joke that if these officials will continue to be stubborn and keep land in oats, we will start feeding them oatmeal * * * the coarse stuff (that) you cannot tell, damn it, whether you are getting your ration or the horse's."

And the Soviet Premier has openly challenged charges that it was he and the Communist Party that actually first promoted the "ley" or grass rotation plan he now considers wasteful. P. A. Vlaayuk, president of the Ukrainian Academy of Agriculture, recently delivered such a charge in the Premier's presence. "To listen to you," Mr. Khrushchev replied, "the party elaborated the ley system while the scientists supported the party in this. No, the very opposite is true. Scientists proposed this system and pushed collective and state farms into applying it everywhere."

Whatever tactics Russia's masterminds apply, the U.S. officials foresee basic problems of geography persisting. For one thing, some Russian soils are thin and sandy; the Soviets have nothing to compare with the rich U.S. Corn and Cotton Belts. Weather is another problem. "A large area of the country has a low, highly variable precipitation and is subject to frequent droughts," says a U.S. Agriculture Department study. It was a pair of droughts—one last spring in the Siberian "new lands" and another last summer in the southern European U.S.S.R.—that damaged 1961 grain crops and undid Mr. Khrushchev's predictions of record farm output.

DRAWBACKS OF CLIMATE

As compared with American weather, Russia's climate is not moderated by warm, moisture-laden winds blowing off oceans or large lakes. Because the U.S.S.R. lies much farther north than the United States the average growing season is short; there are only about 130 frost-free days around Moscow, about the same as in central North Dakota. There isn't time to replant in late spring if an unseasonal hard freeze decimates young crops; to delay planting beyond any possibility of late cold snaps means a gamble that early fall frosts won't nip maturing plants.

Certainly U.S. farm specialists do expect that some of the changes now being made, notably the effort to wring more production from each acre of Soviet farmland, may pay off sooner or later. "Even a small increase in yield per acre," notes a U.S. official, "would significantly increase production because of the large acreages involved."

Already the big effort to lift harvest instead by expanding planted acreage has slowed considerably. Last year the U.S.S.R.'s total cropland rose only 2 million acres from the 502 million tilled in 1960; in that year planted acres had leaped 16 million from the year before. Since 1954, all told, some 90 million Soviet acres have been put under cultivation for the first time.

FIRING FARM BUREAUCRATS

However disappointing the results so far, the Red regime has apparently tried to meet some of its farm problems head on. Late in 1960 the Kremlin fired dozens of agricultural bureaucrats up to and including Minister of Agriculture V. V. Matskevitch, mostly for failing to meet output goals and for furnishing false production figures; some were actually tried and imprisoned.

Responsibilities for operations, supervision, and planning were taken away from the Ministry of Agriculture in Moscow and transferred to Gosplan, the state planning committee, and to the ministries of agriculture of the U.S.S.R.'s 15 constituent republics.

A new organization was created directly under the Council of Ministers, which is

chairmanned by Mr. Khrushchev, to assume the function of supplying agriculture with machinery, fertilizer, spare parts, tractor fuel, and other production needs. A new state committee on procurement was established to direct Government acquisition of farm products for public distribution, and the U.S.S.R. shifted to a more flexible yardstick for required deliveries from collective and state-owned farms. Instead of demanding the same fixed quantity each year from every acre of land, whether in the fertile Ukraine or arid Kazakhstan, contracts with each farm are made on the basis of a capacity figure that recognizes differences in soil and climate.

New production incentives were established. As a concession to owners of private plots, 80 percent of income from sales of meat, livestock, poultry, eggs and dairy products was made tax free. Annual interest on state loans to collective farms was cut. Prices of trucks, machinery, gasoline, and spare parts were slashed 40 percent, according to a Kremlin announcement.

PROBLEMS IN BIPARTISANSHIP

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in today's Washington Evening Star there is an excellent article by William S. White, entitled "Problems in Bipartisanship," in which Mr. White points out that the members of the minority party, the Republicans, have thus far in this administration bent over backward and joined with their Democratic colleagues in a bipartisan approach to our foreign affairs problems. I might point out that has been done in other areas as well.

I hope members of the majority party, and particularly in the administration, will recognize this attitude on the part of the minority and recognize what the Republicans have done, and will cease and desist from the partisan political efforts that characterized such ill-fated programs as the late proposed Department of Urban Affairs, and some of the statements coming from departments urging civil service personnel to take an active part in helping develop proposed programs in public groups.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from today's Washington Evening Star to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

PROBLEMS IN BIPARTISANSHIP—REPUBLICANS SHOWING SELF-DISCIPLINE IN EFFORTS TO BACK PRESIDENT

(By William S. White)

The congressional Republicans are stoutly walking a high and swaying wire over foreign policy, in a complex and very dangerous world.

Their twin difficulties are clear, but their rewards have been meager. Their sense of decent responsibility has been, to date, too little appreciated by the nonpolitical public. Little known, too, is that on the really tough foreign showdowns they have given President Kennedy at least as much vital support as has his own Democratic Party.

The Republicans are caught between an excessively nasty devil and an excessively deep blue sea. The devil they have thus far avoided, with great self-restraint, is the temptation to make politics by offering irresponsible criticism of the Kennedy administration in our marching series of foreign crises.

This kind of criticism, though unhappily not unknown before this in both parties

when one or the other has been in minority opposition, could put this country and all the free lands in grave and immediate peril.

Everywhere—over Berlin, over southeast Asia, over Cuba, over the disarmament question—the situation is filled with a sinister delicacy. Only the President has all the facts and only the President must be trusted to deal with it all in the end. This the congressional Republicans have wisely, and even bravely, recognized.

The deep blue sea which yawns beneath them is this: There is always the chance that in going along with the Democratic administration they may go along all too well, and so later have to share blame for policies which may be seen in the afterglow as bad for the national interest.

Life, of course, is always unfair to any minority party. For such a party can never take up all-out opposition in foreign affairs without endangering the whole country—and at the same time is always vulnerable if its generosity can be shown in retrospect to have been too uncritical.

The present situation, however, is especially difficult, simply because the present world itself is one of monumental difficulties. In the short time of Mr. Kennedy's Presidency, the Republicans have had all these fat and easy partisan targets: The tragic failure of the lost patriots' invasion of Cuba; our increasing—and right—involvement against the Communist aggressors in Vietnam; Mr. Kennedy's long hesitation before resuming nuclear testing in the air, even though the Russians had long since done so.

On all these occasions, the congressional Republicans have listened to the national interest rather than to party interest and have rightly declined to draw their guns against the President.

In ordinary justice these Republicans—and notably their chief spokesman, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois—deserve a public salute for this. It can be fairly said of them (though not of such purely partisan instrumentalities as the Republican National Committee) that they have drawn the gun only when they have felt absolutely obliged to do so.

They have carried self-disciplined bipartisanship to the farthest limit than any set of politicians, being human, could be expected to carry it. When, therefore, they do draw the gun for a shot or two, as in Senator DIRKSEN's recent expression of concern at our harshness to our old European allies over colonial issues, they are entitled to be heard, and with respect.

WORLD'S TROUBLE SPOTS: UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in today's issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer is an excellent article entitled "World's Trouble Spots: Part 1—U.N." A portion of this article relates to the limits on the power of the United Nations, which handicaps this agency in dealing with crises. There is also a graph showing the financial crisis facing the United Nations as the result of the failure of member nations to contribute adequately to the Congo and Middle East operations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD, and that the graph be reduced to tabular form, in figures, and printed in the RECORD, to show the situation regarding the financial crisis facing the United Nations.

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

LIMITS ON POWER HANDICAP AGENCY IN DEALING WITH CRISES

The United Nations is at that difficult age—the midteens. Troubles are built into its structure. Some of the worst, taken from a long catalog, are outlined below, as listed by the Foreign Policy Association.

First of all, without the cooperation of its own members it is helpless. The Soviet Union bowed to U.N. pressure to withdraw its forces from northern Iran in 1946. Ten years later, it crushed Hungary's rebellion with tanks, ignored U.N. protests and got away with it.

France denied the U.N. any right to discuss the Algerian rebellion, calling it an "internal affair." For different reasons, both the United States and Russia have refused to be bound by U.N. votes against nuclear tests. In the Congo, U.N. operations have been hampered by lack of cooperation from the central government, the provincial governments, Belgium, and the Soviet Union.

Second, like any organization, it needs money. Defaults and arrears of several members, especially for U.N. forces in the Congo and the Middle East, confront the agency with a deficit of nearly \$200 million. U.S. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson summed up the situation:

"If members will not pay for the United Nations, they will not have it."

The "independence explosion" presents a third ailment. In its brief life, membership in the U.N. has more than doubled. In many cases, the new sovereign states were ill-prepared for self-government, suspicious of former rulers and fearful of foreign intervention of any sort. At the same time, they are extremely dependent on the rest of the world for markets, for exports, for manufactured goods, economic and military aid.

Some have sought help from their nearest neighbors. Others, such as Cuba, have turned to the Communists. Nations such as Pakistan depend upon the United States and its allies and some have appealed to both sides, playing one off against the other.

For the great powers in particular, a fourth source of irritation is that they no longer, singly or together, can dominate the Organization. Last year, 34 percent of the U.N. members were states that had not been independent at the start of the Second World War. African states accounted for 26 percent. In the General Assembly, where a two-thirds majority is required on substantial issues, the new nations may swing the balance, although they do not always vote as a bloc.

They did so in 1960, by supporting the U.N. Congo operation over bitter Soviet resistance, 70 to 0, in a ballot that reflected Afro-Asian determination to keep the East-West fight out of Africa. They also voted, 71 to 20, to end nuclear tests, defeating 10 Western nations (including the United States) and 10 members of the Soviet bloc.

A fifth difficulty highlights what many consider the U.N.'s most serious weakness. That is the tendency of great powers to bypass the Organization on major issues that it is equipped to handle. Outstanding examples are disarmament and the Berlin crisis.

Since the first meeting of the General Assembly in January 1946, disarmament has been on its agenda but, over the years of hope, deadlock and new starts, the subject has been argued most seriously outside the U.N.

In no case, however, has the Secretary General, as the U.N.'s chief executive, taken a major role in seeking solutions to what is probably the gravest single problem confronting the world.

Delegates to disarmament conferences have acted with the general approval of the U.N., but most of their talks have been at limited conferences, all of which, to date, have ended in failure. So have summit meetings, but optimists keep repeating that magic formula.

The Berlin crisis, clearly a threat to peace, has never been placed formally on the U.N. agenda. It has been discussed in the Assembly, but the Secretary General has not been asked to take the initiative. The U.N. offers one hope of breaking the stalemate.

Finally, most U.N. problems come back to the question: What do member states want the United Nations to do? The late Dag Hammarskjöld, in his last annual report, outlined two alternatives. On the one hand, he said, the U.N. could provide static conference machinery for resolving conflicts. On the other, it could offer a dynamic instrument of governments through which they, jointly and for the same purpose, should seek reconciliation but through which they should also try to develop some form of executive action on behalf of all members.

The first concept, he said, was based on a system of sovereign states in armed competition. The second envisages the possibility of eventually developing an agency capable of constructive international action.

Hammarskjöld died in pursuit of his ideal. The Soviet Union, for one, says it is unattainable. Only the United Nations can prove Moscow is wrong.

U.N. finances—Critical area balance sheets on emergency funds

CONGO	
Budget:	Millions
United States.....	\$32.2
Soviet Union	15.3
Great Britain	7.7
France	6.3
Nationalist China.....	4.9
Canada	3.1
India	2.4
Italy	2.2
Japan	2.2
Australia	1.8
Sweden	1.4
Others	20.5
Total budget.....	100.00
Total amount paid.....	64.59
Balance due.....	35.41

MIDDLE EAST	
Budget:	Millions
United States.....	\$6.11
Soviet Union	3.07
Great Britain	1.46
France	1.20
Nationalist China.....	.94
Canada58
Japan47
India46
Italy42
Australia34
Sweden26
Others	3.67
Total budget.....	18.98
Total amount paid.....	13.64
Balance due.....	5.34

¹ Total amount has been paid.

² Nothing has been paid.

³ Substantial amount has been paid.

⁴ Small fraction has been paid.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FARMERS IN STORAGE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, at the heart of America's much-discussed farm problem are the tremendous surpluses filling the Nation's storage facilities.

The avowed purpose of the Kennedy-Freeman farm plan is to reduce these surpluses. A key feature of the bill calls for fines or imprisonment for those unhappy farmers whose bookkeeping is not tidy enough to suit Mr. Freeman.

When the Secretary testified before the House Agriculture Committee the other day, Representative BELCHER was moved to remark that "if it comes to that, we would all be in jail."

This comment prompted the Omaha World-Herald to wonder editorially whether the Freeman-Cochrane system of supply management might now include placing farmers in the pokey in order to hold down the agricultural surpluses.

Mr. President, our farmers have enough worries complying with agricultural regulations while they are growing America's crops. It ill behooves Mr. Freeman to add to their troubles by the threat that they will not be around to harvest them if they are not careful with his forms. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD to air this idea before some planner at the Department takes it seriously.

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

FARMERS IN STORAGE

A provision in the administration's farm bill which calls for imprisonment or fines or both as punishment of dairy farmers who fail to keep proper records was defended Monday by Agriculture Secretary Freeman.

He said that provision would strengthen the program. We imagine that it would indeed. Representative BELCHER, Republican, of Oklahoma, commented, "If it comes to that, we'd all be in jail."

Mr. Freeman is intent upon establishing a system of supply management which would preclude the production of any surpluses. We imagine that end could be accomplished by keeping a certain number of farmers in jail, but we doubt that very many Members of the Congress are going to view the situation in that light.

LOPSIDED ALLIANCE

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, one of the most publicized objectives of the Alliance for Progress program has been the institution of tax reforms in those Latin American countries which are scheduled to receive assistance.

In fact, in the Charter of Punta del Este the nations agreed to undertake these reforms. The specific language of the charter provides this goal:

To reform tax laws, demanding more from those who have most, to punish tax evasion severely, and to redistribute the national income in order to benefit those who are most in need, while, at the same time, pro-

moting savings and investment and reinvestment of capital.

Thus, Madam President, it is most discouraging to read dispatches such as one which appeared in yesterday's New York Times, headlined, "Central America Wary of Aid Ties—Alliance Program's Call for Tax Reform Challenged."

This story quotes El Salvador's Provisional President Eusebio Rodolfo Cordon as welcoming Alliance for Progress aid, but objecting to the conditions of the program, such as tax reforms.

Similar views are reported from Guatemalan President Fuentes.

These developments are especially disheartening because the Governments of both countries had, at the time the Alliance was under discussion, indicated an acceptance of its charter's terms.

Yesterday's story, if based on fact, would seem to be a repudiation of their earlier pledges.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from the New York Times of Sunday, March 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

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

CENTRAL AMERICA WARY OF AID TIES—ALLIANCE PROGRAM'S CALL FOR TAX REFORM CHALLENGED

SAN SALVADOR, February 26.—The President's office made public tonight a statement in which Provisional President Eusebio Rodolfo Cordon said that El Salvador welcomed any aid under the Alliance for Progress program.

But at the same time the statement added, this country objected to certain conditions that the program seems to impose, such as tax reforms.

Earlier, a newspaper, *Diario Latino*, quoted President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes of Guatemala as likewise criticizing the imposing of conditions on countries wishing to receive U. S. economic and technical aid under the Alliance for Progress.

The Salvadoran and Guatemalan statements were said to be completely independent.

Dr. Cordón conferred yesterday at a mountain hotel near La Palma with President Ramon Villeda Morales of Honduras on Central American affairs. There was no indication that the two Presidents discussed the Alliance for Progress or that the matter might have come up at discussions at Ahuachapán last week between Dr. Cordón and President Ydigoras.

DR. CORDÓN'S COMMENT

The statement here said that Provisional President Cordón at a Sunday night news conference answered questions on general topics. Regarding President Kennedy's program, Dr. Cordón said:

"The Alliance for Progress, up to now, has not been more than a dream. We need the aid contemplated in the program of the Alliance, but without its being imposed on us in exchange for reforms of our institutions, and it should be granted in such a manner that it does not obligate us to limit ourselves."

As for the opinion of the Guatemalan President, *Diario Latino* quoted Colonel Ydigoras as having charged that aid under the Alliance for Progress program was being given to the large countries of Latin America to the slighting of the smaller countries.

The Guatemalan chief of state was also quoted as having lamented the conditions set out in the Alliance for Progress.

"It is desired," he was reported to have said, "that our countries, with national economies a bit disorganized, apply new tax laws, which may be prejudicial for the development of our newborn industries."

"In this way it is sought to guarantee that the economic aid derived from the program does not make the rich richer, nor the poor poorer, but at the same time the efforts we make to apply measures tending to improve the living conditions of the poorer classes are forgotten."

"In Guatemala we are increasing agrarian reform with legal provisions which give a greater field of action to the Agrarian Institute, which has been functioning for several years. Through this organism thousands of acres of land have been distributed for the peasants."

Guatemala does not have an income tax law, although late in 1961 the Congress approved such a law in principle. In previous years the Congress repeatedly rejected Presidential requests to enact an income tax law.

LATIN AMERICAN REFORMS

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I wish to address myself to the same point referred to by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, by inviting attention of the Members of this body to an article which was published in Friday's New York Times under the headline "Rusk Bids Latins Step Up Reforms."

This reminds us all that pressures are being applied. The article explains that in certain areas of Latin America the kind of pressure referred to is being resisted. I think the Senator from Nebraska is exactly correct in continuing to keep in focus how important it is that these regimes in certain parts of Latin America should not succeed in prevailing in the foot-dragging which has been going on in terms of basic tax reforms and the whole structure of the economics of the governments of Latin American countries.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times may be printed in the RECORD.

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

RUSK BIDS LATINS STEP UP REFORMS—SAYS INTERNAL ISSUES DELAY AID FOR MANY REGIMES

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk said today that "we are trying to get our friends" in Latin America to speed their activity in the Alliance for Progress.

Discussing the Alliance, which calls for the cooperative economic and social development of Latin America, Mr. Rusk noted that the hemisphere governments "have their problems because this is based on the fact that rapid growth and economic development can occur within free institutions."

"That means," he said in his news conference, "that many of them have their own legislation, their own laws to pass, their own administrative arrangements to devise, their own steps, and some of these are controversial in their countries. Similar steps were taken in our country as we moved on in our own development."

GOVERNMENTS CRITICIZED

Latin American governments have been criticized recently in congressional, press,

and other quarters here for not moving sufficiently fast with their basic reforms.

"I would not suppose," Mr. Rush said, "that we are ever really going to be satisfied or contented, because this great problem of growth and development is insatiable at least as far into the future as we can see."

He borrowed a thought from Charles Kingsley, 19th century English poet and social reformer, to stress that the United States and Latin America should exercise "divine discontent" in never being satisfied with the achievements of the Alliance for Progress, which is the U.S. aid program for Latin America.

Mr. Rusk ascribed the phrase—later identified as Dr. Warren Weaver, who served with him in the Rockefeller Foundation—but it is generally considered to have been composed by Kingsley, a canon of Westminster and chaplain to Queen Victoria.

UPGROWTH OF ALL VIRTUE

Kingsley wrote in "Health and Education" in 1874 that "to be discontented with the divine discontent, and to be ashamed with the noble shame, is the very germ of the first upgrowth of all virtue."

"So are we satisfied?" Mr. Rusk asked. "No. Do we expect to be satisfied? No. Are we working on it? Yes."

The Secretary said that there would be no problems in committing the funds promised Latin America during this fiscal year, but that "for years to come this will be unfinished business."

The administration is committed to spend about \$1 billion this year in Latin American projects. About 800 million has already been authorized.

Mr. Rusk said that the problem of the Brazilian expropriation of an American-owned telephone company was being discussed with Brazilian federal and state authorities. The company, a subsidiary of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., was nationalized by the state of Rio Grand do Sul.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL—A JET-AGE ENVOY

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Washington Evening Star for Saturday last be printed in the RECORD. The editorial is entitled "Jet-Age Envoy," and in very strong and laudatory terms endorses the efforts and the impact of the Attorney General of the United States in his recent "orbit" of the earth.

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

JET-AGE ENVOY

There is good reason to conclude that jet-propelled Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and his equally energetic and attractive wife, Ethel, really did a pretty fine job on their monthlong tour around the world. Theirs were fresh faces and refreshing personalities of a typically young American kind as they hustled from one country to more than a dozen others, meeting and talking with people in the streets and with heads of governments, and still finding time for play periods with children in many lands.

If this was not an exercise in diplomacy of a conventional fashion, it may be added that it was not so intended. And if one of its original purposes was to give Bobby some on-the-job training in foreign affairs, it may be added too that he distributed a considerable amount of education in return. Long before he became a Cabinet officer, this younger brother of the President had established his qualifications at home as a person possessed of courage, eloquence, and

the intellect to match. He displayed all of these qualities at one time or another in his public appearances abroad—discomfiting some of those who faced him as critics and certainly cheering others who greeted him as a friend.

More time will be needed to measure the lasting impact of the Kennedy travels. It was indicated in news reports along the way that he did much to place the contemporary character of America in true perspective, to correct the distorted and outdated image that has prevailed in certain young and pseudointellectual circles in other countries. No doubt Mr. Kennedy learned as much as he taught. On this basis, the benefits are two way.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN COMMUNIST AND AMERICAN IDEAS OF FOR- EIGN AID

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Washington Post and Times Herald yesterday, on the "Difference Between Communist Idea of Foreign Aid and Ours" may be printed in the RECORD. It is an extract from a speech which was delivered last week by Mr. Walt W. Rostow, a counselor of the State Department, who is Deputy Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. Because it is a very illuminating contrast as between the Russian approach to the question and our own, I think it would be helpful to Members of this body to have a second look at it.

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

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN COMMUNIST IDEA OF FOREIGN AID AND OURS

We look forward to the emergence of strong assertive nations which, out of their own traditions and aspirations, create their own forms of modern society. We take it as our duty to help maintain the integrity and the independence of the modernization process going forward in many parts of the world—insofar as our resources and our ability to influence the course of events permit.

That possibility is challenged by Communist objectives and Communist policy. The Communists also perceive that the process of modernization involves fundamental social, political, and economic change. These are bound to be turbulent times, and it is the Communist intent to exploit the turbulence of this transitional process in order to seize power and to mold the emerging world in their image and link it tightly to the Communist empire.

It is often said that what we can observe in the contemporary world is a struggle between two blocs. This is not the case. What is at stake is whether a new world order shall be created by the voluntary association and cooperation of independent nations—each having fashioned its own modern personality—or a world order, dominated from a single center, of nations forced into a single mold.

We in the United States can live comfortably in a pluralistic world, because our life at home is based on the principle of cooperation among dignified equals, but the Communists are driven, by their methods for organizing power, to violate equally the integrity of individuals and of nations. Thus, when seeking power, they aim to associate themselves with all manner of forward looking human and national aspirations. Once in power, they drag from the shelves their dreary archaic handbooks and impose a pattern of organization which runs against the grain of human and national character and

personality. In the end, that is why the Communist offensive will fail.

THE LESSON OF KOREA

We have not forgotten the lesson of Korea. We cannot assume the Communists will not again overtly cross frontiers with military force, and our dispositions with respect to the CENTO area and elsewhere take that possibility into account; but it is also clear that for some years they have been relying heavily on the possibility of exploiting the turbulence which inevitably comes with the drive toward modernization, to seize power from within.

In defense of the independence of nations and the national integrity of the modernization process, we are, therefore, equally concerned with problems of defense and with the constructive tasks of development. * * *

As we move into the 1960's all of us in the free world are trying to consolidate and to build on the lessons we have learned about economic development since the end of the Second World War.

The first lesson is that aid from outside a country can only be helpful to its development to the extent that the government and people of a nation organize their own resources. Economic growth is primarily a national enterprise. As you have demonstrated by some of the CENTO regional projects, development cannot and should not be wholly viewed in national terms; and, certainly, external assistance is important; but the heart of economic development consists in national measures of self-help.

Second, national planning of the development process is required as a basis both for the domestic mobilization of resources and effective foreign aid. National plans are needed because, as Adam Smith noted long ago—when prescribing for underdeveloped Britain of the 18th century—governments must create the framework within which a modern economy can develop. It is the government which must organize and finance the educational system and shape it to the nation's needs. It is the government which must lay out and, in most cases, finance the fundamental social overhead projects—in transport, electric power, and other sectors—on which development depends.

NATIONAL PLANNING NEEDED

It may seem strange that we in the United States, who are so deeply attached to the virtues of private enterprise, should be the advocates of national planning in the underdeveloped areas. There is, in fact, no incompatibility between a belief that national planning is essential in the early stages of development and a belief in the wisdom of leaving to private enterprise a wide and expanding range of economic activities. How wide that range is each country will, of course, decide for itself in the light of its own problems and possibilities. But the framework within which a modern private enterprise system can develop must, in large part, be created initially by the effort and initiative of governments. It is this perception which has drained away much of the fervor from the argument about government versus private enterprise in the development process—an argument which, even a few years ago, seemed to be central to the whole business. As nations have acquired practical experience in economic development, it is becoming increasingly clear that each of the two sectors has a job to do and that their jobs are supplementary and mutually reinforcing. * * *

A third lesson of our postwar experience is that foreign aid is likely to be most effective if it is geared into national development programs on a long-term basis. In committing themselves and their peoples to ambitious development goals—and demanding the sacrifices and efforts which are necessary for their fulfillment—it is natural that governments should wish to know in advance

how much foreign aid they can count on over any planning period.

American foreign aid legislation has now taken this factor into account and we have been joined by our partners in Western Europe, Canada, and Japan. We are rapidly learning to weave together the national and international contributions to development in a systematic way and we look forward to extending this method as new national development programs come forward.

INDIVIDUAL INCENTIVE

A fourth lesson is this: Although we are still learning this job together—and have much to learn—we are confident that the methods of freemen will prove more effective than the apparently more efficient techniques of totalitarian regimes. Quite aside from the inhumanity of Communist methods, it appears to be a technical fact that the most powerful system of control is an inadequate substitute for the incentives and commitment of the individual citizen, once he can be engaged. Development is a process which requires that millions of human beings and many organized groups assume responsibility for moving things forward on their narrow part of the front. There are simply not enough Communist cadres or secret policemen available to substitute for the energy and commitment of men and women who understand what needs to be done and why it is in their interest to do it. This weakness of communism is most apparent in the field of agriculture. Communist methods have managed to shift one Communist country after another from food surplus to food deficit status, and in the Soviet Union itself they must maintain perhaps twice the working force in agriculture they would need if they were not committed to the method of control they feel necessary for the political safety of the regime. * * *

The difference between Communist planning and planning in the free world comes to this: Communist planning is a device for maximum political control over the individual—and it thereby burdens the state with functions it cannot efficiently carry and destroys individual incentives needed for a vital economy; planning for underdeveloped countries in the free world is a device for assuring balance in the growth process and for creating a framework within which individual incentives and individual initiative can be effective.

In short, the lesson of our experience thus far is that we should be confident that in going forward with economic development by the methods of pragmatic planning and individual consent which are natural to us, we are on the right track technically as well as morally.

THE DOLLAR DEFICIT

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article entitled "Dollar Deficit Is One That Mustn't Run Wild," published yesterday, written by Henry C. Wallich, professor of economics at Yale University. The article deals with the dollar deficit and the problems it connotes for us in managing sound fiscal policies on all counts.

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

DOLLAR DEFICIT IS ONE THAT MUSTN'T RUN WILD

(By Henry C. Wallich)

There is a simple answer when someone begins to complain about the deficit: Ask him which deficit he means, the budget deficit or the balance-of-payments deficit. Require him to define his terms: "You name it, we have it."

The budget deficit this year is \$7 billion; the balance-of-payments deficit, \$2.4 billion. If the President is right (and lucky), there will be no budget deficit next year, but the President will be very lucky indeed if the next balance-of-payments deficit is not bigger than the last.

Though the balance-of-payments deficit is currently much the smaller, it is much the more insidious. What a string of budget deficits would do to the dollar is a question about which reasonable men may differ. It would probably depend on circumstances. There is very little difference of opinion on what a string of balance-of-payments deficits of any size would do to the dollar. It would mean collapse.

LIKE CHECKING ACCOUNT

The balance of payments sometimes is discussed as if it were a profit-and-loss account, with surplus signifying a profit; deficit, a loss. If that were the case, all countries would of course be seeking to have surpluses all the time. Fortunately, it is a wrong analogy.

The balance of payments is one of those rare terms in economics which mean—almost, not quite—what they say. It is the balance resulting from the international expenditures and receipts of the Nation. Its closest analogy is a checking account.

The United States spends money abroad by buying a long shopping list of goods; its citizens travel and obtain other services; it gives foreign aid, keeps troops, pays pensions and acquires profitable investments abroad. On the other hand, the United States gets money from abroad by selling goods, rendering various services and obtaining an income on its investments.

Expenditures are debited to the checking account; receipts are credited. The cash balance in the account is symbolized by U.S. gold holdings. When there is a balance-of-payments surplus, the gold goes up. When there is a deficit, it goes down. For some time now, the gold has been going down.

There is an important qualification. The United States pays for its deficit not only in gold; it also pays by issuing I O U's. The United States has covered some \$5 billion of the deficit of the last 4 years by paying out that much gold, but it has covered the remaining \$8 billion by going into debt.

In contrast to what happens in a store, where the salesclerk asks, "Cash or charge?" the decision to pay gold or issue I O U's is not up to the United States but to the foreigner. The United States pays interest on what it owes to foreign countries or individuals if they choose to leave their money here. Many countries therefore prefer not to take gold for their surplus with the United States, but to keep the dollars they receive in the United States.

In this way, the United States in the last 4 years has avoided paying \$8 billion in gold. But it faces withdrawal of this and other foreign-owned money—and of the funds of Americans as well—if people should cease to trust the dollar.

The decline in the U.S. international cash balance has been very substantial by these figures. That does not necessarily mean that the United States has lived beyond its means. In fact, the country has acquired, through investment abroad, income earning assets that exceed substantially the loss of gold and increase in foreign dollar balances. But these investments are not liquid, and in an emergency the Nation could not count on being able to use them quickly.

BIG STEPS BLOCKED

Foreign countries have made it pretty clear to the U.S. Government that their confidence in the dollar has been stretched about as far as it will go. They are reluctant to have additional dollar I O U's unloaded on them as a result of further deficits. The

United States, on the other hand, is reluctant to lose more gold because a reduction in the gold backing of the dollar would weaken confidence still further. Hence it is urgent to put an end to the deficit.

The first thing that comes to mind, naturally, is to cut some of the Nation's international expenditures. Unfortunately, it immediately appears that there is a hitch to almost everything big that could be done.

To cut imports by raising tariffs or through other restrictions would invite certain retaliation. Since the United States exports more than it imports, it has more to lose from reciprocal trade restrictions than to gain. To cut troop pay by pulling back the troops would fatally weaken the Nation's military posture.

Cutting foreign aid would not help much, quite aside from the damage to our international position, because most of the aid is given in the form of American products or is otherwise tied to purchase here. Foreign investments could be stopped, but they are already earning more each year than they cost and over the years the net gain from them will increase. Tourism could not be restrained without inventing an elaborate system of currency controls that would put an end to the use of the dollar as an international currency.

A great many minor means of saving dollars abroad or earning more from foreigners are, of course, open: some savings on troop pay and foreign aid can always be made; foreigners can be induced to travel and invest in the United States. It is easy to put together pages and pages of good ideas, but in dollar terms there is only one thing that really amounts to anything: to export more.

The United States must sell more abroad. There is no question that the foreigner has the money; he has been getting it through the American balance of payments deficit. The obstacle is inadequate competitiveness of American products. Competitive after a fashion we are; how else would American exports exceed imports? But the margin of competitiveness is not sufficient.

The United States needs some 2 to 3 billion dollars a year more exports, in relation to imports, than it now has. That would solve the problem. But the continuation of this small deficiency puts the dollar in jeopardy, prevents the administration from taking active measures to increase employment and slows down the whole economy.

To make American exports more competitive, prices must come down or at least must be held constant while prices abroad drift upward. There are other factors, such as improved design, credit, service, and selling, but price is the big one. The way to keep prices in line is to keep wages from advancing too fast.

Public pressure against price increases is necessary, too, to keep profits from advancing sharply if wages slow down. But since profits amount to only about 4.5 percent of the sales of manufacturing corporations, wages obviously are the key factor.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers has suggested that wage boosts remain within a limit that may be interpreted as 2.4 percent. If the Nation succeeds in doing that, it has a fair chance of working out of its balance of payments problem. If it doesn't, the dollar will be in jeopardy and our means of maintaining our international posture will be inadequate and efforts to increase employment at home will suffer.

ATMOSPHERIC TESTS OF THERMONUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Post and Times Herald Sun-

day, March 4, entitled "The Two Messages," referring to the two messages of the President. There was a message of stern and strong language on the resumption of above-ground nuclear tests, and, at the same time, a second message in the same address to the American people and to the world, in which the President very carefully spelled out the hope that commonsense might still prevail and that it would be possible to negotiate some kind of a suspension of nuclear tests.

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

THE TWO MESSAGES

The President of the United States delivered not one but two solemn and eloquent messages on Friday night, in the address that disclosed that this country will conduct atmospheric tests of thermonuclear weapons in late April unless there is a test-ban agreement before then. It is to be hoped that the leaders of the Soviet Union and the people of the world heard both of them.

One was the message of a national leader charged inescapably with the burden of maintaining the military defenses of his own country and those of the free world alliance within the iron frame of circumstance that he did not create and cannot alter. The other was the message of a man of warm humanitarian impulse who shrinks from steps that might harm the health of even one individual, and who is still hoping against hope that those who have fixed the circumstances within which he must act still may be persuaded to alter them.

It will be a tragedy if the Soviet Union hears but one of these messages for there is still time, even though the 11th hour is at hand, to change the dreadful direction events now take. If the interlude is wasted in a dreary dialog between those who say there can be no test ban without inspections of the kind already proposed and those who say there can be no inspection whatever, it will be discouraging indeed. Surely human societies that have conducted the great discoveries and inventions that bid fair to transform the whole environment of man, if they devote themselves seriously to the purpose at hand, can discover some alternative to this monotonous and unproductive litany. There can be, there must be a way to loose manmade fetters that bind us firmly to policies that inevitably and inescapably carry us toward our doom.

The President of the United States has solemnly invited the Soviet Union to uncover new proposals for ending this stalemate. It is an invitation attended by enormous hazard and great danger and it deserves a response appropriate to its daring. This country, it is clear from the President's message, believes that it can gain, by a series of tests, disclosures as to weapons effects and capabilities that might be well-nigh decisive in the event of an attack upon it. Yet it is willing to forgo these discoveries and advantages, allowing the Soviet Union the benefit of the last round of tests, if "they will agree to an effective treaty."

The President's statement of the military necessity for the resumption of testing under existing circumstances was convincing and eloquent; so was his assertion of the desirability of changing those circumstances. It will be sad if the intellectual antenna in the Kremlin pick up the first and not the second message.

It would be at some risk that we now would enter into a test-ban treaty permitting Soviet scientists to utilize their recent tests for the perfection of their thermonuclear weaponry. The President, nonetheless, is right

to run this risk. It is justified both by the threat of radioactive fallout from the tests themselves, and perhaps even more justified by the certainty that unrestricted competition in the development of thermonuclear weapons ultimately will end in disaster.

TRADE POLICY

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Saturday last, entitled "J.F.K.'s Economics and Trade Policy," an analysis prepared by Seymour Harris, a professor of political economy at Harvard University.

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

J.F.K.'s ECONOMICS AND TRADE POLICY (By Seymour Harris)

What is striking about the President's new, bold, and courageous trade program is that it goes way beyond the congressional postwar position. As a spokesman over many years for the New England Governors who were greatly concerned over the destruction of their textile industry, I observed the rising protectionism in Congress since the end of the war.

One may ask why the President hazarded the political risk of moving in front of Congress on trade policy, and yet was reluctant to move too far ahead of Congress on domestic policies. Apparently the President sensed the possibility of a victory on trade policy or at least important educational gains and had already experienced opposition by Congress on some of his essential welfare and growth policies.

Unlike many of the economists of liberal persuasion, I would defend the President's caution in fiscal policy. For years the economists have been preaching that deficits are the medicine in recession and surpluses in prosperity. They have not said, or, if they have, only in whispers, what some have recently learned, that a growing economy may require continued deficits even in prosperous times, for the rising income brings increased tax revenues and surpluses and hence less spending that slow up or stop a recovery.

The President has learned that the A B C's of modern fiscal theory, the Congress less so, and the general public, avid for debt financing in their private lives, assume a highly moral position on Government borrowing. If the President has not moved far or fast enough—and he has moved more courageously than any other President—it is not his, but the economists' fault.

The economists are right in their contention that a moderate rise of debt in prosperity and resultant costs, given the increases in GNP, is not going to be troublesome. But the inflationary effects (inclusive of balance-of-payment repercussions) need careful watching against the gains of output and employment.

But to return to trade policy, when the first rumblings of the new trade policy were heard early in November, I wondered whether the President would go along. Here were breaks with past policy that were revolutionary, for example, in the proposed extent of tariff cut, in the suggestion of across-the-board bargaining, and in the abandonment largely of the principle of no injury to industry through tariff cuts which has been the basis of the reciprocal trade policy since 1934.

But the President has made it clear that, like Adam Smith, he is not a doctrinaire free trader. He realizes that a government cannot overnight remove the protection upon which industries and jobs have been built. Hence he is wise not to heed the demands of

those who would scrap the escape clause, the peril point, and the relevant national security clauses.

Here are a few aspects of this trade program which requires some emphasis here.

1. The attention given to the new trade policy by Ways and Means means less attention to other programs such as medicare. Perhaps, in pushing the trade policy, the President recognizes the difficulties of getting medicare through in 1962.

2. The new trade program is one for increasing both exports and imports and hence one for increasing income and growth. On the basis of past experience in negotiating, we shall be fortunate indeed to increase our exports as much as imports through these new trade policies.

3. What is required for raising the excess of exports over imports is rising productivity, reasonable price and wage policies, export drives, etc., all measures being taken or urged.

4. Another relevant factor is the continued growth of Western Europe and Japan. Both our penetration of these rich markets and the continued unshackling of trade barriers in the Common Market could seriously suffer from a slow rate of growth or depression.

5. The President quite rightly points out that increased trade with the Common Market would reduce our excessive exports of capital which contribute to deficits in the dollar account.

6. A strong case can be made for Europe reducing her trade barriers more than we do (and hence rise of U.S. exports vis-a-vis imports) in a period of dollar saturation and loss of reserves here—just as in the period of dollar shortages Europeans increased their restrictions while we reduced ours.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROGRAMING

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an extract from the TV column of the Washington Post and Times-Herald for Friday, March 2, 1962, the article written by Mr. Lawrence Laurent, the TV editor, in which he discusses, under the title "People and Programs," the extensiveness of the informal and quite unofficial network which Mr. Theodore Granik has managed to hook up in behalf of his new program "All America Wants To Know." In these times we have run into increasing difficulty in attracting network concerns to more and more public affairs and public information programs. I think it is important that the attention devoted to Ted Granik and to his new show be included in the RECORD, so I ask unanimous consent to have the excerpt printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

PEOPLE AND PROGRAMS (By Lawrence Laurent)

Theodore Granik, who began dealing in public affairs programing back in 1928, has finally got his own network. It's for "All America Wants To Know," a panel-style show that is currently being broadcast on 1,025 radio stations and telecast on 150 TV stations.

Granik dropped by the other afternoon to show the results of a postal card survey. The Reader's Digest, which pays for production, filming and distribution of the programs, had mailed out the cards to all of the stations. "They didn't get one negative reply," Granik boasted.

"Some stations say they have run a single program six times," Granik continued.

"Some use our program with a local follow-up."

Granik's 1928 radio beginning was in New York. Out of those first programs came "The American Forum of the Air" and, later, "Youth Wants To Know." The newest, "All America Wants To Know," is scheduled for Sunday (5:30 p.m.) on WTTG. It is a discussion of "Are Wiretapping Laws Aiding Criminals?" Panelists include Senator Kenneth Keating, Republican, of New York, Senator John O. Carroll, Democrat, of Colorado, Virgil Peterson, of the Chicago Crime Commission, and Lawrence Speiser, of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Granik's impromptu American network is extended overseas by the U.S. Information Agency.

CATHOLIC BISHOPS ASSAIL RIGHTISTS

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, from the New York Times of Friday, March 2, 1962, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by John D. Morris entitled "Catholic Bishops Assail Rightists."

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

CATHOLIC BISHOPS ASSAIL RIGHTISTS—CHURCH OPENS DRIVE AGAINST EXTREMISTS—BOOKLET ON ANTICOMMUNISM ISSUED (By John D. Morris)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—The Roman Catholic Church began a national campaign today to discourage participation in extreme anti-Communist movements such as the John Birch Society.

The drive got underway with publication by the National Catholic Welfare Conference of an 80-page booklet attacking "extremists of the right" for fomenting "a virulent form of disunity that is dangerously weakening the Nation."

The National Catholic Welfare Conference is the central administrative organ of the country's Catholic bishops.

The Reverend John F. Cronin, author of the booklet, said at a news conference that its publication signaled the start of a campaign for sanity in meeting the Communist threat. Father Cronin, a nationally recognized expert on the Communist movement for 20 years, is assistant director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

For the citizen who asks, "What can I do to fight communism?" Father Cronin suggests in his booklet:

"Devote all your strength and energy, in concert with your fellow Americans, to building national unity and moral strength. Practice your religion, and make it a vital force in your community.

"Even in dealing with moral evils, concentrate less on denunciation and more on giving leadership and example. Be a man of integrity in your work. Make your family outstanding by the quality of parental love and discipline you show.

"Unite with your neighbors for racial justice and harmony. Do your part to make this a better and stronger Nation, and we shall not fear what the Communists plot and scheme against us.

"Above all, we must have a broader vision of world needs."

The conference is distributing 100,000 copies of the booklet to Catholic dioceses throughout the country for use by parish study clubs, parochial school teachers, and church publications. Issuance of the booklet was expected to be front-page news in most diocesan newspapers in their weekly editions today and tomorrow. Many of them are expected to serialize its text and base

editorials on it. Pastors are expected to use it as a basis for sermons.

BOOKLET'S SIGNIFICANCE

Ultimately, Father Cronin said, from 500,000 to 1 million copies are to be printed and distributed by the conference and the booklet's copublisher, the Paulist Press of New York.

The campaign is regarded as particularly significant in view of the fact that some priests and nuns and many Catholic laymen have been identified with the militantly rightwing anti-Communist movement now brought under attack by their church.

Robert H. W. Welch, Jr., leader of the semi-secret John Birch Society, has said that about 40 percent of the members of his organization are Catholics. Father Cronin said that he believes this to be an exaggeration but he conceded that quite a few Catholics belonged to the society.

Altogether, about 50 sizable organizations constitute the extremist forces at which the booklet is aimed, Father Cronin told reporters.

The leadership and membership of most of the others that he named are predominantly non-Catholic. They include the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, headed by Dr. Fred C. Schwartz of Los Angeles; the Christian Crusade, led by the Reverend Billy James Hargis of Tulsa; the Circuit Riders, Inc., of Cincinnati, and the American Council of Christian Churches, directed by Edgar C. Bundy.

None of the organizations is mentioned by name in the booklet, but it was clear that the John Birch Society was the main target.

The central theme of the Cronin booklet is that "the basic threat of communism is external, not internal" and that anti-Communist extremists are misdirecting their energies by concentrating on internal subversion.

MANY SEEN BEWILDERED

"Speakers and writers for such groups," Father Cronin writes, "are vigorously fighting problems that were mostly solved by 1950, and neglecting the far greater dangers of Communist subversion in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and the general world Communist offensive.

"In many parts of the country," he declares, "hysteria and suspicion are becoming increasingly evident. A virulent form of disunity is weakening us in the world struggle against communism and performing this disservice in the name of militant anticommunism. Many Americans are confused and bewildered by the whole trend."

Father Cronin accuses some anti-Communist extremists of identifying communism with whatever ideas they happen to dislike, inciting racial and religious prejudice under the guise of fighting subversion and seeking to discredit reputable individuals and institutions with the taint of communism.

He is emphatic in challenging Mr. Welch's contention that 7,000 Protestant clergymen are identified with the Communist movement. He says that Communist influence among the Protestant clergy is virtually nonexistent.

He attributes the spread of anti-Communist extremism largely to the frustration of impatient Americans who want to do something about communism, but who do not realize that the main threat to the United States no longer is subversion here.

He advises citizens to leave the task of combating subversion to experts in the Federal Government who have the training and authority to do the job.

MINERAL ROYALTIES FOR WESTERN STATES

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD a prepared statement edited by the Wyoming Natural Resources Board of Cheyenne. The document states a very strong case, and in explicit language, on behalf of the Western States for the return of 90 percent of the mineral royalties to the State of origin of the income from those royalties.

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

EQUALITY FOR THE WESTERN STATES: A CASE FOR THE RETURN OF 90 PERCENT OF MINERAL ROYALTIES TO THE STATE OF ORIGIN

INTRODUCTION

The people of the West are particularly conscious that the Federal Government owns so large a part of the surface of their respective States, and often an even larger part of the mineral rights of the States. The inequity of the situation in which the Western States find themselves is emphasized by these facts:

1. The original States of the Union and others east of the Rocky Mountains received State or individual title to the lands within their borders.

2. Alaska was admitted to the Union under a provision guaranteeing her 90 percent of the mineral royalties taken out by the Federal Government.

3. It appears that some States stand to directly benefit from ownership of minerals produced from offshore submerged lands.

For these reasons, and others to be elaborated upon later, perhaps no proposal is so important to the Western States as the one to return a larger share of the receipts under the terms of the Minerals Leasing Act of 1920. Such a proposal is embodied in S. 898, introduced by Wyoming's Senators in the last session of the 87th Congress in early 1961.

BACKGROUND

The original Colonies retained all their lands, and other States, east of the Rockies for the most part, were given admission on an equal footing with the original States.

Following the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, the public domain was expanded through: (a) Purchase of Florida from Spain in 1819; (b) annexation of Texas in 1845 (though there is no Federal land in Texas); (c) acquisition by treaty of the Oregon Territory in 1846; (d) Mexican cession of 1848; (e) the Texas Purchase from that State in 1850; and (f) the Gadsden Purchase from Mexico in 1853.

Treaties with France and Mexico made it clear that new States would be on an equal footing with all other States. Wyoming, to use it as an example, was forged out of the public domain acquired through the Louisiana, Texas, and Mexican Purchases, and the Oregon Treaty. At the time of admission to statehood, Wyoming disclaimed title to the public lands within the State, so that at present the U.S. Government owns the surface and minerals of some 32 million acres and owns the minerals under an additional 12 million acres, or 52 percent of the land area, and 70 percent of the minerals in the State.

These facts are not given to support a claim for the turning over of federally held land to the State, however desirable this may be. What is desired is equal treatment, and the first step toward equal treatment for the Western States could be the return of the mineral royalties to the State of origin.

THEORY OF SHARED-REVENUE PAYMENTS

Two different philosophies may be identified which explain the revenue-sharing idea now in use. These may be called (1) the Federal custodial interest philosophy and (2) the tax equivalent payment philosophy.

Under the Federal custodial interest philosophy, the Federal Government would hold

and manage land for the benefit of the people of the State where the lands are located without any financial gain above the cost of stewardship. Many State and local officials entertain this view especially as it concerns public domain lands. There is no shared-revenue program which conforms perfectly to this philosophy, although payment plans for the O. & C. lands, the Taylor Grazing Act lands, and mineral leases reflect a good deal of it.

A modification of this philosophy would treat as beneficiaries of the Federal land holdings the people in a general region not limited to the particular State where the Federal lands are located. The Taylor Grazing and Mineral Leasing Acts seem to reflect this modified interpretation more than any other payment arrangement.

Then there are those who maintain that Federal lands are held for the benefit of all the citizens of the country, a view which challenges any revenue sharing with State or local citizens.

Where revenues from Federal lands are shared with States or local governments or utilized for the benefit of particular regions, it is arguable that the percentage distributions of revenue among the different levels of government reflect the varying degrees of beneficial interest on the part of these different levels of government in the Federal holdings as determined by Congress. Actually, as this paper testifies, there is diversity of opinion as to the proper percentage to be allocated to States or local governments even where revenue sharing is endorsed as an appropriate payment arrangement.

Considerable attention has been given in this respect to the appropriateness of the present 37½ percent distribution of mineral royalty receipts distributed to the States. Any justification for increasing the percentage is dependent upon the weight given to the concept that the Federal Government holds mineral leasing lands for the benefit of the people of the State where those lands are found. The present 37½ percent rate of distribution is adequate to replace whatever receipts the States would derive from taxation if the mineral lands were privately owned. But, this is an *ex post facto* rationalization, the legislative history of the Federal decision to establish that percentage indicates that the decision resulted from a compromise and is rather arbitrary. The fact that Congress determined to return to the States via the reclamation fund an added 52½ percent of the income receipts from mineral lands, reserving only 10 percent for administrative costs, lends some credence to the claim that Congress has recognized the custodial principle. Complete adoption of such a philosophy would suggest the propriety of returning to each State all Federal receipts from mineral lands within the State, minus Federal administration costs. This is the philosophy behind S. 898 and this paper.

The existing situation seems to be one of a modification of this philosophy, in that the group of States receiving the benefit of the 52½-percent contribution to the reclamation fund are generally the same States containing the mineral lands. However, the individual States do not share in the reclamation fund in direct proportion to contributions to that fund from mineral lease royalties within the individual States.¹ (See table A.)

THE SITUATION IN 1961

Before Congress can give proper attention to legislation to correct the present unfair

situation, it will be necessary to create a favorable climate of opinion among the citizens of the Western States. Only after we have united the Western States in our drive for acceptance of the principles involved will Congress lend an ear. The reason that Wyoming is spearheading the action is that we have the most at stake. A glance at table A will show that in fiscal 1960, Wyoming contributed 41.1 percent of the moneys received by the reclamation fund.

I

The Minerals Leasing Act of 1920 was entitled as "An Act To Promote the Mining of Coal, Phosphate, Oil, Oil Shale, Gas and Sodium on the Public Domain." Under its terms, a royalty on mineral production on Federally owned land and other land on which the Federal Government has retained the mineral rights would be paid to the Federal Government. The royalty is usually 12½ percent, or on a sliding scale.

Table A shows the royalties paid by the States affected. It also shows the redistribution of those receipts to the States (37½ percent) and to the reclamation fund (52½ percent). In addition, it shows that the Bureau of Reclamation cost of plant, property, and equipment built and in progress, and the relationship of the mineral royalty payments as a percentage of the cost of those projects.

To use the example of Wyoming, in fiscal 1960 receipts totaled \$33,165,394. Of this, 37½ percent was returned to Wyoming (\$12,437,023) and 5½ percent went to the reclamation fund (\$18,906,881). The difference (\$3,821,490) went to the U.S. Treasury. Over the years Wyoming has paid 41.1 percent of the total mineral royalty funds to the reclamation fund. In return, Wyoming has received only 6.4 percent of the Bureau's expenditures on reclamation programs.

It will be noted, however, that from 1920 to 1960, Wyoming has contributed \$176,775,622 to the reclamation fund and has received in plant, property, and equipment a total of \$221,901,973. The implication is sometimes made that Wyoming is getting a good deal. It is not, as two very important considerations are ignored:

1. The relative comparison with other States.

2. The principle that reclamation projects are largely self-financing on a repayment basis.

As table A will show, mineral royalty receipts to the reclamation fund represent 79.9 percent of the cost of projects in Wyoming. The average for all States is 12.3 percent. And the fact is ignored that although \$221 million in Bureau projects were appropriated for Wyoming, not all this money got into the State. The Washington siphon took its toll in administrative costs. But since this affects all States more or less equally, the relationship between 79.9 percent and 12.3 percent is generally valid.

The difference between the all-State average of 12.3 percent and 100 percent has been made up by:

1. General appropriations from the Treasury.

2. Reclamation fund revolving revenues such as repayment and profits.

3. Other smaller sources.

Therefore, the moneys, taken from the States for reclamation projects account for only 12.3 percent of total costs of the projects. It is evident that the reclamation program no longer depends upon the reclamation fund.

II

When the reclamation fund was established in 1902, it was the only means of financing the Federal reclamation projects of the arid west. It's most reliable sources of new funds was the contributions from the sale of public lands. After 1920, the accruals under the provision of the Minerals

Leasing Act became an additional source of revenue.

Money appropriated out of the reclamation fund, is, in general, reimbursable to that fund. Repayments have, therefore, become an important contributor to the growth of the fund.

Reclamation projects can and do stand upon their own merits under the congressional appropriations methods. This is fully demonstrated by the financing in fiscal 1961 when \$76 million was appropriated from the general fund. Approximately 90 percent is reimbursable and will be added to the reclamation fund when repaid from the power and water revenues. Thus, the lion's share of the funds appropriated find their way back into the reclamation fund.

The reclamation fund has served a very useful purpose, particularly in the seminal years, as it clearly earmarked money for the early endeavors in reclamation. The very existence of the fund in the early years acted as a guarantee of appropriations for reclamation projects.

However, moneys into the reclamation fund from mineral royalties have not kept pace with the needs and possibilities for reclamation, so that the financing has increasingly come to depend upon money appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury. In short, the reclamation fund is no longer as important in financing reclamation as it was in the early years.

We are not against the reclamation fund—we only think it unfair to put the mineral royalty receipts into this fund, as reclamation is largely carried on by appropriations from Congress, and from the reclamation fund revolving revenues mentioned above. The mineral royalties money is not essential to the welfare of either the reclamation fund or the reclamation program in the West.

It would, therefore, be far more rational public policy to handle reclamation matters by direct appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury, the reimbursable items of which will ultimately make their way into the reclamation fund.

The reclamation fund has served successfully for nearly 60 years. A look ahead at the next 60 years, however, casts doubt upon the wisdom of contributing income from depletable resources to expand a fund which will be receiving further expansion by the collection of reimbursable revenues.

III

In the meantime, if the Western States had the additional 52½ percent in royalty revenues, they could make direct and immediate use of these funds derived from the production of mineral wealth on the public lands within their respective borders. Among the uses to which this money could go would be a system of State parks adjoining the reservoirs created by the construction of reclamation dams. Table C shows the additional funds which would have been available to the State in 1960 under such a 90-percent plan.

In Wyoming, for example, the funds returned under the 37½-percent provision of the law go for specific purposes as determined by the State legislature. At the present time, the breakdown is as follows: 50 percent to schools, 35 percent to highways, 9 percent to the University of Wyoming, 3 percent to county road improvements, 3 percent to assistance for county highways.

Should Wyoming receive 90 percent of the mineral royalties, as desired, it would be necessary for the law to be amended on both the Federal and State level for other than road or educational use, as it is provided under title 30, United States Code Annotated, section 191, that the 37½-percent royalty return be used for roads and/or educational purposes. This statute was last amended to take Alaska into consideration. Under Wyoming law, section 9-577 of the

¹ Extracted from an Aug. 8, 1955, speech by Senator Barrett, of Wyoming, and based upon a report submitted to the President called The Report of the Study Committee on Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues.

1957 Wyoming Statutes, volume IV, page 298, the distribution is to be for roads and/or educational purposes.

We in Wyoming are not against reclamation. Far from it. It can be shown that reclamation pays. Arguments that reclamation contributes to the glut of farm commodities are for the most part unsound.

The contribution of reclamation to the West cannot be measured in dollars and cents. But the individual States, with their individual problems, know best the projects in the future which will have to be built, but which will be too small for Bureau of Reclamation consideration. To finance these projects, the States will have to have the

funds—perhaps by changes promulgated by State legislatures, or at least funds released from other uses. This is the problem of the future for the Western States—getting money for small water projects and other similar projects. It is necessary that we all unite to get to work for the fullest development of the West.

TABLE A.—Mineral Leasing Act receipts

	Total, fiscal 1960	1920 through fiscal 1960	37½ percent to States		52½ percent to reclamation fund		Percent of total	Bureau of reclamation cost of plant, property, and equipment built and in progress	Percent	Mineral royalty to fund as percent of cost of projects
			Fiscal 1960	1920-60	Fiscal 1960	1920-60				
Alabama	\$2,156	\$245,553	\$808	\$92,082	\$1,073	\$216,397	0.05			
Alaska	3,064,989	14,429,525	2,787,939	12,137,063				\$32,863,181	0.9	
Arizona	676,157	3,001,237	253,559	1,125,266	269,636	1,339,627	.3	347,257,541	10.0	0.4
Arkansas	61,878	253,183	23,204	94,944	38,507	110,923	.03			
California	6,498,875	164,602,262	2,755,388	62,380,982	3,475,883	82,177,956	19.1	880,143,000	25.3	9.3
Colorado	9,154,007	104,387,078	3,432,990	39,149,406	5,170,360	52,300,523	12.2	215,660,752	6.2	24.3
Florida	364	6,470	57	2,347	17	3,222				
Idaho	237,203	2,866,566	88,951	1,074,955	122,197	1,458,565	.3	174,336,158	5.0	.8
Illinois		142		113		75				
Indiana		160			84	84				
Iowa								3,397,963	.1	
Kansas	322,317	1,650,508	120,869	622,310	145,717	773,224	.2	69,098,784	2.0	1.1
Louisiana	257,557	2,670,512	96,664	1,001,359	192,238	1,381,543	.3			
Michigan	1,588	65,953	596	24,734	1,218	34,030				
Minnesota								10,431,631	.3	
Mississippi	6,467	60,111	2,425	22,541	3,213	29,961				
Montana	4,586,482	39,733,777	1,761,994	14,975,419	2,480,394	19,605,126	4.6	220,530,626	6.3	8.9
Nebraska	17,695	186,238	6,636	69,840	8,317	90,997	.02	112,077,085	3.2	.08
Nevada	427,739	8,050,975	160,402	3,019,115	188,113	4,114,175	1.0	106,098,920	3.0	3.9
New Mexico	17,603,124	131,606,577	7,774,844	60,562,134	7,475,267	62,497,906	14.5	96,885,861	2.8	64.5
North Dakota	220,316	2,539,783	82,618	962,798	108,966	1,269,692	.3	52,380,004	1.5	2.4
Oklahoma	109,646	745,021	48,742	323,780	36,353	353,420	.08	31,398,021	.9	1.1
Oregon	144,708	797,814	54,266	299,501	22,203	356,828	.08	77,304,199	2.2	.5
South Dakota	272,010	2,194,340	102,004	822,263	108,730	1,077,212	.3	84,682,361	2.4	1.3
Texas								32,949,226	.9	
Utah	7,268,335	49,292,959	2,729,621	18,490,891	3,626,597	23,724,165	5.5	112,289,801	3.2	21.1
Washington	1,447	185,034	500	66,099	658	96,759	.02	600,305,828	17.2	.02
Wyoming	33,165,394	353,821,140	12,437,023	132,121,693	16,906,881	176,775,622	41.1	221,901,973	6.4	79.7
Nonproject property								1,554,223		
Total	84,091,454	883,300,918	34,722,100	349,431,635	40,382,520	429,787,530	100.0	3,453,543,138	100.0	12.3

Sources: Tables 120 and 126, 1960 Statistical Appendix to Annual Report of the Director, Bureau of Land Management; pp. 20 and 57-58, Report of the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, 1960.

TABLE B.—Federal mineral royalties received by Wyoming¹

Calendar year	Total to Wyoming	For schools	Common school per- manent fund	University building improve- ment	University permanent fund	University excess royalty fund	Highway commis- sion	Highway permanent main- tenance fund	Highway commis- sion for counties	Counties for roads
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(10)
1921	\$745,446	\$374,223		\$74,845		\$209,440			\$14,960	\$14,960
1922	1,748,875	871,988		174,388		627,795			34,878	34,878
1923	2,424,482	1,210,304		230,780		856,204			63,567	63,567
1924	4,225,299	2,000,000	\$111,649	360,690	\$20,007	1,400,000	\$78,155		126,699	126,699
1925	2,980,537	1,490,268		268,248		1,043,188			89,416	89,416
1926	2,584,107	1,292,054		232,670		904,447			77,523	77,523
1927	1,911,890	955,945		172,070		669,161			57,357	57,357
1928	1,102,484	551,242		69,224		385,809			33,075	33,075
1929	996,591	498,206		89,693		348,807			29,898	29,898
1930	1,227,926	613,963		110,613		429,774			36,838	36,838
1931	813,474	406,737	20,000	73,213		264,716			24,404	24,404
1932	537,862	268,931		48,408		158,252			16,136	16,136
1933	453,560	226,780		40,820		158,746			13,607	13,607
1934	425,517	212,758		38,297		148,931			12,796	12,796
1935	521,663	260,831		46,950		182,582			15,650	15,650
1936	490,426	245,213		44,138		171,649			14,713	14,713
1937	513,693	257,847		46,412		180,493			15,471	15,471
1938	683,503	341,752		61,515		239,226			20,505	20,505
1939	643,237	321,619		57,891		225,133			19,297	19,297
1940	653,290	326,644		58,796		228,651			19,599	19,599
1941	778,819	389,410		70,094		272,587			23,365	23,365
1942	1,003,089	501,545		90,278		351,081			30,093	30,093
1943	872,022	436,011		78,482		305,208			26,161	26,161
1944	1,675,614	837,807		150,805		586,465			50,268	50,268
1945	1,438,805	719,402		129,492		503,582			43,164	43,164
1946	1,251,928	625,964		112,674		438,175			37,558	37,558
1947	1,860,532	930,266		167,448		651,186			55,816	55,816
1948	3,388,536	1,694,268		304,968		1,185,988			101,656	101,656
1949	4,047,542	2,000,000	23,771	360,000	4,279	1,400,000	16,640		121,426	121,426
1950	3,300,536	1,650,268		297,048		1,155,188			99,016	99,016
1951	4,866,721	2,000,000	433,360	360,000	78,005	1,400,000	303,352		146,002	146,002
1952	5,469,342	2,000,000	734,671	360,000	132,241	1,400,000	514,270		164,080	164,080
1953	5,726,097	2,000,000	863,048	360,000		\$155,349	604,134		171,783	171,783
1954	7,302,940	2,000,000	1,651,470	360,000		297,265	1,156,029		219,088	219,088
1955	8,396,916	4,198,458		360,000		395,722	2,938,921		251,907	251,907
1956	9,357,725	4,678,363		360,000		482,195	3,275,204		280,732	280,732
1957	11,109,738	5,554,869		360,000		639,876	3,888,408		333,292	333,292
1958	11,694,956	5,847,478		360,000		692,546	4,093,234		350,849	350,849
1959	12,075,688	6,037,844		360,000		726,812	4,226,491		362,271	362,271
1960	12,651,866	6,325,783		360,000		778,641	4,428,048		379,547	379,547
Total	133,950,970	63,155,878	3,817,970	7,690,060	234,621	4,168,406	44,242,879	2,072,579	3,984,439	3,984,439

¹ Calendar year production but funds received on fiscal year basis.

Source: State treasurer's office, Cheyenne, Wyo.

NOTE.—Figures may not add due to rounding.

TABLE C.—Mineral royalty distribution to Western States under present situation and under 90 percent proposal

Western State (1)	Present situation ¹			Under 90 percent return proposal ²		
	Total royalties fiscal 1960 (2)	37½ percent to States (3)	52½ percent to reclamation fund (4)	10 percent to Treasury (5)	90 percent to States (6)	Increase to State (col. 6 —col. 3) (7)
Alaska.....	\$3,064,989	\$2,787,939	-----	\$306,499	\$2,787,939	-----
Arizona.....	676,157	253,559	\$269,536	67,616	608,541	\$354,982
California.....	6,498,875	2,755,388	3,475,883	649,888	5,848,987	3,093,599
Colorado.....	9,154,007	3,432,990	5,170,360	915,401	8,238,606	4,805,616
Idaho.....	237,203	88,951	122,197	23,720	213,483	124,532
Montana.....	4,586,482	1,761,994	2,480,394	458,648	4,127,834	2,365,840
Nevada.....	427,739	160,402	118,113	42,774	384,965	224,563
New Mexico.....	17,603,124	7,774,844	7,475,267	1,760,312	15,842,812	8,067,968
Oregon.....	144,708	54,266	22,203	14,471	130,237	75,971
Utah.....	7,268,335	2,729,621	3,626,597	726,834	6,541,501	3,811,880
Washington.....	1,477	500	658	148	1,329	829
Wyoming.....	33,165,394	12,437,023	16,906,881	3,316,539	29,848,855	17,411,832

¹ Not shown is 10 percent to U.S. Treasury.² Based on 1960 figures in col. 2.

NOTE.—Hawaii has no public lands and is therefore not affected.

Source: Table A.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HART. Madam President, Mr. Harry A. Williams, managing director of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., addressed the Road Gang in Washington on January 19, 1962, on the national transportation issue, a matter on which there has been focused considerable attention throughout the country in recent years. Mr. Williams is an articulate spokesman on the subject of transportation and economic growth.

It gives me pleasure to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of Mr. Williams' address, which is entitled "Just Who Is Trying To Ruin Our Cities," before the informal highway transportation discussion group.

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

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS BY MR. HARRY A. WILLIAMS

All of us, I am sure, are aware that the Nation's urban freeway program has come under attack these last few years from a variety of sources.

We hear increasingly the use of such terms as "urban sprawl," "social costs of transportation," "pooling of transportation user fees for efficient allocation of national resources," and "destruction of urban land values by highway and parking facilities."

Now I submit that these attacks on the nation's urban highway program are based on a shocking ignorance of the nature and objectives of the program itself. In short, the real trouble with these self-appointed allocators of our national resources is that they didn't bother to do their homework when they were studying urban transportation problems.

For their first brush-up assignment, I would recommend that they read the Interregional Highways report which was sent to Congress in 1944 by the late President Roosevelt. That report set forth very clearly the nature and objectives of the nationwide roadbuilding program which today is being carried out on the Interstate Highway System.

Let me quote to you one sentence from that 1944 report—a sentence which, although it was written nearly two decades ago, would make a good lead sentence for an urban transportation article in tomorrow's newspapers. The sentence reads:

"Urban planning is really just now coming to grips with one of the basic urban problems—decentralization or dissipation of the

urban area to an extent not economically justified."

In other words, the question of so-called urban sprawl was recognized by the Nation's highway officials long before it became a catch phrase for attacking the highway program.

Similarly, the need for revitalization of our downtown areas, for slum clearance, and for redevelopment of blighted neighborhoods within older urban communities, is covered in detail in that 1944 Federal Highway report. In addition, the highway planning steps for promoting these objectives are all laid out clearly and concisely.

If our large cities want to promote urban sprawl, and steady economic deterioration of their downtown areas, and a continuing spread of neighborhood blight, and lowered property values, they have only to heed the advice of those who would curtail urban freeway programs.

Another excellent way to assure the bankruptcy of our metropolitan core cities is to adopt the suggestion of those who would impose special tolls on motorists who dare to try to drive and park downtown.

Fortunately, the vast majority of city planners in the United States, and of city officials and downtown merchants, are not being taken in.

Farsighted merchants, officials, and planners have read the statistics on the steady decline in mass transit riding, and the steady rise in urban motor trips—and they recognize that just as motor traffic built the suburbs, so now the central city's future depends primarily on adapting to motor transportation requirements.

And right here is where the urban highway plan laid out in that 1944 Interregional Highways report is going to become the basis for a revolution in city transportation during the next 10 years.

As most of you perhaps know, the freeway networks now being constructed in our larger urban areas include an inner belt freeway looping around the fringes of the downtown business center.

This inner belt freeway has the dual purpose of allowing traffic to bypass the downtown center if it has no business there, and of allowing motorists with downtown destinations to use the belt freeway to a point nearest their inner destination so they will make minimum use of downtown streets.

Traffic surveys in our large cities show that over 80 percent of peak-hour morning and evening traffic on downtown streets is merely passing through to other destinations. Most of this traffic, once it can, will use the downtown bypass freeways. In short, most American cities will largely if not completely eliminate the problem of downtown traffic congestion within the next 10 years.

In addition to the downtown loop route, freeway programs for our larger cities include a series of radial and crosstown routes. As these new freeway networks are developed over the coming decade, they will carry 50 percent of all urban traffic, at double today's average travel speeds, with an 80 percent decline in traffic accident rates—and will sharply reduce traffic volumes on existing city streets.

As one metropolitan traffic engineer put it recently, "Today's city freeway and expressway congestion is like the problem of a family that is trying to live in a new home only 15 percent finished. Living conditions are crowded today—but when the whole house is completed, the overcrowding will end."

With downtown accessibility restored by the new urban freeways, major investors in downtown land—including large insurance firms—anticipate a healthy revitalization of our downtown areas. A key element here, they inform us, will be large-scale investment in multideck parking garages.

From the standpoint of our downtown areas, one of the most encouraging trends of the last 5 years has been the tremendous success of new office buildings, retail stores, apartments and hotels in which parking is directly tied into the building.

Typical of the new trend is the ZCMI department store in Salt Lake City, which now has a 500-car parking garage adjacent to the store in the heart of the downtown area. Parkers can walk directly from their cars into the store at whatever level they stop. During the first year of operation, of the new parking facility, the store's retail sales increased 10 percent faster than the gains reported by the Federal Reserve Board for all department stores in the region.

Even in nightlife circles, where the sense of profit through change is notoriously acute, we have a recent example. Toots Shore has built his new Manhattan spot with seven of its nine floors designed specifically for parking.

Thanks to today's construction techniques, new retail, office or apartment structures can include multideck parking facilities at a cost that can be financed by some \$150 to \$200 in yearly income per car space. This means that a modest daily fee per parking space would cover the added expense.

What it all adds up to is this: The parking industry appears to be on the threshold of an era of unprecedented expansion within our downtown areas, as an adjunct of structural redevelopment of our central business districts. The new result can be a doubling or tripling of downtown parking spaces, or a substantially smaller land area

than that occupied by present downtown open-lot parking facilities.

This trend has a special significance for downtown areas such as that of New York City, whose colossal traffic jams are in part due to curb parking and inability of motorists to find parking spaces.

These traffic jams cannot be eliminated until more offstreet garages are developed. The interregional highways report pointed out in 1944 that offstreet parking facilities are basic to ending street congestion caused by traffic having downtown destinations.

Our industry research specialists have discussed these trends with downtown property investors and city planning officials in many cities—in Chicago, in Philadelphia, in Toronto, to name but a few. In every instance, they found a recognition that urban freeway and downtown parking programs offer the only real assurance of continued growth of the central business district.

The story in Toronto is particularly significant. This progressive Canadian city has often been cited by antihighway groups as the model for a transit-oriented metropolitan area. Yet in spite of its modern subway system, Toronto has experienced a steady decline in mass transit patronage ever since 1945.

Where 80 percent of all Toronto passenger trips to and from the central business district were by transit in 1945, in the year 1962 it is expected that automobile trips will equal the transit total—and for the metropolitan area as a whole, transit service accounts today for only 30 percent of passenger trips.

As one Toronto city planning official puts it:

"Modern freeways and downtown parking garages are going to eliminate the disadvantages our central cities face today in competition with their suburban areas. While we will try to preserve and expand mass transit as much as possible, additional freeways are essential to the future growth of downtown Toronto."

Nor will the benefits of new urban freeways be limited to downtown areas. After all, urban redevelopment is severely hampered today by demands on the archaic checkerboard street pattern for both local and through-traffic movement.

Once the urban traffic which is moving on trips of more than a few miles in length is removed from surface streets and placed on the freeways systems, a basis for redevelopment is created—because only then does assurance exist that traffic congestion will no longer be able to change the character of a given neighborhood.

Let me make a final reference to that 1944 interregional highways report cited earlier:

"The plight of the cities is due to the most rapid urbanization ever known, without sufficient plan or control. The result is square mile after square mile of developed city that is functionally and structurally obsolete, both as to buildings and neighborhood arrangements."

One of the Nation's great tasks of the coming decade is to rebuild those obsolete city neighborhoods. Most cities now are well equipped for the technical part of the job, with professional planning commissions and legal authority. But it must be understood that the prerequisite framework for urban redevelopment lies in the modern highway program. It can and will be the most powerful of all tools available to our cities for doing the job that lies ahead.

ESTONIA—44TH ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FROM CZARIST RUSSIA

Mr. HART. Madam President, on the Baltic Sea lives a small nation of people who undoubtedly today in bitter silence

are commemorating the 44th anniversary of their declaration of independence from czarist Russia. Each year during the 20-odd years before 1940, the Estonian people throughout the world observed the 24th day of February with rejoicing for on that date in 1918, after several centuries of autocratic Romanov rule, the gallant Estonian people declared their independence and proceeded to establish a democratic country.

Madam President, the Estonian nation is small, but her people are among the oldest of Europe. They have their own language, their own music, their own literature, customs and culture. They have the right to be free and independent and to choose their own form of government.

From that joyous day in 1918 until 1940, the Estonian people sedulously built their country. Then out of Russia in 1940 came a new imperialism, a new tyranny, a new brutal master. Soviet Russian armies proclaiming freedom and equality under communism brought by force of arms death, deportation, repression, regimentation.

Today the people of Estonia suffer the miseries of subjugation, but they have not forgotten their dreams and aspirations of freedom and national independence. Nor has this country forgotten the legitimate aspirations of the Estonian people. We today join the Estonian people in reaffirming their desire for freedom from the foreign imperialism of Russia.

BULGARIA—84TH ANNIVERSARY OF LIBERATION FROM RULE OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

Mr. HART. Madam President, on March 3, Americans of Bulgarian descent celebrated the 84th anniversary of the liberation of Bulgaria from subjugation to the rule of the Ottoman Empire.

The Bulgarian people are an ancient people with a long history of struggle for freedom and independence. For 500 years the Bulgarian people suffered the yoke of the Ottoman rulers, but never for a moment did they give up hope of freedom, never did they cease resistance to their oppressors. Their iron will and resolution was rewarded in March 3, 1878, with the reestablishment of the Bulgarian nation.

Today, the world once again sees the brave Bulgarian people suffering the imposition of another tyranny. At the end of the Second World War the independence of Bulgaria was snuffed out by the Soviet Army, and a complete Communist police state was imposed. But it is clear that the will and resolution of the Bulgarian people that they shall be free remains as strong today as it was in the period of trial under the Ottoman Empire.

Madam President, we receive reports today from Bulgaria that despite the worst efforts of the state, the young people of Bulgaria are turning to the ideas and ideals of the West, clear evidence that the Bulgarian people continue in their resistance to Communist domination.

It is proper that we today join Americans of Bulgarian descent in commemorating the liberation of Bulgaria 84 years ago if only as some small sign to those continuing the fight in Bulgaria that their valiant efforts have our hopes and prayers.

KALEWALA DAY—FEBRUARY 28—FINNISH HOLIDAY

Mr. HART. Madam President, every nation rightfully takes pride in its language and its history and its legends. And because this is so, every nation develops out of its history and its language an epic which embodies the virtues, the values, and the principles which have borne that nation through history and led it to greatness and which reflect the character and personality of that nation.

Madam President, the Finnish people have a long and glorious history. The heroic deeds of legendary and historic leaders of the Finnish nation had for centuries been handed down by spoken word from generation to generation in song and verse.

However, these songs, verses and legends which constitute the Finnish epic were collected and set down in writing, and on February 28, 1835, the first fairly complete collection in some 12,000 lines was published in Finland. This epic is called the "Kalewala."

Madam President, ever since, February 28 has been celebrated by the Finns throughout the world as a national holiday. I join my Finnish friends today in celebrating the 127th anniversary of the publication of the "Kalewala."

Mr. HART. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, March 8, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 5, 1962:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

John W. Oliver, of Missouri, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Missouri, vice R. Jasper Smith, deceased.

John K. Regan, of Missouri, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Missouri, vice Randolph H. Weber, deceased.

James H. Meredith, of Missouri, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Missouri, vice George H. Moore, retired.

Ralph C. Body, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Allan K. Grim, retired.

STATE DEPARTMENT

Robert J. Manning, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from the class of career minister to the class of career ambassador: W. Walton Butterworth, of Louisiana; Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia; Miss Frances E. Willis, of California.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The following-named persons to be members of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:

Roger M. Blough, of Pennsylvania.
The Reverend Edward A. Conway, of Nebraska.
John Cowles, of Minnesota.
Trevor Gardner, of California.
George B. Kistlakowsky, of Massachusetts.
Robert A. Lovett, of New York.
John J. McCloy, of New York.
Dean A. McGee, of Oklahoma.
Ralph E. McGill, of Georgia.
George Meany, of Maryland.
James A. Perkins, of New Jersey.
Herman Phleger, of California.
Isidor I. Rabi, of New York.
Thomas D. White, of the District of Columbia.
Herbert F. York, of California.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 5, 1962:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Arlon E. Lyon, of California, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 28, 1964, vice Horace W. Harper, retiring.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Gertrude M. Cwikla, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointments and promotions as indicated:
John Calvin Hill, Jr., of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer, for promotion from class 3 to class 2.

Philip J. Farley, of Virginia, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America

Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr., of California.
Joseph Godson, of New York.
Alfred le S. Jenkins, of Georgia.
Spencer M. King, of Maine.
Ellas A. McQuaid, of New Hampshire.
Charles N. Manning, of Texas.
Julian L. Nugent, Jr., of New Mexico.
Philip P. Williams, of California.

Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America

Samuel Owen Lane, of California.
Everett K. Melby, of Illinois.
Norman Armour, Jr., of New York, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, in accordance with the provisions of section 520(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

Charles H. Taquey, of the District of Columbia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Charles C. Flowerree, of Virginia.
Colbert C. Held, of Nebraska.
Alvin T. Slemmons, of Indiana.
Windsor W. Stroup, of Virginia.
Miss Dorothy E. Weihrauch, of Florida.
James F. Shea, of Maryland, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Joseph Basile, of New Jersey, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Joseph O. Eblan, of New Hampshire, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Philip J. Adler, of Pennsylvania.
James R. Falzone, of Massachusetts.
J. Hal Lesh, of Indiana.
David Dysart Morse, of Illinois.
Peter Solmssen, of Pennsylvania.
George Peter Varros, of Connecticut.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

David L. Aaron, of California.
Miss Peggy Ann Antonides, of Illinois.
Edwin L. Barber III, of Virginia.
J. Peter Becker, of Pennsylvania.
John P. Becker, of Massachusetts.
Peter T. Beneville, of Colorado.
Robert B. Bentley, of California.
Alan D. Berlind, of Virginia.
F. James Bingley, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Stephen M. Boyd, of Missouri.
Werner W. Brandt, of New York.
Philip E. Burnham, Jr., of New Hampshire.
F. Scott Bush, of Illinois.
James A. Carney, Jr., of Virginia.
Reed Cecil, of Texas.
James Richard Cheek, of Arkansas.
Timothy W. Childs, of Connecticut.
John H. Christensen, of Iowa.
Carl John Clement, of Minnesota.
John Albert Collins, of New York.
Edwin G. Corr, of Oklahoma.
David W. Cox, of Wisconsin.
Miss Patricia A. Dawson, of New York.
Richard J. Dols, of Minnesota.
Mark M. Easton, of New York.
Lloyd H. Ellis, Jr., of Nebraska.
Edward M. Featherstone, of Pennsylvania.
William A. Feldt, of Wisconsin.
Patrick E. Fitzgerald, of Montana.
Robert A. Flaten, of Minnesota.
Jerry A. Fowler, of California.
Ralph P. Gallagher, Jr., of New Jersey.
Stephen R. Gibson, of California.
Philip C. Gill, of California.
Alexander G. Gilliam, Jr., of Virginia.
Robert F. Gillin, of Pennsylvania.
Robert Coleman Gratsch, of Michigan.
Olaf Grobel, of Tennessee.
David W. Guthrie, of Ohio.
Ralph E. Hamil, of New York.
Donald D. Haught, of California.
Charles Higginson, of Massachusetts.
Miss Elinor V. Hohman, of Illinois.
George R. Hoover, of California.
Alden H. Irons, of Massachusetts.
Miss Harriet W. Isom, of Oregon.
William Harding Jackson, Jr., of Virginia.
Philip K. Johnson, Jr., of Ohio.
William P. Kelly, of Pennsylvania.

Don Roland Kienzie, of Massachusetts.
Roland Karl Kuchel, of Massachusetts.
Walter J. Landry, of Louisiana.
James O. Langland, of Iowa.
Walter C. Lenahan, of Oregon.
Donald R. Lesh, of Massachusetts.
Howard C. Loper, of Pennsylvania.
Winston Lord, of New York.
Matthew T. Lorimer, of New Hampshire.
George E. Lowe, of Illinois.

James M. Lucas, of California.
John T. McCarthy, of New York.
Mark McCormack, of Pennsylvania.
William J. McDonough, of Illinois.
Thomas J. McGee, Jr., of New York.
Carroll R. McKibbin, of Iowa.
J. Philip McLean, of Washington.
Donald M. MacLay, of Pennsylvania.
John Linden Martin, of Oregon.

David P. Matthews, of Virginia.
Gary L. Matthews, of Missouri.
Robert Allan Mautino, of California.
William B. Milam, of California.
Robert Wesley Miller, of California.
Miss Carole A. Millikan, of Indiana.
Miss Marilyn H. Moninger, of Illinois.
Robert J. Montgomery, of Texas.

Lewis Roy Murray, Jr., of Tennessee.
William V. P. Newlin, of Pennsylvania.
David G. Newton, of Massachusetts.
Thomas J. O'Donnell, of Michigan.

Bradford C. Oelman, of Ohio.
Robert H. Pelletreau, Jr., of New York.
Charles R. Pogue, of Indiana.
Henry Precht, of Virginia.

Leo J. Reddy, of Maryland.
James W. Reeves, of California.
Davis R. Robinson, of Connecticut.
Fernando E. Rondon, of California.

Richard C. Schneek, of New York.
Carl W. Schmidt, of New Jersey.
Cornelius D. Scully III, of Virginia.
John W. Sewell, of New York.

Henry Jacob Silverman, of Pennsylvania.
Samuel Sloan, of New York.
Miss Edith Smith, of Illinois.
Murray C. Smith, of Virginia.

Richard J. Smith, of Connecticut.
Gerald E. Snyder, of Ohio.
Joel S. Spiro, of Pennsylvania.
John P. Steinmetz, of California.

Miss Joan L. Steves, of Ohio.
William Morgan Stewart, of Maryland.
Richard L. Storch, of Illinois.
Garett Gordon Swamy, of Washington.

Peter Tarnoff, of New York.
Clyde Donald Taylor, of the District of Columbia.

Rush W. Taylor, Jr., of Texas.
James F. Twaddell, of Rhode Island.
Lannon Walker, of the District of Columbia.

William Graham Walker, of California.
William J. Waller, of California.
Donald J. Walsh, of the District of Columbia.

Ralph Claiborne Walsh, of Texas.
Barclay Ward, of Connecticut.
Alexander F. Watson, of Massachusetts.
Martin A. Wenick, of New Jersey.

Frank G. Wisner II, of Maryland.
Miss Joanna W. Witzel, of California.
William R. Womack, of Virginia.
Murray David Zinoman, of New York.

Harris H. Huston, of Ohio, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

To be consuls of the United States of America
Stuart J. Bohacek, of Nebraska.
Alessandro Cagliati, of Massachusetts.

Harold C. Champeau, of Maryland.
Nelson Chipchin, of New York.
Miss Frances E. Coughlin, of California.
William F. DeMyer, of New York.

James R. Echols, of Washington.
Robert H. Feldmann, of California.
Charles T. Foo, Jr., of Florida.
Jack B. Geaslin, of Maryland.
Edward J. Killeen, of California.
Charles M. Levy, of New York.
Hugh J. McMillan, of Washington.

Howard L. McVitty, of the District of Columbia.

John L. Maddux, of California.

Jean M. Nater, of Connecticut.

Charles C. Penney, of Massachusetts.

W. Wolf Reade, of the District of Columbia.

Howard E. Stingle, of Maryland.

Gerald Stryker, of Virginia.

John W. Dixon, of Virginia, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Rodney N. Landreth, of Pennsylvania, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

To be vice consuls of the United States of America

Charles L. Acree, Jr., of New Jersey.

Rexford L. Baer, of California.

Melvyn R. Brokenshire, Jr., of Georgia.

Allan W. Brown, of Virginia.

Fred A. Coffey, Jr., of Texas.

William E. Dietz, of Maryland.

Neal T. Donnelly, of New York.

Abol F. Fotouhi, of North Carolina.

David K. Grinwis, of New Jersey.

Pilitti M. Heiskanen, of Maryland.

Donald C. Horan, of Maine.

Desmond L. Jackson, of Texas.

Joseph R. Johnson, of Virginia.

Louis P. Linfante, of Pennsylvania.

John F. McDonald, of Maine.

Joseph F. McManus, of Massachusetts.

Charles L. Medd, of New York.

James D. Montgomery, of Virginia.

John E. Palevich, of Pennsylvania.

Vincent Rotundo, of New Jersey.

I. L. Sablosky, of Indiana.

Chapman Stockford, of Maine.

Stanley E. Williams, of Hawaii.

Warren W. Williams, of Pennsylvania.

Douglas A. Zischke, of Wisconsin.

Charles H. Bibbings, of Virginia, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a vice consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

To be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Thomas R. Blackshear, of California.

Alexander Bloomfield, of California.

Ernest F. Chase, of Virginia.

John P. Condon, of Oklahoma.

Thomas E. Drumm, Jr., of New Jersey.

Albert Harkness, Jr., of Rhode Island.

Peter K. Helmann, of the District of Columbia.

Arthur L. Jacobs, of the District of Columbia.

Andrew S. Kelsey, of Virginia.

Nathaniel Knowles, of Pennsylvania.

William A. Krauss, of California.

Carney G. Laslie, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Harry T. Mahoney, of Illinois.

John W. Mowinkel, of the District of Columbia.

Lawrence E. Norrie, of Washington.

Rutherford T. Walsh, of California.

Ernest J. Colton, of Virginia, a Foreign Service staff officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

Facing the uncharted vastness of a future unseen, we pray that we be ever mindful of our dependence on Thee. As we broaden our knowledge of the universe around us, so may we deepen our love for Thee and Thy children. Make us equal to the challenge of the new age that Thou hast opened up for us, and crown our hopes with peace.

Vouchsafe Thy blessings, we pray Thee, upon the constituted leaders of our beloved land, that they may ever guide the destiny of our Nation with wisdom and understanding, and help us to bring near the day when the hallowed ideals of our blessed land will become the cherished portion of all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 1, 1962, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

On March 2, 1962:

H.R. 258. An act to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes.

On March 3, 1962:

H.R. 74. An act to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army;

H.R. 1375. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owner thereof;

H.R. 4934. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas;

H.R. 8625. An act for the relief of Dennis H. O'Grady; and

H.R. 8842. An act to amend subsection (h) of section 124 of the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 10050. An act to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act.

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

H.R. 3788. An act to provide for the transfer of the U.S. vessel *Alaska* to the State of California for the use and benefit of the department of fish and game of such State.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following

titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 778. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia Government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved August 11, 1950; and

S. 875. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of Wyoming for agricultural purposes certain real property in Sweetwater County, Wyo.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 991) entitled "An act relating to manpower requirements, resources, development, and utilization, and for other purposes," and agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. MURPHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced the appointment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], a member of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, now meeting in Ottawa, Canada, vice the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], resigned.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED ON LIFE AND SERVICES OF SPEAKER CHAMP CLARK

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, the 112th anniversary of his birth, I have 20 minutes at the close of the 1-minute period to address the House on the services of Champ Clark, the greatest Speaker in the history of the House.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE WALL DOXEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to call to the attention of the membership the death of my predecessor in the Congress representing the Second Mississippi District, the Honorable Wall Doxey. Wall Doxey passed away the day before yesterday at the age of 69. Truly Mississippi and the Nation have lost a great citizen and a great friend.

Born in 1892, he was graduated from the University of Mississippi in 1913 and from the law department in 1914. In the period 1915 to 1923 he served as prosecuting attorney in Marshall County, Miss., and was district attorney for the third district from 1923 to 1925.

He was first elected to the Congress in the 71st Congress, was reelected to six succeeding Congresses until he was elected U.S. Senator on September 23, 1941, to succeed our beloved Pat Harrison.

In 1943 he was elected Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. Senate and served there

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Jacob Hurwitz, Temple Israel, Binghamton, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Our God and God of our fathers, in reverence and humility we turn our hearts to Thee as we ask Thy blessings upon us. Thou hast been our help in days gone by. Be Thou our guide in the days ahead.