McLaurin's driver's license. McLaurin showed it. The officer asked McLaurin what he was doing there. McLaurin told him he worked in voter registration. Then, accompanied by obscene remarks, the officer said:

Nigger, do you know the way out of town?

McLaurin replied:

Yes.

The officer said, with more obscenity:

Nigger. Can't you say "Yes, sir?"

The officer's partner asked the officer what charge should be put on the tickets. The officer said:

Charge the ——— $26 on both charges. Nigger, you got $52?

McLaurin replied:

No.

The officer said:

Then you're going to jail.

At the jail, McLaurin learned that the officer was Clarksdale Police Chief Ben Collins. McLaurin was in jail a few minutes when his companions posted bond for him in the amount of $103. They decided to forfeit bond rather than run the risk of a higher fine or incur the legal expense of an appeal.

October 31, Jackson, Hinds County: Thomas E. Johnson, a white minister, and a member of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commisison on Civil Rights, saw a group of neighbors dumping garbage on his lawn. Johnson had just returned from taking his car to a safe place because of threats by neighbors to damage it. Johnson sought a peace bond against the man whom he had observed leading the garbage-dumping operations of his neighbors. The man presented 11 witnesses who swore that he had been in their presence at all times on the evening in question. The justice of the peace accepted their testimony and refused the bond. Then the Hinds County Grand Jury indicted Johnson and his wife on perjury charges, because of their testimony at the peace bond hearing.

November 6, 1962, Greenville, Washington County: Two WAF's and two airmen—all white—from the Greenville Air Force Base were fined $55 and given 30-day suspended sentences on charges of creating a disturbance by entering a restaurant and seeking service with two Negro voter registration workers.

December 26, 1962, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: Ivanhoe Donaldson and Benjamin Taylor, students from Detroit, brought a truckload of food, clothing and medicines for distribution to the Delta's needy families who had been cut off from Federal surplus commodities. The medicines had been donated by a physician in Louisville, and were consigned to Aaron Henry, a licensed pharmacist. They were arrested by Clarksdale police and held for investigation. After police searched the truck on December 27, and found what they described as a drug used to ease the pain of middle-aged women, Donaldson and Taylor were charged with possession of narcotics and bond was set at $15,000. Bond was later reduced to $1,500.

1963

January 17, Canton, Madison County: The castrated and mutilated body of Sylvester Maxwell, 24-year-old Negro, was found by his brother-in-law less than 500 yards from the home of a white family. Mississippi NAACP Field Secretary Medger Evers termed the slaying a "probable lynching."

February 2, Greenwood, Leflore County: Willie Peacock, SNCC registration worker, complained to the Justice Department that officials had refused to register him on two occasions, and had rejected his poll tax payment for this year.

February 20, Greenwood, Leflore County: Four Negro businesses on the same street as the SNCC voter registration office were burned to the ground. Mrs. Nancy Brand, a worker in the SNCC office, reported an anonymous telephone call in which a man's voice asked her if she ever came to the office. When she said "yes", the voice said:

You won't be going down there anymore, that's been taken care of.

The burned businesses were Jackson's Garage, George's Cafe, Porter's Pressing Shop, and the Esquire Club. The pressing shop is next door to the SNCC office, and SNCC workers believed the businesses were burned by mistake. Sam Block, SNCC field secretary, was arrested 2 days later for suggesting there was some connection between the burnings and the registration efforts of SNCC. He was charged with circulating statements calculated to create a breach of the peace.

February 28, Greenwood, Leflore County: Three registration workers were attacked with gunfire on U.S. Highway 82 just outside Greenwood. The shots were fired from a 1962 white Buick. The car in which the workers were riding was punctured by 11 bullets. One worker, James Travis of SNCC, was wounded in the neck and shoulder.

March 4, Clarksdale, Coahoma County: The show windows in the Fourth Street drugstore were smashed, as they have been several times in the past. The proprietor of the store, Aaron Henry, found the damage when he returned from speaking at a mass meeting in Leflore County in connection with the voter registration drive there.

March 6, Greenwood, Leflore County: Samuel Block and three others were fired on from a station wagon which pulled up beside their car as they were parked in front of the SNCC voter registration office. Both front windows were shattered. Police later found the wadding from a shotgun shell buried in the headliner of Block's car, and several pellets in the wall of the building in front of which the car had been parked.

March 12, Greenwood, Leflore County: A 12-year-old Negro girl was attacked by an egg-throwing truckload of white teenaged boys. The girl suffered facial bruises.

March 20, 1963, Jackson, Hinds County: Three shots were fired through the windshield of a car belonging to Mrs. Mattie Dennis while it was parked in front of the home of Mrs. Dennis' cousin, whom she was visiting. Mrs. Dennis is the wife of David Dennis, CORE field secretary for Mississippi. Both have been active in voter registration.

March 24, 1963, Greenwood, Leflore County: Fire destroyed partially the interior of the voter registration office at 115 East McLaurin Street, making the office unusable and necessitating a search for new headquarters. Witnesses said they saw two white men fleeing the scene shortly before the fire was discovered.

March 26, 1963, Greenwood, Leflore County: A shotgun blast ripped into the home of Dewey Greene, Sr., father of the latest Negro applicant to the University of Mississippi. Another of Mr. Greene's sons and a daughter have been active in the Leflore County registration project. Greenwood police said they were investigating.

March 27, 1963, Greenwood, Leflore County: James Forman, executive secretary of SNCC, Bob Moses, and about 10 other registration workers were arrested and taken from a group en route to the courthouse to register after the police dispersed a group of more than 100 Negroes with the use of police dogs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Psalm 72: 19: *Blessed be His glorious name forever; and let the whole earth be filled with His glory.*

Almighty God, we have entered upon Holy Week, commemorating events and experiences in the life of our blessed Lord whose sacred meaning our finite minds can only faintly comprehend.

Grant that during these days we may be filled with penitence and humility, with praise and thanksgiving as we turn our minds and hearts to the cross to meditate upon the sufferings and death of the great High Priest, who on Good Friday laid upon the altar the acceptable sacrifice of His own life for the sins of the world.

May we accept and submit ourselves to His claims and commands and have the faith and the courage to believe that someday all mankind shall be lifted to higher levels of character and conduct through the transforming and conquering power of His sacrificial love.

Hear us in our Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 4, 1963, was read and approved.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 6. An act authorizing the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes;

S. 72. An act for the relief of Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi;

S. 74. An act for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer;

S. 93. An act for the relief of Flora Romano Torre;

S. 196. An act for the relief of Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte;

S. 206. An act for the relief of Chang Ah Lung;

S. 213. An act for the relief of Carmelo Schillaci;

S. 215. An act for the relief of Mannor Lee;

S. 292. An act for the relief of Yoo Chul Soo;

S. 310. An act for the relief of Kaino Hely Auzis;

S. 504. An act for the relief of Domenico Martino;

S. 671. An act for the relief of Mirhan Gazarian;

S. 686. An act for the relief of Millie Gail Mesa;

S. 715. An act for the relief of Laszlo Janos Buchwald;

S. 752. An act for the relief of Janos Kardos;

S. 822. An act for the relief of Elvira Ciccotelli; and

S. 866. An act for the relief of Enrico Petrucci.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file sundry reports.

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

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on Tuesday, April 9, 1963.

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

There was no objection.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, many people will be making pitches this afternoon.

My pitch, Mr. Speaker, is on behalf of the accelerated public works program. This Nation needs the $500 million for which the President asked in his request for a supplemental appropriation.

I was interested in this morning's paper to read a strange observation by the chairman of the Republican National Committee, who stated:

> It is high time some White House initiative was exerted to lift us out of the Democratic rut.

I congratulate the Republican Party, which usually charges strong Presidents with being dictators, for at long last coming out in favor of firm Presidential leadership in the Lincoln-Teddy Roosevelt tradition. One of the best examples of Presidential leadership was the statement which President Kennedy made last Saturday urging the Congress to restore the $500 million needed for the accelerated public works program.

As a part of my remarks I include President Kennedy's statement, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1963]

> Yesterday's decision by the House Appropriations Committee to eliminate funds for the accelerated public works programs was, I believe, most unfortunate and one that I am confident will be reversed by the entire House when the facts are presented to it.
>
> It seems inconceivable to me that people can make speeches against unemployment and then vote to destroy a program the objective of which is to attack the unemployment problem by providing jobs, especially in those areas with chronic and persistent unemployment.
>
> When the Congress enacted the program I recommended, authorizing the $900 million program last year, and appropriated $40 million to initiate the program, it was widely understood that the additional amount authorized would be considered early in 1963 and that the early experiences under the program would guide the Congress in determining how much money should be made available of the remaining $500 million authorization.
>
> The response to the program has been truly remarkable. Since its enactment thousands of projects have already been approved and there are now in hand applications for over 6,200 projects for more than 3,000 communities throughout the United States, which are eligible under the standards of the program.
>
> It will be recalled that the basic objective of the program is to speed up those projects which would otherwise be undertaken at a later date in order to provide immediate employment—hospitals, streets, sewers and other essential facilities.
>
> On the basis of experience thus far under the program it is clear that with the full $900 million authorized by the Congress last year 500,000 of our Nation's unemployed will be on the job, on project sites and in supporting activities. That the projects undertaken by the funds are worthwhile is evidenced by the fact that local communities across the country have raised matching funds to participate in the programs even to the extent of passing local bond issues. The combination of local and Federal money flowing into the economy has proved to be a healthy and substantial stimulant.
>
> This program must not be permitted to lapse and I am confident that the Congress will not permit it to do so. I hope that partisan activity will not be allowed to destroy or weaken a program aimed at our unemployment problem.

Mr. Speaker, some 3,000 projects have been approved, and I believe that this additional funding will enable the financing of over 6,000 projects which are now pending. We should not only have the $500 million supplemental appropriation but also move immediately to extend the accelerated works authorization for another year as contained in the bill H.R. 3311, which I have introduced.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that the $450 million supplement authorized by the whole Congress last year to complete the accelerated public works program has been deleted from the bill reported last Friday by the House Committee on Appropriations and intended for consideration in this body tomorrow.

There is no need to repeat the history of this bill. It is well known. We all recall that the bill authorized $900 million in matching funds to assist municipalities in undertaking needed public works essential to the health and welfare of the community in many distressed areas, including northeastern Minnesota, where the unemployment problem is acute.

The House had already sent its appropriation bill to the Senate when the Accelerated Public Works Act became Public Law 87–658 on September 14, 1962. The Senate, in October, appropriated $400 million for the program of accelerated public works. The statement on the accelerated public works appropriation published in the Senate committee report on the appropriations bill was specifically and enthusiastically endorsed at the joint conference by the House managers.

Mr. Speaker, the whole Congress thus pledged itself to a definite program of assistance to the Nation's distressed municipalities. The following remarks from the report published by the Senate and endorsed by the House conferees clearly identifies this pledge:

> The committee felt, therefore, that it would be desirable to provide a partial appropriation which would permit this program to get underway at the maximum possible rate for the next 4 months, with the understanding that the administration can submit a supplemental estimate in January, at which time they should be in a position to support a definite program, with specific recommendations for projects to be undertaken and justification therefor.

To be frank, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply shocked at the action of the House Committee on Appropriations, and I say this advisedly, with full respect for the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. The Congress made a serious commitment, on the basis of which distressed municipalities and governmental subdivisions throughout America went ahead and planned to raise additional local funds for over 6,000 essential public

works projects. In many instances they even utilized the difficult procedure of floating bond issues while waiting for this additional $450 million or $500 million to be appropriated. They counted on the money being made available this year to take up the slack of unemployment by creating work in their localities. Now, for some reason or other, after having given a solemn pledge, a firm declaration of intention, the Congress has reneged.

When the appropriations bill comes up, I urge the full membership of this body to give serious reconsideration to restoring the $450 million accelerated public works supplemental appropriation which was both authorized and literally promised to the distressed communities by the 87th Congress.

THE PURCHASE OF A MOBILE AIRPORT CONTROL TOWER KNOWN AS THE AN/MRN-12

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, as my colleagues will recall, I presented an hour-long documentation of a procurement case I had studied for over 4 months. It was a purchase of a mobile airport control tower known as the AN/MRN-12 in which, my analysis showed, the Air Force wasted over $560,000 and paid Craig Systems, Inc., of Lawrence, Mass., considerable excess profits. I asked for a complete audit of the matter by the General Accounting Office as well as a study by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Defense.

In reply to my presentation made on the floor of the House, Erich Kauders, president of Craig Systems, made a statement to the Boston Globe. It was printed on page 28 of the Globe on Monday, April 1. In his statement, Mr. Kauders said my allegations made on the floor of the House were, and I quote:

> Repetitious of a speech he (WILSON) made last October and it is our understanding that the findings of various Government agencies who have reviewed this procurement since then are contrary to Congressman WILSON's findings.

To my knowledge, no such reports have been made. Certainly I want to see them if they exist. I contacted the General Accounting Office and asked if any such report had been made by the Comptroller General. I was assured it had not. I contacted the Air Force and was told the same thing—no study has been made of the procurement, so consequently no findings had been returned.

In a spirit of cooperation, Mr. Kauders was then telephoned for his assistance. Certainly, since he mentioned the reports, he knew where they could be found. I wished to see them in order to be perfectly fair with everyone concerned. Mr. Kauders at first denied having made the statement, but after I read it to him verbatim from the Boston Globe, he confirmed its content as his own remarks. However, he said, he had nothing to add and declined to identify the various Government agencies mentioned in his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I can only assume that there are no such reports and that none have been made. I can only assume that the contractor and perhaps some in the military are trying to pour oil on the troubled waters at Lawrence and Boston, Mass., and Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y.

This, to me, is simply more evidence that this entire procurement should be audited thoroughly by the General Accounting Office, the Justice Department and the Department of Defense. A letter of transmittal referring my file to GAO, together with a series of questions I wish answered, went into the mail today, and I hope for an early reply.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS ON H.R. 5389 TO REPEAL THE SILVER ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will consider H.R. 5389, to repeal the Silver Purchasing Act of 1934. H.R. 5389 was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee because of its impact upon monetary policy. The Banking and Currency Committee referred title II of the bill to the Ways and Means because it involved the repeal of a tax.

Because of the haste with which this matter was considered my request to file supplemental views with the majority views of the Ways and Means was neglected. I am setting forth these views in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so they will be available during debate on the measure.

Essentially I am pointing out that no committee considered the fiscal aspects of the proposed legislation which are of grave importance because of our balance of payments, gold flow, and debt-management problems.

The Kennedy administration is cashing in capital assets wherever it can find them to lessen its current deficits—see my remarks of April 4, 1963, entitled "Balance of Payments," page 5827, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This simply staves off the day of accounting and makes it worse when it comes because we have failed to do what is necessary, reform our ways of spending more than we take in in current revenues. H.R. 5389 permits the administration to cash in $2 billion of capital assets, $2 billion of silver bullion. It is an essential step to the devaluation of our dollar. The problem we face of the cash in of silver certificates and melting down silver coins for the silver value in them can be met without permitting the administration to cash in the silver itself to meet current expenditures. This matter needs the study and evaluation of a committee of the Congress before floor action is in order. Hence I recommend recommitting this bill to the Ways and Means Committee for such and study.

Herein follow my supplemental views:

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS ON H.R. 5389, TO REPEAL THE SILVER PURCHASING ACT OF 1934, INCLUDING THE TAX ON TRANSFERS OF SILVER BULLION

H.R. 5389 is divided into two parts. The first part, sections 1 through 3, is concerned with the repeal of the silver legislation and authorization for $1 Federal Reserve notes. This matter was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee which held hearings on these aspects on March 11–14, expressly reserving to the Committee on Ways and Means jurisdiction with respect to the second part of the measure, the repeal of tax on transfers of silver bullion. The Ways and Means Committee held no public hearings and devoted one morning session of informal executive session to the matter. No testimony was taken, and very short notice was given to the members of the committee that the matter was to be taken up.

Neither the hearings nor report of the Banking and Currency Committee were available during the Ways and Means Committee's consideration. Nor were the hearings and report of the Ways and Means Committee which had jurisdiction of the entire legislation in 1934 made available to the committee. The memorandum prepared by the Ways and Means Committee staff made no reference to the original 1934 hearings and committee report. Upon interrogation of the Secretary of the Treasury and other persons present at the informal executive session it was apparent that they were unfamiliar with these hearings and report.

I received copies from the Library of Congress just as the committee went into executive session.

From the 1934 hearings and report, it is apparent that the Silver Act of 1934 was presented "in developing an improved monetary system."

The committee in its report makes the following points:

The measure is a logical and necessary complement of the Gold Reserve Act passed by this House on January 20 and approved by the President on January 30, 1934. Silver is a valuable component of any monetary system designed to stabilize the money's worth of goods. * * * We may look toward a coordinated use of that silver to check changes in the purchasing power of the dollar.

Section 2 declares the policy of the United States to be to increase the proportion of silver to gold in its monetary stocks with the ultimate objective of having and maintaining in silver one-fourth of the monetary value of the stocks of gold and silver, and three-fourths of the monetary value of such stocks in gold.

The second sentence of the section (5) requires that there be maintained in the Treasury as security for all silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued an amount of silver in bullion and standard silver dollars aggregating in monetary value the face value of such certificates outstanding at the time.

Section 10 states: "'Monetary value' is defined to mean a value calculated on the basis of $1 for an amount of silver or gold equal to the amount at the time contained in the standard silver dollar and the standard gold dollar respectively."

In respect to the tax being imposed, the committee report has this to say: "Holders of silver are thus allowed to make a profit which should at least equal any profits arising from investments in silver or the pur-

chase and sale of silver for industrial use during times when the price is not being increased by governmental action. The tax being in the nature of a profits tax covers transactions taking place prior to enactment. Were this provision not included in the bill, the policy of equitably reimbursing the Government for the increase which its action may bring to the price of silver could easily be obstructed."

The first question asked Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., when he testified before the committee was in respect to the revenue aspects of the tax. I quote from page 9 of the hearings of the House Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 9745, the Silver Purchasing Act of 1934, in the 2d session of the 73d Congress, May 25 and 26, 1934:

"The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Doughton). Mr. Secretary, has there been any estimate made as to the probable amount of revenue that may be derived from this 50 percent tax?

"Secretary MORGENTHAU. It would have to be a very rough estimate, but I would say that it is perfectly possible the Government might get as much as $25 million.

"The CHAIRMAN. Per annum?

"Secretary MORGENTHAU. Well, I would not want to say that; but over the period of the purchase of silver.

Mr. VINSON. The Treasury is deriving no revenue from that source at this time?

"Secretary MORGENTHAU. No.

"Mr. VINSON. Then that will be additional revenue?

"Secretary MORGENTHAU. That is correct."

I make this reference to point up two things. The expressed basis for the passage of the act was to establish a monetary policy based upon two precious metals, silver and gold. The purpose of the tax was to collect revenue from the profits that speculators in silver stood to gain from the Government's actions.

The proposal of the Kennedy administration to repeal the act and the tax makes no reference to this historical basis.

The Congress is asked to abandon the monetary policy based upon two precious metals established in 1934 with no reference to its merits or demerits and with little reference to the monetary policy which will supplant it.

The administration presents its arguments in 1962 as if the reasons advanced by the administration in 1934 were specious and sham, that the real purpose of the Silver Act was not to establish a monetary policy, but to provide subsidization to the silver mining industry and that the real purpose of the tax was not to raise revenue, but rather to police the subsidization act.

The question for the Congress is not to determine why the Kennedy administration should treat the Roosevelt administration proposals as sham, but rather whether the 1962 presentation itself is a sham.

Perhaps the Silver Act of 1934 was not to establish a monetary system, but rather to provide a subsidy for the silver industry. Perhaps the tax was imposed not for revenue, but for policing the subsidy measure.

But the proposal of President Kennedy to repeal the act is certainly not designed to improve our monetary system. Rather it is designed to solve a serious economic condition resulting from the fiscal policy of deficit finance and economic circumstances wherein silver bullion is worth considerably more than the silver certificate for which it may be exchanged.

Repeal of the act adds one other method to the many which have been utilized by the Kennedy administration to cash in capital assets of the Nation to temporarily ease the problems created by the continued high deficits we have experienced and that the administration is planning to continue for several years to come.

In other words, there are more fiscal issues than monetary issues involved in the proposal to repeal the Silver Act.

The bald effect of the President's proposal to repeal the Silver Act is to permit him to sell off and to use as current revenue $2 billion of precious metals (silver bullion and vault silver dollars) which is maintained as security for $2 billion of our paper currency. He may then issue $2 billion of new Federal Reserve notes in place of the $2 billion of silver certificates. This will leave us with an additional $2 billion of paper money backed by our present diminishing gold reserves.

Not only will this leave us minus $2 billion of precious metal to back up our $32 billion of paper currency but it withdraws precious metal which was required to be dollar for dollar of the paper money issued against it. Furthermore due to the rise in value of silver in relation to the paper dollar, the silver bullion behind our silver certificates is 30 percent greater than the face value of the paper money it supports. Contrast this to our gold reserves which must be only 25 percent of the outstanding paper money and we begin to see how much the outright repeal of the Silver Act cuts back on our precious metal reserves.

If the Kennedy administration was simply trying to repeal or amend the bimetallic monetary policy we have adopted instead of, as I suggested, cash in capital assets to pay for some of our current expenditures then it would propose one of two things: Readjust the silver reserve required to back up the silver certificates or replace the silver backing the paper currency with gold. Either proposal would correct the problem of silver cash-ins which is the professed concern of the administration.

Certainly it is true that as the policy of deficit financing continues the problems of marketing and managing the Federal debt (a part of fiscal policy within the purview of the Ways and Means Committee) becomes more acute. The precious metal standing behind our currency is not just a matter of monetary policy, in these critical times of balance of payment and limited supply of precious metals in our vaults. It deeply involves our basic fiscal policies.

Neither the Banking and Currency Committee nor the Ways and Means Committee have studied or evaluated the implications of the repeal of the Silver Act upon the overall fiscal policy of the United States. This is a responsibility the Ways and Means Committee must meet.

I suggested to Secretary Dillon in executive session that by proposing an outright repeal of the Silver Act the administration lends credence to the belief currently expressed that the administration contemplated devaluing the dollar. Secretary Dillon stated that this was in no sense the policy of the administration. I then asked him if it was true that repeal of the Silver Act was a necessity in order to devalue the dollar. With this he agreed, reaffirming, however, no intention on the part of the administration to do so.

Under these circumstances I strongly urge that this bill be recommitted to the Ways and Means Committee for immediate and full hearings into the fiscal implications of this bill.

MONETARY POLICY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Missouri in concern over the situation that is involved in our monetary backing of our money in gold and silver. Also, I join the gentleman from Missouri in his supplemental views on the silver bill. The gold outflow is implicit in the trade bill and in the tax bill on which we have concluded hearings and are now in executive session.

We have $15.8 billion of gold on hand. Gold is outflowing at the rate of $100 million a month and foreign holdings of liquid liabilities are increasing. The world holds $24 billion that can be claimed on us in gold. We have only $4.1 billion on hand above the $11.7 billion sold for monetary backing. Devaluation of our money is imminent at the current outflow. Huge deficits are building up. The Silver Act, of course, points in that direction as we reduce precious metal backing of a dollar from 100 to 25 cents.

The outflow of gold is so serious that I will not be a party to this conspiracy of silence, one may call it, where we have not faced up to the gold outflow problem, the reasons for it, what to do about it and confide in the American people.

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

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I simply wanted to point out that I just had a study made of foreign and international ownership of Federal securities which shows that in 1950 the ownership was $4.3 billion; in 1962 the holdings are $15.3 billion, an increase from 1.7 percent as the total of Federal securities outstanding to 5 percent, which further bears on this important issue of balance of payments which is in addition to the demands that can be directed against our gold supply and other capital assets.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include my views at this point in the RECORD in supplement to what the gentleman from Missouri has said.

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

There was no objection.

The supplemental views are as follows:

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, our tax policies at home and abroad are intimately interrelated with our overall economy and our international balance of payments. Several witnesses have mentioned gold outflow and the imbalance of payments. Earlier, of course, the consideration of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 by the Ways and Means Committee resulted in our considering the imbalance of payments many times during both the hearings and the executive sessions.

Over the years the Ways and Means Committee has never lost sight of the inherent danger of our position as the world's banker and our responsibility as a committee in the field of refinancing Federal indebtedness. Former Secretary of the Treasury, Bob Anderson, warned us in no uncertain terms of the danger of our gold outflow at a time when the U.S. gold level was approximately $22 billion.

Inasmuch as the imbalance of payments and gold outflow are a part of the hearings on tax recommendations and because of colloquies between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] and myself, I would like to supplement earlier statements with information bringing the gold situation up to date. At my request, Colin Stam, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, submitted the following information which I include at this point:

MARCH 25, 1963.

Hon. BRUCE ALGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALGER: In response to your request for data on the relationship between the U.S. balance of international payments and declines in the U.S. gold stock, we are enclosing a table which shows the U.S. balance of international payments and the offsets thereto, including changes in U.S. gold stock, during the period 1954–62.

In this connection, you may be interested in the following succinct summary of the U.S. experience in the last 5 years by Hon. William McChesney Martin, Jr., chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, in his February 1, 1963, statement before the Joint Economic Committee. Mr. Martin stated: "Finally, let me comment briefly on our balance-of-payments problem. * * * As a result of five large successive deficits, we have transferred to foreigners some $7 billion from our monetary gold stock and added another $9 billion to our liquid liabilities."

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

U.S. balance of international payments and resultant reductions in U.S. gold stock, 1954–62

[In millions of dollars]

Year	U.S. balance of payments	Year	Increase (−) in liquid liabilities to foreigners [1]	Increase (+) or decrease (−) in convertible currencies	Increase (+) or decrease (−) in U.S. gold stock
1954	−1,550	1954	−1,252		−298
1955	−1,145	1955	−1,104		−41
1956	−935	1956	−1,241		+306
1957	+520	1957	−278		+798
1958	−3,529	1958	−1,254		−2,275
1959	−3,743	1959	−3,012		[2] −731
1960	−3,925	1960	−2,223		−1,702
1961	[3] −2,360	1961	−1,618	+116	−858
1962	[3] −2,181	1962	−1,274	−17	−890

[1] To International Monetary Fund, foreign central banks and governments, foreign commercial banks, and other international and regional institutions.
[2] Excludes payment of $344,000,000 as increase in U.S. gold subscription to the International Monetary Fund.
[3] The U.S. payments deficit in 1962 would have been $900,000,000 higher in the absence of certain special receipts: $660,000,000 of advance repayments by France, Italy and Sweden of postwar debt to the U.S. Government, and $250,000,000 of receipts from sale by U.S. Treasury of 15- and 16-month nonmarketable securities denominated in foreign currency to Italy and Switzerland. Debt prepayments of over $660,000,000 had also been received in 1961. By the end of 1962 most countries experiencing reserve gains had repaid all or a substantial part of their 1946–49 borrowing in the United States.

This information was then more fully explained again in my request by Mr. Stam in the following letter:

MARCH 25, 1963.

Hon. BRUCE ALGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALGER: This is in response to your request for data showing for the 5-year period 1958–62 the relationship between the U.S. balance of payments on the one hand and the resultant increase in liquid liabilities to foreigners and decrease in our gold stock on the other.

The requested data are as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

U.S. balance of payments	−15,738
Increase in liquid liabilities to foreigners	−9,381
Increase in convertible currencies	+99
Decrease in U.S. gold stock	−6,456
Total	−15,738

If the $344 million increase in U.S. gold subscription to the International Monetary Fund is included as a decrease in gold stock rather than as an increase in liquid liabilities, the figures would appear as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

U.S. balance of payments	−15,738
Increase in liquid liabilities to foreigners	−9,037
Increase in convertible currencies	+99
Decrease in U.S. gold stock	−6,800
Total	−15,738

Thus, as our letter of this morning indicated, the 5-year situation may be summarized as follows:

As a result of five large successive deficits in our balance of payments, we have transferred to foreigners some $7 billion from our monetary gold stock and added another $9 billion to our liquid liabilities.

The above figures were derived from those in the table submitted to you this morning.

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

This information clearly shows the extreme danger of our current position where foreign nations hold approximately $24 billion for which they may demand gold, and we have on hand as of March 1963 $15.8 billion. The outflow has been approximately $100 million a month for the last several years. Mr. Stam's figures show that the outflow of gold is only a part of the clear and present danger wherein the liquid liabilities to foreigners have increased $4,640 million in fiscal 1961 and 1962. In his more recent letter, Mr. Stam outlines the 5-year period 1958 through 1962 increase of liquid liabilities to foreigners $9,381 million, and the decrease of gold out stock of $6,456 million for a total of $15,738 million of increase in both gold outflow and liquid liability.

At any time our gold supply, therefore, could be wiped out and our currency valuation and entire economy jeopardized. The greatest danger, of course, would be loss of confidence at home and abroad in the future value of our currency and the interrelated aspect of lack of fiscal self-discipline by the Federal Government, assuming the best, however, rather than a run on the bank, it would appear that we have less than 4 years left at the current rate of outflow assuming further no speedup of imbalance of payments before it will be necessary to devalue our currency by reducing the percentage of gold backing upon our currency.

The danger becomes all the more apparent to some of us who recognize in the President's deficit financing the large oversea expenditures through foreign aid and the lowering of tariffs, a further increase of gold outflow or increase of liquid liabilities, which would build up the pressure to a possible breaking point.

So far as I am concerned there is absolutely no room at this point for complacency or wishing away the problem. We are derelict in our duty if by silence we default in solving the problem. As I see it, we must go to meet this problem. At this juncture, it is nothing short of ridiculous to justify our present fiscal imbalance by pointing out that our imbalance monthly or yearly is now less than during comparable periods in the preceding administration. Every day that passes the cumulative pressure is building toward that inevitable moment when creditors of the United States abroad doubt our fiscal responsibility and demand gold.

Not to be forgotten in our concern over gold outflow is the accompanying jeopardizing of confidence of American businessmen in our Government's fiscal policies. Our entire economy, which is largely private and still oriented around the principles of capitalism, is motivated almost entirely by confidence—confidence of businessmen in the value of currency, confidence in the stability of the market, confidence in future supply and demand wages and prices and any loss of confidence because of the intrusion of Government through deficit financing, inflationary practices, planned economy and fiscal irresponsibility would jeopardize our entire economic system. Lack of confidence will tie up risk capital, stifle incentive, result in layoff of workers, less expansion of future business in a decelerating spiral which in total could wreck the American economic system. If we do not or cannot pay off in gold when requested, foreign and domestic confidence in the U.S. Government would nosedive.

On a related subject we see a gold squeeze developing as we remove 100 percent backing in precious metal of $1 bills, to be replaced by 25 percent backing in gold which is not redeemable. This change will require $35 million per year approximately to be added to our gold reserve and suggests two related problems: First, we are devaluing $1 currency by 75 percent and, secondly, we will be needing even more gold to undergird our money and the gold supply is rapidly dwindling.

It is obvious that our gold supply and the imbalance of payments is interrelated by the President's tax recommendations and these figures and remarks should be a part of this RECORD.

It is appropriate at this point that I include the memorandum of April 5 of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] concerning gold holdings, U.S. dollars owned by foreign countries, U.S. balance-of-payments position, and gross public debts:

Gold holdings (free world countries):	
U.S. gold holdings on Dec. 31, 1952	$23,252,000,000
U.S. gold outflow to foreign countries, 1952 through 1962	−7,195,000,000
U.S. gold holdings on Dec. 31, 1962, reduced to	16,057,000,000
Gold holdings, other countries,[1] Dec. 31, 1952	13,028,000,000
Gold holdings, increase, other countries, 1952 through 1962	+11,630,000,000
Gold holdings, other countries, Dec. 31, 1962 increased to	24,648,000,000
U.S. dollars owned by foreign countries (free world):	
Foreign dollar holdings on Dec. 31, 1952	10,546,100,000
Increase in foreign dollar holdings, 1952 through 1962	+14,437,900,000
Foreign dollar holdings on Dec. 31, 1962, increased to	24,984,000,000
U.S. balance-of-payments position:	
1950 net deficit	−1,912,000,000
1951 net deficit	−578,000,000
1952 net deficit	−1,100,000,000
1953 net deficit	−2,100,000,000
1954 net deficit	−1,500,000,000
1955 net deficit	−1,100,000,000
1956 net deficit	−1,000,000,000
1957 (only credit in 13 years)	+500,000,000
1958 net deficit	−3,400,000,000
1959 net deficit	−3,700,000,000
1960 net deficit	−3,800,000,000
1961 net deficit	−2,400,000,000
1962 net deficit	−2,200,000,000
U.S. deficit, 1950 through 1962, inclusive	−24,290,000,000
Gross public debts:	
U.S. public debt on Dec. 31, 1962	303,470,080,489
Other free world countries (latest available figures)	201,500,000,000
U.S. debt exceeds debts of other free world countries by	101,970,080,489
U.S. debt exceeds all other countries of world by	24,000,500,000

[1] Does not include Sino-Soviet bloc.

The above indicates clearly what the foreign aid program is doing to our gold reserves and our balance-of-payments position (trade).

It is long overdue but let us hope not too late that the Congress immediately direct its attention to solving the imbalance of payments and the gold outflow. For my part, it is quite clear that restoring fiscal order will require reduced Federal spending, immediate balanced budget, a reduction of our debt and then with that background tax reform which primarily means a drastic cutback in the tax progression and a reduction of rates.

Finally, a further comparative chart from 1950 to 1962 on foreign holdings of Federal securities, balance-of-payments deficits, and gold outflow to which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] referred:

	Foreign and international ownership of Federal securities [1]	As a percent of total Federal securities outstanding [2]	As a percent of total short-term liabilities to foreigners [3]	Balance-of-payments deficit [4]	Change in total gold stock [5]
End of December—	*Billions*			*Billions*	*Millions*
1950	$4.3	1.7	50.0	−$3.6	
1951	4.3	1.7	46.2	.3	
1952	5.3	2.0	50.5	−1.0	$492
1953	5.9	2.1	50.9	−2.2	−1,168
1954	6.3	2.3	48.5	−1.6	−298
1955	7.5	2.7	55.1	−1.1	−40
1956	7.8	2.8	52.3	−.9	305
1957	7.6	2.8	50.0	.5	799
1958	7.7	2.7	47.5	−3.5	−2,275
1959	12.0	4.1	61.9	−3.7	−1,075
1960	13.0	4.5	61.0	−3.9	−1,703
1961	13.4	4.5	59.8	−2.5	−857
1962	15.3	5.0	61.2	−2.2	−890

[1] Source: Treasury Bulletin, February 1963. Consists of the investments of foreign balances and international accounts in the United States.
[2] Securities issued or guaranteed by the U.S. Government, excluding guaranteed securities held by the Treasury.
[3] Derived from data in Treasury Bulletin, February 1963.
[4] Source: 1962 supplement to Economic Indicators.
[5] Source: Treasury Bulletin, August 1959; February 1963.

SPEECH OF THE RIGHT HONORABLE HAROLD WILSON, O.B.E., M.P.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged on April 1 to attend the National Press Club luncheon for the Right Honorable Harold Wilson, O.B.E., M.P. Mr. Wilson's brilliant analysis of the economic and foreign policy problems confronting the free world deserves our attention. As leader of Britain's Labor Party, Mr. Wilson brings to us a new approach. I commend Mr. Wilson's speech to my colleagues.

SPEECH BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE HAROLD WILSON, O.B.E., M.P., AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB AT WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 1, 1963

I should like to begin by saying what I am here for. First, what I am not here for. I am not here to negotiate. An opposition cannot negotiate with Governments. I am here as leader of one of the great parties in our democracy to learn more about current thinking in the United States on the great issues confronting the Atlantic partnership. I was last here in January 1962, at that time as the Labor Party's spokesman on foreign affairs. I would have come in January of this year, but had to return from New York to London on the day that Hugh Gaitskell died, without coming on to Washington.

So having said what I am here for I do not need, I hope, to repudiate the story which was featured in some papers last week under the title "Wilson's Fourteen Points." I haven't got 14. I haven't got any. A statement in one of Friday's papers that I "announced" before leaving London that I was bringing a 14-point program is quite wrong. The London story came as the responsibility of the pressman who wrote it and who at that time had not been to see me or had any discussion with me. It was a nice and amusing piece of imaginative writing but I cannot take any responsibility for it. I'm sorry.

I have not come to press any lines of policy on the U.S. administration. To do so would be highly improper and unconstitutional. My purpose in coming is to learn and to listen—and to explain, when I am asked, the general trend of Labor Party thinking and policy on the main issues of world affairs.

But I have read a great deal of what has been written, and I should like to thank you for all the kind things you have said about me—I have in the process learned a lot of things about myself I didn't know before, and I have been asked by many pressmen a lot of questions about our approach. I should, therefore, like to try today in my talk to answer some of these questions.

I should like to begin with the economic problems the free world is facing.

All of us want to see a great expansion of trade, and a removal of trade barriers, between member-countries of the Atlantic Community. Equally we urgently need to see a steady and dynamic expansion of production within our respective countries. My fear is that anything we are able to do in freeing trade and expanding national production will run in a measurable period of time into a crisis of world liquidity. World trade his increased fourfold in monetary terms since prewar: the monetary resources available to lubricate this trade have barely doubled. We have the position that the two greatest trading nations in the world both urgently need to expand production, in their own interests and that of the free world, and that both are inhibited by fear of balance-of-payments difficulties. We are moving more and more into the position that if sterling is strong, the dollar is weak, if the dollar is strong, sterling is weak, there are times when we face the danger that both are weak. And if Western nations show the degree of statesmanship which we hope for in reducing trade barriers, there is a real danger that trade expansion will grind to a standstill through a famine of liquidity. And we shall be reduced again to beggar-my-neighbor measures designed to export unemployment and deflation from one country to another. We are within a reasonable distance of a major seizeup in free world trade, beginning with a crisis in dollar and sterling trade, which at best will inhibit our

hopes of economic expansion at a time when other nations are pressing remorselessly ahead, and which at worst could create another 1931. I am also deeply concerned at the growth of indebtedness in underdeveloped countries such as those of Latin America. Already the burden of servicing loans is preempting a high proportion of their overseas earnings; in 4 or 5 years many of them will reach breaking point.

In passing may I say with all the emphasis I can command that the answer does not lie in devaluation whether of the dollar, or sterling, or both. That would be a lunatic and self-destroying operation, neither justified by the problem nor relevant to its solution. The same applies to loose talks about floating rates. As an ex-trade minister I have a built-in prejudice in favor of enabling exporters to quote fixed prices with reasonable assurance of monetary stability. Equally the answer cannot be found in a revaluation of gold, which would simply provide an uncovenanted benefit to two countries, South Africa and the Soviet Union, whose benefit should be low in our scale of priorities.

What is needed is a medium for the creation of international credit through the established machinery of the International Monetary Fund. The unparalleled American and British expansion in the 19th century was made possible by a new discovery, the power of commercial banks to create credit, free from the thralldom of gold. In the 20th century we have so far shown ourselves unworthy of the ingenuity and inventiveness of our grandfathers. We should now move toward a system in which the IMF could create international credit peri passu with the development of world trade. If this could be combined with the Australian proposal for discriminatory credit facilities to be issued to underdeveloped countries to spend in debtor countries—such as, in present circumstances, United States and Britain, we could evoke increased production in our two countries, related to the needs of world development. This could be the answer to unused capacity in our countries.

The dangers—and the opportunities—we now face would justify the summoning of a World Monetary Conference, an economic summit for the free world.

Now I turn to the situation which arises from the breakdown of the Brussels negotiations. I do not want to go back over the past. What matters now is our response to a challenging and even exciting situation. It is above all a new, though not an unforeseeable situation. For 18 months Western policies were directed to a consummation in Brussels. Now we have to start again.

The Labor Party was prepared to accept a solution which would have been genuinely outward-looking and be a steppingstone to a wider free trade area embracing the Atlantic Community and the Commonwealth. There was nothing in the Treaty of Rome, as such, that would have precluded such an advance. What we were not prepared to join was an inward-looking, autarchic Europe which would sever Britain from our traditional channels of trade with the Commonwealth and the wide trading world. The adoption by the EEC of an agricultural policy based on restrictionism, of high prices policed by a penal import levy on imports from the outside world was a sign that perhaps Schacht, rather than Adam Smith, provided the inspiration for the agricultural planners of the new Europe. This policy involved a degree of interference with established market channels, a degree of rigging of prices and production, of internal self-sufficiency, far transcending the wildest dreams of any British or American Secretary of Agriculture, of any party, who ever existed, and in saying this I am speaking the language of superlatives.

At every stage of the debates in Parliament, Hugh Gaitskell and I and others of us stressed the need for the preparation of an alternative policy in case the talks broke down and Britain was presented with entry terms which proved intolerable. This was designed not only to strengthen our bargaining position, for negotiations based on the thesis that there was no alternative to entry were bound to produce stiff, possibly unacceptable, terms: it was designed to avoid a vacuum, a paralysis of policy in the event of breakdown. At all stages we spelled out a policy based on the concept of an Atlantic—and wider than Atlantic—community based on the United States, Britain and EFTA, EEC, the Commonwealth and probably Japan and possibly Latin America. As long ago as November 1961, when the Clayton-Herter report was presented to the joint committee of Congress, I said that this, rather than a narrow European conception, provided the key to the future.

President De Gaulle's brusque intervention faced us with the need for a constructive alternative. Paying every tribute to the breadth and vision of Mr. Macmillan's reappraisal after Brussels, I could not feel that a policy whose constructive measures were limited to the cancellation of a royal visit to Paris could be said to be measuring up fully to the challenge with which we were faced. We, therefore, put forward the following:

First, urgent action to make the Kennedy round effective, on the basis I have mentioned including the United States, United Kingdom, the Commonwealth, EFTA, and those trading areas such as Japan and Latin America which are essential to U.S. trade.

Second, urgent action to conclude international commodity agreements to provide stability in the prices and production of those commodities which enter into international trade, including products of temperate zones such as cereals and dairy produce, and those of primary producing countries such as cocoa, tin, rubber, sisal and tea. We are too apt to forget that all that has been done in the past 10 years in the development of economic aid from advanced countries to the underdeveloped areas, amounting now to $3½ billion, has been more than offset by the collapse in the export income of underdeveloped countries through the fall in primary commodity prices.

Three, associated with this, action to channel food surpluses from advanced countries to meet the needs of hungry nations, for example on the lines proposed by Lord Boyd-Orr in 1946 for a World Food Board, an imaginative concept 15 years ahead of its time, which was rejected because most of us hadn't the dollars in a dollar-hungry world. We must face the fact in our modern democracies, that built-in subsidies and support to our farmers will mean a permanent surplus of food, and this will be enormously augmented if the Common Market agricultural policy is not vetoed by GATT.

Four, planned international action to provide not merely monetary help for developing countries, but governmental and intergovernmental orders for steel, machine tools and transportation equipment—linking their needs with our industries at present working below capacity.

Five, measures to expand international liquidity.

Six, urgent action on the lines so imaginatively proposed by Mr. George Ball to provide planned quota outlets in all advanced countries for textiles and other manufactured goods from Asia and Africa.

Seven, on a Commonwealth basis closer integration of Commonwealth development plans enabling Britain to recapture markets we have lost through neglected opportunities in the past decade.

These are measures required on a marked scale. For our part we are prepared in Europe to work to find a solution to the problem of an economic division between EEC, and EFTA. Perhaps OECD will provide the right forum; perhaps, as we have suggested, regular meetings of European heads of government to seek close political unity and a solution of Europe's economic problems. We are prepared at the right time, and given the right conditions to enter into fresh negotiations with the Six, provided this does not mean another 18 months with Britain sitting in the antechamber while the Six meet and wrangle about our fate, provided that no one regards the concessions made by Mr. Heath as an acceptable starting point. We have stated the five broad conditions which should govern Britain's entry and we are prepared to negotiate on the basis of these conditions. But no one sees any immediate prospect of a new breakthrough, and that is why I stress the urgency of the other measures which are open to us.

Now I turn to some of the wider issues of world affairs, three in particular: Berlin, disarmament, and the defense of the West.

On Berlin, I recognize that reports of a speech I made in Cardiff 5 weeks ago have caused some anxieties. This is because the full text was never available. I do not blame the press. I overloaded them. It was the night I made my first major speech as leader of the opposition. I had a full handout on our policy for housing and rents, and the position of slum landlords: In addition I had a few animadversions on Mr. Macmillan and his colleagues which news editors thought of some interest. So there was little space to report a speech I made earlier in the day at the university in which Berlin was mentioned. Our view, which I repeatedly stated in Berlin when last year I led 42 Labor M.P.'s on a mission to Berlin, designed to show our solidarity and support for Willy Brandt and the citizens of West Berlin, is clear. Any settlement of the Berlin issue must provide two nonnegotiable, inalienable conditions—first, the right of the people of West Berlin to live in a system of society and under a system of government of their own free choosing: second, guarantees of access to West Berlin from the West going beyond mere paper promises together with all other measures necessary to insure the viability of West Berlin. Third, we regard it as essential that for the foreseeable future Western forces remain in Berlin, as of right, and as custodians of the new agreement. Fourth, to secure such an agreement, we should be prepared to show some degree of flexibility in relation to recognizing the existence of the authorities in East Germany and working out practical measures with them. Fifth, we should show a willingness to recognize on a factual basis Germany's eastern frontiers. Unfortunately some reports from Cardiff only repeated the fourth and fifth points of this package.

On disarmament I will say little because of the delicate stage of the negotiations, because we could be on the verge of a great breakthrough. My party accepts and insists on the need for effective international verification and supervision. On the test ban there is not only the problem of the number of inspections, but also the means and effectiveness of the system of inspection. On this Russia still has to come through.

On the wider question of a comprehensive disaramament agreement, nuclear and conventional, we feel that the time has come when the Secretary-General of the United Nations might be asked to take the two drafts and examine the possibility of bridging the formidable gap which still exists between them.

We believe that a further step forward could be made—here I know that what I am saying will find little acceptance here today—by the creation in areas of high tension, of nuclear-free zones and areas of effectively controlled conventional disarmament. Such areas as the continent of Africa, the Middle

East, Latin America, and central Europe, might be taken, perhaps in that order.

This would mean effective inspection. The Soviet acceptance of the Rapacki plan involves acceptance of inspection. But inspection must be effective. And, as the Swedish Government insisted in their December 1961 resolution at U.N., we must have realism and no disturbance of the present balance of forces in Europe.

Now, on defense. Our position is clear. We stand firmly by NATO and the Western Alliance. We are not a neutralist party and neutralism has no part or place in our policies. We want to see Britain and other European countries make a more effective contribution to NATO.

I know there is nothing more boring in nature than a politician who continually refers to his past speeches, but I find that if I repeat, ipsissimis verbis, the speeches I made 2 or 3 years ago on this issue, there is a rush to say "How he's changed since he became leader of his party." In every speech I made as foreign affairs spokesman I stressed the central role of NATO in our defense policy and in that wide section of our foreign policy which relates to defense; and secondly, the paramount need to increase our contribution to the conventional strength of NATO forces. We do not believe this is possible if we pour out our substance on the vain effort to maintain the so-called independent, so-called British, so-called deterrent. Because it isn't independent, it isn't going to be British and its deterrent value in our view adds nothing to the effectiveness of Western deterrent power.

But it does mean such a deployment of our financial and real resources as to limit our ability to make an effective contribution to NATO's ground forces. It does mean a block to our hope of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and it does mean increasing the danger that a conventional outbreak in Europe can quickly escalate into nuclear war.

I believe that our view on this represents the consensus of military opinion in Britain, including many Conservative M.P.'s, and that in this respect Mr. Macmillan is inhibited from pursuing the right military policy by the clamant pressure of a small but vociferous band of atavistic back-benchers whose intervention was decisive at the time of Nassau.

It is argued that to be realistic and recognize the plain fact that the United States is the custodian of the strategic deterrent on behalf of the Western alliance, that this places us in a position of humiliating dependence on another nation. I do not agree. It is dependence on the United States for the so-called British deterrent which creates the wrong relationship and which means that meetings of Western leaders, instead of being directed to the urgent problems of strenthening the alliance, are dominated by unrewarding, and I would feel humiliating wrangles about the supply of particular weapons.

Every American pressman I meet asks whether a labor government would repudiate the Nassau Agreement. I don't like the word "repudiate" which implies breaking faith with a partner, and I have my doubts about the enthusiasm with which the U.S. administration approached the Nassau Agreement. My answer is that a labor government's first task would be to survey the defense position we inherit, to survey the shambles, some say, then to enter into discussions with our American partners about Nassau and about our broader approach to NATO. In view of our policy on deterrents, we should then renegotiate, I have heard the word "denegotiate," the agreement.

Before I leave defense I should like to say one word about Britain's oversea bases east of Suez. The future of some of them is obscure: one thing we should have learned at heavy cost is that you cannot hold a military base in hostile territory. But in general, though some rundown is possible and desirable to release troops for Germany and for the strategic reserve, I believe it to be a mistake to evacuate key bases where we have the chance to remain. It is a hundred times easier for Britain to remain there, even with a token force, than for us, still less the United States, to seek to enter if trouble breaks out. I believe, therefore, that our maintenance of these bases should be regarded as a specific and invaluable contribution to the alliance.

I have talked today mainly about the relationship of Britain and the United States within the alliance. Frequently I am asked, "What about the special relationship?" I am never quite sure what this means. I am more interested in a close relationship based on a common purpose, common objectives, and as far as can be achieved community of policy, a relationship based not on condescension or on a backward-looking nostalgia for the past, but on the ability of both parties to put forward their strength and their own unique contribution to our common purpose. Charles Lamb said in one of his essays, "There is nothing so irrelevant in nature as a poor relation," and if ever our relationship with you were based on that status the sooner it were ended the better: that is why the first priority in British internal policy is to build up our economic strength so that as partners—in the alliance, in Europe, and the Commonwealth—we are relevant and necessary. It is on that, not on any conception of past greatness that our standing in the world will depend. Our ability to restore the lost dynamic to Britain's economic society, to restore a sense of economic and social and moral purpose, will have far more bearing on our value as an ally and a partner than any vain nuclear posturings. It may not be long before the same truth dawns on President de Gaulle.

Because we reject the notion that Britain is fated by history or some vicious twist of fate or by internal debility to be treated as the Sick Man of Europe, we are not. We have a reservoir of unused and underused talent, of skill and craftsmanship, of inventiveness, and ingenuity, of administrative ability and scientific creativeness which if mobilized will, within a measurable period of time enable us to become—not the workshop of the world; that is no longer our role—but the pilot plant, the toolroom of the world. Our scientists are among the finest in the world. The tragedy is we don't produce enough of them, and those we do produce we do not use intelligently. Some we fail even to hold—and the reason for this is not, as one noble lord has said, the deficiencies in your educational system—it is deficiencies in our industrial and governmental system, that we do not provide the status and opportunities, above all the key role in our society that the needs of the 1960's demand.

That is why the central thread of Labor policy, the key to our plan to redynamize Britain's economy, is our plan to mobilize the talents of our scientists and technicians, redeployed from missile and warheads, on research and development contracts, civil reresearch and development to produce the new instruments and tools of economic advance both for Britain and for the war on poverty in underdeveloped areas of the Commonwealth and elsewhere. If we are able to do this, and I have no doubt that we can—we shall be able in a very few years to transform our society and, in the alliance, in our economic relations with the Atlantic Community, and in the wider context of the North-South challenge, to put forward our full and so far unrealized strength, dependent on no one, but ready to play our full role in the interdependent community of free nations.

URBAN RENEWAL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to my colleagues that I do not intend to take this full time. However, I shall be back. I will be back on Wednesday next with a special order and there will be sufficient time for my colleagues to participate in an exchange, I hope, on urban renewal.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to be blunt enough today in the RECORD, for those who are interested in the subject, so there will be plenty of reason to cross-examine me or to share with me this concern next Wednesday at the time of my special order.

Mr. Speaker, what is urban renewal?

Urban renewal is the replanning and rebuilding of our Nation's cities by the Federal Government at the expense of the taxpayer. It is the condemnation of one man's property for resale to another—in violation of our traditional concepts of property rights. It is the demolition of whole areas of our cities. It is the rebuilding of cities in conformity to the schemes of Federal planners, through Federal finance and Federal control. It threatens to end local self-government.

Urban renewal is a political weapon. It is an attempt by liberals using the taxpayers' money, to reduce their opposition to ineffectiveness by buying off large sections of the business community. If an individual accepts his slice of the New Frontier, how can he legitimately deny others their portion? Urban renewal is a planned alliance between local political leaders and the Kennedy administration, aimed at keeping both in power.

Urban renewal is a pretext for introducing public housing into a community. Frequently, public housing—unpopular on its own merits—is tied to urban renewal as a condition for receiving Federal funds, and in this way socialized housing gets a foothold in the local community.

Now a new trend in urban renewal and public housing is developing. If the social planners in Washington get their way, the Government will be able to nationalize your home or choose your neighbors for you.

Mr. Speaker, I would call to my colleagues' attention the fact that tomorrow, I believe, is the issue date for a special supplement of Human Events that will spell out in some detail this proposition on urban renewal which I will develop further on Wednesday next.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will have the time to look at this RECORD tomorrow and to participate with me on Wednesday in this matter of urban renewal.

In any bill of particulars these matters deserve special attention:

First. Because of urban renewal, the Supreme Court has reinterpreted the Constitution, and violated the letter and spirit of the law.

Second. Private property can be taken away for esthetic and spiritual reasons for private—not public—use.

Third. The Federal contribution results in Federal control of local government.

Fourth. Local need for Federal help has been fraudulently determined by both local and Federal Government.

Fifth. The financially less able cities and States are supporting the wealthier cities and States in the Federal aid distribution.

Sixth. Federal guidelines, procedures, criteria, and formulas are inequitable, and cannot be made equitable.

Seventh. Misuse of Federal aid is scandalous.

Eighth. Windfall profit at taxpayer expense is commonplace.

Ninth. Public housing is forced on communities that want urban renewal.

Tenth. Crime abounds in public housing and is getting worse; morals and moral values are being destroyed.

Eleventh. Urban renewal and public housing are being used to affect sociological changes in U.S. society at the planners' whim.

Twelfth. When people know the facts and there is a referendum, public housing is rejected.

The constructive answer to urban renewal and housing is local; it is a local problem, not Federal. The solution must be local, not Federal. Examples are Indianapolis, Dallas, Erie, Pa., and many others.

U.S. MILITARY AID TO INDIA—THE NEED FOR A KASHMIR SETTLEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, Secretary of State Rusk, in a hearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, outlined the foreign aid programs proposed for the next fiscal year.

While we appreciated the detail and depth in which the Secretary of State delved in these discussions, many of us were disturbed over what is happening in Asia between two neighboring countries.

At a time when India faces the immediate threat of further invasions of its territory by the Red Chinese, we find that India is diverting a large portion of its military forces, not to protect against invasion from China, but to guard the border between India and Pakistan.

If Red China should launch another offensive against India, most military experts agree that India would have little chance of stopping it.

At the same time, Pakistan would find itself under possible attack by the Communists.

Instead of facing up to this dangerous situation, what has happened?

A majority of the forces of both India and Pakistan, some say as high as 80 percent, now face each other on the Kashmir border.

Defense expenditures

[Millions of dollars]

PAKISTAN

Figures for 1962–63:

Total expenditure inluding revenue expenditure and capital outlay	1,022
Total defense expenditure (the Pakistan expenditure on defense is approximately 20 percent of total expenditure)	216

INDIA

Figures for 1963–64:

Total expenditure including revenue expenditure and capital outlay	5,626
Total defense expenditure	2,043

NOTE.—The Indian expenditure on defense is approximately 36 percent of their total expenditure. If revenue expenditure alone were to be taken, India's defense expenditure in 1963 will amount to nearly 47 percent of their total revenue expenditure.

The crux of the dispute between India and Pakistan is Kashmir, not a very prosperous territory of high mountains and beautiful lakes. At present, Kashmir is under the control of India.

Pakistan argues that Kashmir should be Pakistani because the majority of its people are Moslems. India argues that it should continue to retain control, because the present rulers are Hindu.

Four attempts have been made to settle this longstanding dispute, but so far without success. A fifth series of conferences on this question is now about to begin, and hopes for a successful solution are very slim.

Instead, a majority of the armed forces of both Pakistan and India confront each other on the border, forgetting for the time being their need to unite against a common enemy.

The current U.S. military assistance program to India, in which the British are participating, is to cost around $120 million. And this is only the beginning. A joint United States-British-Canadian mission recently returned from India after studying India's needs for offensive and defensive air power. Another mission has visited India to study ways of developing her defense production capacity. The Indian Army is to be expanded from the existing 11 divisions to 17 divisions in the near future. The United States will, no doubt, be asked to pick up the tab when the time comes to implement these proposals—a tab that may eventually run into billions of dollars.

What is the declared purpose of this heavy and obviously long-term military aid to India? To enable her to resist Communist aggression. But it seems to me that the method we have chosen to buttress Indian defenses against the Chinese Communists will, if persisted in, not only defeat our purposes in that region but may also lose for us the friendship of Pakistan, our stanchest ally in that part of the world.

The scale of the current U.S. military assistance to India, and the prospects of it continuing for the next 10 years—for that is Mr. Nehru's estimate of the time it will take to settle the Sino-Indian conflict—has caused alarm among the people of Pakistan. It is creating bitter resentment among the Pakistani people against U.S. policies in that region. Even so, there is no certainty, that if the hot war were to start again in the Himalayas, the Indians would be able to resist the Chinese attack any more successfully than they did last year.

Commenting on this subject, the Chicago Tribune had this to say in an editorial on February 27. I quote:

> Once again we find ourselves ignoring the interests of a country (Pakistan) with which we have firm military alliances in favor of those of India, which has studiously avoided committing itself to the West. If a country is our friend, Washington seems to reason there is nothing to gain by being nice to it. The folks we must humor are the uncommitted ones. Sooner or later our friends may decide that they are being made suckers.

The Tribune's warning is not to be taken lightly. Editorials in Pakistani newspapers have, in recent months, been outspokenly bitter in their criticism of U.S. military aid to India, a neutral country, which has made no secret of its hostility to Pakistan, a U.S. ally. Pakistanis feel they are being let down by their allies.

Now, why should the Pakistanis, who have been, and still are, our stanch allies, begin to think in those terms?

The Pakistanis argue—and no one has disputed their argument—that the key to the security of south Asia lies in a just and satisfactory settlement of the Kashmir dispute between Pakistan and India.

In the absence of such a settlement, we have seen the pathetic spectacle of India trying with a handful of troops to defend its borders against Chinese Communist attacks while maintaining an estimated 80 percent of its best-equipped forces massed against Pakistan.

This state of affairs is borne out by Mr. Saville R. Davis, of the Christian Science Monitor, who paid a visit to India to study the situation there during the Chinese attack. Writing in the Monitor's issue of March 1, 1963, he categorically states that the Nehru policy was to endorse, and here I quote Mr. Davis' own words:

> The stationing of most of India's Army with its best weapons on the frontier of Pakistan—while leaving the Chinese Communist frontier virtually undefended except by the interposition of patrols and armed posts and some half-hearted deploying of pathetically underequipped forces.

Listing the reasons for the Indian defeat by the Chinese, Mr. Davis says, and I quote again:

> That Mr. Nehru did not want to make concessions to Pakistan in Kashmir to free the Indian troops so they could face the Chinese.

Mr. Davis' conclusion was that the Indian nation under Mr. Nehru's leadership "was, and is, unsure where it is going." Let us see the course Mr. Nehru has charted for his government.

He is anxious to take from the United States all the military assistance this country can give him. Yet he insists on remaining allegedly unalined. I say "allegedly" because he has sided with the Soviet Union against us whenever it suits him, and will no doubt continue to do so, despite our aid. He insists that China's attack on India was not Communist aggression; instead, he calls it merely imperialist aggression. Rather than settle the Kashmir dispute with Pakistan, which would immediately release two-thirds of his army, now immobilized on Pakistan's borders, he wants to maintain the bulk of his forces against Pakistan and create a second army to face the Chinese. Hence his Government's decision to double the size of the Indian Army, which he hopes to arm with military assistance from the United States.

Unsure as the Indians are of the direction in which they are going so far as resisting Communist aggression is concerned, the United States is, nevertheless, prepared to give them heavy long-term military assistance despite the danger it might constitute to Pakistan and despite opposition from our Pakistani allies.

It is not surprising, then, that the Pakistanis should exhibit alarm at such U.S. policies.

Already the Indian Army, they say, is four times as strong as their own and more than three-fourths of it has always remained massed on Pakistan's borders. The recent Indian military takeover of Goa was a fresh reminder to the Pakistanis that no faith can be placed in Mr. Nehru's professions of peaceful intentions, or in his promises not to use American arms for purposes of aggression. They recall that, while explaining the reasons for the Indian military debacle in the recent fighting against the Chinese, Mr. Nehru publicly admitted that the Indian Army had been organized to fight Pakistan only. This is precisely what the Pakistanis had maintained ever since Mr. Nehru sent in his troops to occupy Kashmir. Indian leaders have repeatedly alleged that by her presence in Kashmir, Pakistan is guilty of continuing aggression against India and have suggested that Mr. Nehru take steps to put an end to this aggression, if necessary, by force of arms. They have publicly termed Pakistan as India's enemy No. 1.

All these factors have served to make the Pakistanis extremely suspicious of Indian military intentions. An India greatly strengthened with American arms, they argue, may or may not fight the Chinese Communists. It will certainly use its vastly increased military strength to intimidate or attack Pakistan. This danger is very real and cannot be ignored.

The aim of U.S. policy is to strengthen the security of the India-Pakistan subcontinent as a whole. What is needed to implement this sound policy is that the Indian and Pakistani forces in Kashmir and along the Indo-Pakistan borders be disengaged. This would immediately release six to seven divisions of the best equipped Indian forces for deployment against the Chinese, without the United States having to spend a single additional dollar of aid. Such a disengagement can be brought about only, however, if there is a just and satisfactory settlement of the Kashmir issue. Without it, Indian and Paskistani relations cannot improve and the armies of the two countries will continue to remain poised against each other, immobilized through mutual fear.

I cannot see how, under present circumstances, the supply of massive U.S. military equipment to India can serve to strengthen India's defenses against the Chinese Communists. On the contrary, continued U.S. military aid to India could only serve to make Mr. Nehru more determined in his resolve not to make concessions in the Kashmir dispute, which in turn will make the dispute itself more difficult to settle. Yet the key to the security of the entire south Asian region clearly lies in the settlement of the Kashmir issue and the establishment of a rapprochement between India and Pakistan which only a Kashmir solution can bring about.

To give military assistance to India without making it contingent upon a Kashmir settlement can only cause harm to the real interests of India, Pakistan, and the United States. If there is no Kashmir settlement, the security of India would not be increased despite the arms. In fact, both India and Pakistan could be further weakened by this heightening of tension between two neighbors with a common enemy. The U.S. taxpayer would have provided very large sums of money to no purpose. The only result of this policy would be to destroy the existing good relations between the United States, Pakistan, and India.

Some claim that a settlement between India and Pakistan is impossible. I do not think so.

India and Pakistan came to a mutual understanding on a problem at least as complex and important when agreement was reached on the Indus River Basin compact.

In 1949, the United Nations passed a resolution urging a plebiscite in Kashmir to determine the wishes of the majority of people in that area. India to date has refused to honor this resolution.

Supplying the arms and equipment for two nations to destroy each other while the wolf is waiting at the door to pick up what is left seems, to me, to be folly.

Unless there is some assurance that the arms we are supplying will not be used by two friends to fight each other, I think we should seriously reconsider military assistance to both Pakistan and India.

The need is apparent for India and Pakistan to face a common foe together, united in strength rather than weakened by division and conflict.

NATO and the coordinating of defense forces in free Europe certainly should demonstrate to India and Pakistan the absolute necessity of a common front against a common aggressor, whether that foe be communism, imperialism, or a combination of both.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 27, 1963]

WHY BE NICE TO OUR FRIENDS?

The announcement of our latest and largest development loan to India—$240 million for the purchase of foodstuffs—isn't going to contribute to our stature as an unbiased helper in the negotiations between India and Pakistan over Kashmir.

Our friendship and military alliance with Pakistan already have been jeopardized by the military aid we've given India since the Chinese invasion. Pakistan's suspicions have been aggravated by reports that when the Kashmir talks resume on March 9, the United States will propose a partition favorable to India.

The American plan, according to information from New Delhi, is supported by the British. Although it would give Pakistan at least half of all Kashmir, it would give India the capital, Srinagar, and most of the valley surrounding it—which is pretty much the only part of Kashmir worth having. Most of the state consists of snowy Himalayan peaks.

It would ignore the legitimate Pakistani contention that most of those who live in and around Srinagar are Moslems and would vote to join Pakistan.

Although Pakistan should be entitled to most of Kashmir on ethnic grounds and on the basis of self-determination, our Government seems to favor the claim of India, which is based on a legalistic act of accession by the late Maharajah of Jammu and Kashmir and on India's present possession of the Vale.

Once again we find ourselves ignoring the interests of a country with which we have firm military alliances in favor of those of India, which has studiously avoided committing itself to the West. If a country is our friend, Washington seems to reason, there's nothing to gain by being nice to it. The folks we must humor are the uncommitted ones. Sooner or later, our friends may decide that they're being made suckers.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 8, 1963]

INDIA NOW: IF THERE'S A NEW ATTACK BY CHINESE REDS—

(NOTE.—Mostly, it's business as usual in India, little sign of urgent alert against another invasion by Red China. Sol W. Sanders, of the international staff of U.S. News & World Report, studied Indian defenses and plans for this report from New Delhi.)

NEW DELHI.—It is just about half a year since Chinese Communists poured over the border and clobbered the Indian Army. It was a jolt that Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru says could be repeated any time.

Yet, the country is not on anything like a war footing, although a new defense budget is before Parliament.

The Army probably could do better than last time if the Reds attacked again. But it couldn't halt an offensive.

And Mr. Nehru, despite the shock the Communists gave him, still is committed to a policy of nonalignment.

The new budget includes the equivalent of $1.8 billion for defense, almost three times that of last year. But just before the budget was submitted, T. T. Krishnamachari, the Minister of Economic and Defense Coordination in the Nehru Cabinet, said that the economic measures to meet the emergency of renewed war with Communist China were both unrealistic and insufficient.

Additional troops are being raised. Plans are under way to recruit and train six new divisions for mountain warfare. With the aid of a dozen American transport planes and crews, the Indian Army has pushed supplies into several forward areas in the Himalayan regions bordering Chinese Communist Tibet. But no one believes this buildup has yet reached anything like the proportions needed to hold the Chinese in check.

Other elements are at work to endanger effective military cooperation among India, Britain, and the United States. Indian requests for Western aid are regarded as being

quite impractical, in many cases. But refusal to meet these requests is being used by leftwing and anti-Western forces—centering around former Defense Minister V. K. Krishna Menon—to prove that Western help cannot be relied on.

This, in turn, is leading the Indians to count heavily on Russian help to brake the Chinese Communists. The result is almost certain to make effective cooperation between India and the United States that much more difficult.

POLITICS TO BLAME?

Looking back on the defeats of last autumn, observers here tend more and more to put the blame on the intrusion of politicians into strictly military questions—although shortage of materiel, Chinese superiority in men and weapons, surprise and terrain all played a role.

Military men say the essential mistake was the insistence by Prime Minister Nehru and Defense Minister Krishna Menon on the so-called forward positioning of Indian troops. This meant that Indian outposts were flung out on mountain pinnacles where they could not be defended. The policy was a calculated risk based on a belief that the Chinese Communists would never attack in force. But they did.

As a result of the defeats, both Gen. P. N. Thapar, chief of the army staff, and Gen. B. M. Kaul, who commanded the corps that suffered the greatest defeats have been removed. The new commander is Gen. J. N. Chaudri, who has been characterized by one of the foreign military attachés here as "a perfect British officer and gentleman."

A high Indian officer says now that if the Chinese should attack again, India would retreat to positions that could be defended and held.

TAKING THEIR TIME

What worries many foreign observers here is the slowness with which Indians are repairing deficiencies exposed by last year's attack. An American military mission has been set up under Brig. Gen. J. E. Kelly, an Infantry officer with experience in Asia. But so far the Indians have not taken many of General Kelly's hints of offers to extend training facilities. The same thing is true with the British.

A planning target established during the heat of the Chinese attack called for $120 million worth of American and British aid—$60 million from each side. But by March only about $30 million worth of the U.S. aid had arrived or was in the pipeline.

An Indian source says the aid is moving slowly because the Indians are screening their requests, carefully "since, theoretically, at least, we don't know whether there will be anything forthcoming after this $120 million is used up." But American sources put the blame on unrealistic requests they get from the Indians—that, plus the slowness with which requests are processed in the Indian Defense Ministry.

LOGISTICS OF LADAKH

Everybody admits that the job of building up Indian defense against the Chinese Communists is a terrific one. Take the example of the defense line in Ladakh, the northwestern corner of the 1,800-mile Indian frontier with Red China.

For 4 months, the Indians have been building stockpiles in the area against a possible Chinese attack this spring. This has been done with the help of U.S. air transports, since India does not have the aircraft required.

It has been a tremendous job. Yet, American military observers here believe that the huge tonnage necessary to maintain Indian forces in Ladakh cannot be permanently airlifted—even if India had the planes to do it.

The observers say that India needs two all-weather roads leading from the valley of Kashmir to Leh, the jump-off place in Ladakh for Indian defenses. U.S. sources estimate it would take at least 2,000 trucks, much heavy roadbuilding machinery, snow-handling equipment, and other equipment plus spare parts to turn the one truck route that is passable only part of the year into an adequate supply line. It could mount up to a $50 million project.

Such logistical problems abound along the whole northern frontier.

THE STUCK UMBRELLA

Also, there still is thorough confusion about Indian strategy and tactics. For example, consider the issue of an "air umbrella," as it has been called by Indian newspapers.

The Chinese Reds have at least 12, possibly 15, airfields capable of launching jets within easy range of India's 3 principal cities—Delhi, Calcutta, and Bombay. If hostilities broke out again now, the Communists would have virtual immunity from Indian air attack. It is believed they have jet interceptors that could keep India from bombing Tibet's difficult supply lines.

The Chinese also could make terror raids on Indian cities. It was fear of this that kept the Indians from using their tactical air support in the fighting in the northeast frontier agency last year.

AIR COVER—BUT HOW?

During the crisis last autumn, Mr. Nehru asked the United States for air cover for Indian cities. A joint United States-British-Australian-Canadian mission is preparing a report at India's request on the air-defense question.

But it is clear that any extensive build-up of the Indian Air Force—even if the United States and the rest of the West were willing to foot the bill—would take anywhere from 3 to 5 years.

It is also clear that any attempt to have Western air power here "on a standby basis" as some Indian newspapers have suggested would mean the presence of Western ground forces. Yet, Mr. Nehru insists that he will not tolerate Western bases in India—and that includes Western personnel permanently assigned here.

An American mission has toured India to see whether the country's two dozen ordnance plants can be overhauled. Some of these date back to before World War I.

The plants performed excellently under the British, and even supplied a good part of the munitions used during the Battle of Britain in World War II. But during the past 15 years the plants have been permitted to deteriorate.

One Indian official estimates that $125 million worth of capital equipment is needed just to begin their rehabilitation. And he says "eight times that figure" is needed in foreign-exchange support for the defense budget—largely to finance the importation of raw materials. These figures do not include future capital equipment for the ordnance plants, many of which appear to American observers to be suitable only for scrapping.

A BURDEN—BUT WHOSE?

What part of this burden can the Indians bear themselves? Very little, the Indians believe. The argument is that, should a large part of their resources be diverted from their 5-year development plans, the country would be further weakened and exposed to Red subversion.

The Indians maintain—and most foreign observers here agree—that very little of this planned economic development could be turned to defense purposes. Much of the money is committed to specific projects. Their abandonment would weaken the overall defense effort, since they are devoted to building up India's basic structure—steel, railroads and power.

So far, about the only important measure the Government has taken to meet the crisis that grew out of the Communist attack is to try to gather up India's huge hoard of privately held gold. Some economists estimate it to be as much as $10 billion.

The Government has asked private holders of gold to declare their holdings and has offered a 6½-percent gold-bond loan. It has forbidden jewelers to make gold into jewelry of more than 14-carat purity.

Critics of the Government policy—including most businessmen—say these steps not only are unreasonable, but are damaging to the economy.

In a country where some of the highest interest rates in the world prevail, the 6½-percent bond issue is regarded as a joke. Also, by searching for bullion, the Government has driven it into hiding and closed off one of the most important sources of credit financing in India.

Businessmen and bankers predict a wide-scale flouting of the gold law. They say it will bring an increase in black-marketing and will create general antagonism toward the Government at a time when national unity is essential.

UNLEARNED LESSONS

About half a year after a shocking military defeat, there is little evidence that the Indians learned many lessons from their experience on the Chinese border.

Mr. Nehru said after the Chinese Communist attack that India had been living in a world of unreality of its own creation. It seems incredible that India should ever move back into that world. Yet, most observers here believe that, to a large extent, that is exactly what has happened.

PUT TEETH IN EXPORT CONTROL ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House the merry-go-round policies of the State and Commerce Departments, and point out some very interesting revelations that require this Congress to put some teeth in the Export Control Act.

Since the beginning of 1963, the Department of Commerce has persisted in issuing export licenses authorizing the shipment of such strategic materials as steel mill machine parts, synthetic rubber, woodpulp, recording and controlling instruments and electrical devices, to Russia, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and other Communist nations.

This trade is voluminous, running into many millions of dollars. One such authorization was for $4 million worth of rolling mill machine parts to Yugoslavia. This type of mill is used to reduce steel ingots into intermediary sizes and shapes before further processing into such things as steel plates, rails, wheels, sheets and skelp—which is used in the manufacture of oil pipe, the very type of pipe which the United States and NATO have asked Germany not to ship to Russia.

The products of this mill are also to be used in the machine building and ship construction industries, and Yugo-

slavia has been engaging in shipping and trade with Cuba.

The synthetic rubber we ship to Czechoslovakia is for the manufacture of tires, and the woodpulp to Russia is for the manufacture of rayon tire cord. It is not inconceivable that this same material finds its way into the tires used on the military equipment these countries have delivered to Cuba.

The recording and controlling instruments and other electrical equipment are of the same type that is found on the Russian fishing trawlers that spied on our nuclear testing in the Pacific and that have recently been seen prowling all corners of the globe collecting data and intelligence.

Apparently, the only way to bring a halt to this practice is to tie the hands of the Departments of Commerce and State by putting teeth in the Export Control Act.

Incredibly, many of these same purchases are financed through the Export-Import Bank, an organization which acts as agent for the U.S. Treasury. The Export-Import Bank negotiates the loan with the Communist nation, then borrows the money from the U.S. Treasury and lends it to the Communist nation to make the purchase. This, in effect, is using the taxpayers' money to enhance the Communist economy.

Last year, Congress authorized the Export-Import Bank to borrow up to $750 million for development loans.

What good are economic sanctions by this country against Cuba if she can obtain these materials indirectly from the United States through her Communist allies?

How can we expect to win the cold war by making it possible for these Communist countries to obtain these strategic materials through the use of U.S. tax dollars? Where is this merry-go-round going to lead us?

APPALACHIAN HIGHLANDS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing provides for immediate action and for longer time comprehensive planning for developing the resources of the Appalachian Highlands area.

The time is long past due to take more positive action to prevent disastrous floods such as were experienced in 1957 when there were $40 million worth of damages in eastern Kentucky alone. Again in 1963 a similar disastrous loss occurred with like amounts in eastern Kentucky and in Virginia, West Virginia, Tennessee, and other States.

These disastrous losses can be prevented, and at the same time productive and profitable use can be made of the abundant rainfall with which this whole region is blessed. Plans are underway to build more reservoirs under authorities already in existence, but I am proposing a greatly expanded program for water resource developments in the Appalachian Highlands area.

In this bill, I am proposing both a long-range approach and an immediate acceleration of action under existing authorities.

To accomplish this, I have made a four-pronged approach under four titles.

Title I provides for an Appalachian Highlands Commission composed of Federal agencies and representatives appointed by the Governor of each of the 11 States in the region. This proposal is patterned after the legislation that established the U.S. study commissions for the Texas river basins and the river basins of Southeastern States. This Commission could be formed immediately, and could begin at once to prepare comprehensive plans for development of the entire Appalachian Highlands region. Such a Commission would not preclude the formation of an Appalachian States Interstate Compact at such time as it is needed. In fact, I would favor the formation of such an interstate compact. But to form such a compact might require several years. The Commission I am proposing could get underway immediately with studies, surveys, and long-range plans to deal with the many complex problems of accelerated development of recreation, timber supply, water commerce industry, and full employment.

As a part of this bill I have incorporated the provisions of a bill which I previously introduced as H.R. 2610, 88th Congress, 1st session. This provides for a new approach to meeting the peculiar needs of this area for conserving and developing soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and recreation on farms and woodlands of the Appalachian Highlands. I have proposed a $100 million appropriation authorization for this work.

I have made provision to get underway with immediate action by authorizing an appropriation of $500 million to accelerate Federal public works programs under existing authorities, but with cost-sharing provisions more in keeping with the needs of this area than are provided for in existing programs. I am proposing an amendment to the Small Watershed Act, which I had previously introduced as H.R. 4189, to adapt the authorities of that program to the special conditions in depressed rural areas.

A more detailed summary of the bill follows:

SUMMARY OF BILL TO PROVIDE FOR A RESOURCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR THE APPALACHIAN HIGHLANDS AREA

The President would be authorized under the bill to establish the boundaries of the Appalachian Highlands area within the States of Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, and to designate the counties in which the provisions of titles I, II, and III would be applicable.

The bill would provide for the formulation and submission to Congress of a comprehensive plan of resource and economic development in the Appalachian Highlands area by a Commission composed of representatives of Federal departments and agencies and of the concerned States. Pending the authorization of the plan by Congress, the bill would authorize a program for the conservation and development of soil and water resources through Federal assistance agreements with landowners, operators, and occupiers in the Appalachian Highlands area, and would also authorize acceleration in such area by Federal departments and agencies of public works projects and programs carried out by such departments and agencies.

TITLE I

Title I would provide for the formulation of a comprehensive plan for flood prevention and control, domestic and municipal water supply, improvement and safeguarding navigation, reclamation and irrigation of land, including drainage, possibility of hydroelectric power and industrial development, soil conservation, forest conservation, preservation, protection and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources, salinity and sediment control, pollution abatement and protection of public health, industrial, housing, transportation and other economic development, and other beneficial and useful purposes.

The plan would be formulated within guidelines set out in the bill by an Appalachian Highlands Commission composed of a chairman, to be appointed by the President; Federal members representing the Departments of Agriculture, Army, Commerce, Health, Education and Welfare, Interior, and Labor, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, to be appointed by the heads of such departments and agencies; and State members representing the States in the Appalachian Highlands Area, to be appointed by the Governor of each State.

The duties, functions, and authorities of the Appalachian Highlands Commission are prescribed, and the compensation of the chairman and State members are set forth. Federal members would receive no additional compensation.

In the formulation of the comprehensive plan respecting the control, conservation and utilization of water, conservation and development of land resources, flood prevention and control, navigation, reclamation, agriculture purposes, power, recreation, fish and wildlife, economic development, and other needs set out in title I, the Commission would be directed, among other things, to take into consideration certain prescribed benefits, utilize the services, studies, surveys and reports of existing Government agencies, and to include in the plan specified costs, benefits, and payout schedules, and the Commission's recommendations concerning construction and operation of the projects therein.

Prior to the submission of the comprehensive plan to the Congress through the President, the plan would be submitted to each Federal department or agency and to the Governors of each State represented on the Commission, for their written views, comments or recommendations.

TITLE II

Title II would provide for a program in the Appalachian Highlands Area for the conservation and development of soil and water resources, including land use adjustments and the beneficial use of lands. The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to enter into agreements of not more than 15 years with landowners, operators, and occupiers in counties having serious need of protection of lands from water erosion, and flooding or sedimentation, stabilization and improvement of the quality of streamflow, development of beneficial uses of land, including improved woodland, and private recreational and fish and wildlife developments, or improvement of local living conditions and of opportunities for raising the

level of family income through conservation and development of soil and water resources.

In return for the agreement by such landowners, operators, or occupiers to make needed changes in land use, and to establish practices and measures needed to conserve and develop soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and recreation resources, the Secretary would be authorized to furnish them with appropriate technical, financial, and other assistance.

Acreage allotments and marketing quota histories would be preserved for any landowners, operators, or occupiers during the period of the agreement, and for an equivalent period thereafter for specified purposes.

An appropriation of $100 million would be authorized to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE III

Title III would authorize the direct Federal departments and agencies to accelerate within the Appalachian Highlands Area, to the maximum extent feasible under authorized increased appropriations, existing public works programs and other programs providing technical or financial assistance, grants or loans to States and local agencies. It would provide that all land rights needed for such projects and programs, except those needed in connection with Federal projects, would be acquired by and in the name of State and local agencies in accordance with the provisions of State laws. It would increase the existing statutory percentage of Federal financial participation in such projects and programs by one-half the difference between the existing statutory percentage and 100-per centum Federal participation. An appropriation of $500 million would be authorized to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE IV

Title IV would amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide that in areas in which Federal grants and loans may be made under the Public Works Acceleration Act the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to bear the costs of relocations, removals, and replacements needed to make land, easements, and rights-of-way acquired by local organizations suitable for the installation of works of improvement, and that such costs would not need to be considered in determining benefit-cost ratios. It would also authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to bear an equitable part of the cost of installing works of improvements for the added purpose of water quality control.

THE WILDERNESS BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1963, I introduced H.R. 5246, to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people of our Nation. This measure is substantially the same as the bill introduced in the U.S. Senate by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would block development and exploitation of the few remaining virgin areas left in the United States. It creates a national wilderness preservation system of about 6.8 million acres.

I like the language of this legislation. Senator ANDERSON's definition of what wilderness is, is both eloquent testimony of our wilderness areas and strong argument for enactment of this legislation. It states:

> Wilderness—in contrast with those areas where man and his works dominate the landscape—wilderness is an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man—where man himself is a visitor who does not remain.

In a very short time—because of commercial development or the growing recreational program—there will not be many areas left in California nor throughout the Nation where "the earth and its community are untrammeled by man—where man himself is a visitor who does not remain."

Mr. Speaker, as a native Californian, I have seen vast sections of our outdoors give way to front doors, sliding doors, and picture windows—with no picture left to view. Nor are Californians the only Americans who have seen this. All Americans see this endless drama unfold every day. This is growth. This is boom. This is progress. This drama is, in fact, one measure of our Nation's greatness. Pioneers who tested their cunning and skill against the elements to tame the wilderness are national heroes. And well they should be. They tamed the West and laid the groundwork for this prosperous life we now enjoy.

In many ways, this pioneering spirit is seen today as the businessmen who risk their capital and their energy and time to develop new lands—to build homes and streets and shopping centers on the land. This is good. This is progress.

My fear is that in our dedication to progress—in our sturdy individualism—that one day we may wake up to find our State and our Nation with no land left "untrammeled by man."

There is another equally important factor to consider, too. It is this: The decrease in primitive, virgin land in this country is not due to commercial interests alone. It is due also to the unprecedented pressure of our States and Federal Government to open more and more park lands to mass public recreational uses.

What does this mean? It means recreational facilities—roads and boat landings—cabins and barbecue pits—cars and trailers—service stations and restaurants.

In a word, it means civilization. And that starts with C and that rhymes with T and that stands for trouble.

Trouble for those of us who believe some wilderness areas should be set aside and left exactly as they are.

Trouble for the generations of Americans who will follow us. We have seen the wilderness. We must ask ourselves: Will they? There will be outdoor recreation, to be sure. But will there be any wilderness left? Will any areas remain where "man and his works have not begun to dominate the landscape"?

Let me read a little more from the bill itself:

> Wilderness is further defined to mean an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence—with the imprint of man's works substantially unnoticeable.

Recreational areas show the imprint of man's works. The imprint is there—from lodges to superscenic highways to advertisements. The imprint is as bold as life and as up to date as the cheerful billboards reminding us that "every litter bit hurts." Indeed, every litter bit does hurt. I feel a pain every time I am reminded of that fact in that manner. Yes—a thousand times, yes—I am against litter bugs—be they driving down Market Street or toasting marshmallows at Lake Tahoe.

But it seems to me that there ought to be some lands preserved in our Nation where there are no antilitter signs, littering up the landscape—where there are no picnic tables and salt licks—and man and beast are alone on the land from which they sprang. The land is our land—yours and mine. And we ought to preserve some of it—just a little of it anyway—just the way it was created.

We are not asking too much, really. The wilderness bill would include in its national wilderness preservation system only about 2 percent of the more than 2 billion acres of national land area. Two percent of 2 billion. That is not very much.

The wilderness bill will create a wilderness area system to be composed of areas that are already reserved and restricted—forest, park and wildlife areas. These areas will continue to be administered by the agency now in charge of it. There would be no change of their present purpose—as game ranges or refuges or parks or monuments or forests. We would simply add to their administration the new condition that they remain wilderness areas. And cannot be reclassified without an act of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of this legislation will insure a sensible and logical program of our overall land, water, and resource conservation program. It would be most meaningful in holding large timber stands and preserving our water runoff sheds.

Let me point out that all of these areas subject to inclusion in the wilderness system are presently restricted areas. They have already been set aside by Congress, by the President or the Department of Interior or Agriculture for special purposes—including preservation of their natural state.

What the bill does is this: It says that those areas presently under a high degree of wilderness protection may be placed in the wilderness system upon the recommendation of the President. But any new areas—areas not already restricted—can only be included in the wilderness system by Act of Congress.

Inclusion of the wild and wilderness and primitive, park and wildlife areas in the wilderness system will cause little or no disturbance to individuals or communities or economic patterns. These areas have been restricted for years. There have been no timber sales from forest lands involved so there are no lumber mills dependent on them which would be forced to close down.

In short, there is virtually no change in the status quo. The bill simply makes wilderness preservation a statutory directive. The existing administering agency continues to hold responsibility for the land. The bill does not set up any new agencies or new categories of land classification.

In introducing this bill in 1961, Senator ANDERSON said that he did not remember a witness before his Senate Interior Committee who was opposed to preserving some of our great, natural scenic areas in their primitive, natural state. The debate he said, had been over how the preservation would be accomplished—over what safeguards would be placed around the wilderness system once it had been established.

I think the arguments in support of the bill are sound. I agree with Interior Secretary Udall when he says that "wilderness can be preserved only by positive public action designating and protecting areas of wilderness."

I agree with a spokesman for the AFL-CIO who pointed out that the wilderness bill offers "every reasonable concession to those who fear that economic development may be hindered by setting aside certain wilderness areas."

Mr. Speaker, as a Californian I believe I am in a unique and enviable position of seeing—at closer range, perhaps, than many other people—why this legislation is important—why it is so necessary that we pass it as soon as possible—why this is in a very real sense last-chance legislation.

I think a short summary of reasons for supporting this bill go something like this:

America is growing. To be sure, we have very serious problems—unemployment, for example, is much too high—production in many industries is well below capacity—but the undeniable fact is that we are growing. California—the No. 1 State in the Union—is vigorous testimony to that growth.

Every year California must provide 200,000 to 300,000 new jobs. Because 1,600 new citizens arrive in our State every day. And we must build and build and build—new homes and schools and highways and playgrounds and supermarkets and harbors and department stores.

A hundred years from now students will ask their history professors, Well, did it ever stop—all this building and growing?

I know the answer will be, "No, it never stopped." They were bold, ambitious, enterprising people—these energetic citizens of the sixties. They went right on building their schools and their homes and highways and playgrounds.

But they were not so consumed with their own destiny—their own needs and ambitions—that they forgot about ours.

They left us their spirit—they left us their natural resources—they even left us some of their wilderness as a reminder of our past and our heritage. This they inherited from those who went before them. This they preserved for us. This we must preserve, too.

UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION OR UPHOLD THE JUDGES?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sam Holliday, of San Antonio, Tex., has written a very provocative analysis of our Supreme Court's recent operations. In my opinion Mr. Holliday, whom I have the pleasure of knowing for many, many years, is a very able student of constitutional law. It gives me pleasure to insert his analysis and observations in the RECORD at this point:

DOES THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES HAVE THE RIGHT TO REVERSE PRIOR CONSTITUTIONAL INTERPRETATIONS BY THAT COURT?

In considering this question, we are immediately met with the evident and undisputable fact that the Constitution does not state that the Supreme Court may interpret the Constitution. It does not say anything whatever about the matter. Many eminent men, including Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence and one of the inspirers of the American Bill of Rights, incorporated into the Constitution, were of the opinion that the Supreme Court had no more power to interpret the Constitution than did the other branches of the Government in their respective spheres. The Court's asserted right is based, upon a claimed logical necessity. It is claimed that the Court, in applying the Constitution to the facts in cases coming before it, must ascertain, or interpret, the true meaning of the Constitution in order to know what it was applying. In other words, it is claimed that the Court is called upon, or has the duty, to search for and ascertain the Constitution's true meaning and then apply that meaning to the facts before the Court.

Much criticism has been heaped upon those, especially lawyers, who do not agree with recent reversals of prior constructions of the Constitution by the Supreme Court. Generally, such reversals occurred when the Court was composed of a different group of judges than those who rendered the prior decision. The basis of such criticism is that the Supreme Court has the duty to interpret the Constitution, when it needs interpreting to arrive at its true meaning; that as the Court is only interpreting the Constitution to ascertain its true meaning in order to apply such meaning, that, when the Court does interpret, or construes, a provision, that is, when it has ascertained or found its true meaning, such interpretation should be accepted as the same as the provision. It is claimed that it is the duty of all citizens to uphold such interpretation just as if that had been the way the provision in question had been expressed when it became part of the Constitution, because that was its true meaning when it was adopted, only expressed differently. It is claimed that such interpretation must be upheld whether the lawyer critic, or other critic, likes it or not, just as it is his duty to uphold the express terms of the Constitution, whether he likes it or not. This writer has no fault to find with such reasoning.

But the duty to uphold the Constitution and such an interpretation is not only that of the lawyer, the official, the soldier, and other citizens, but it is also the obligation of the members of the Supreme Court themselves. They, like the lawyers and other citizens, are obliged to uphold all of the Constitution. And if an interpretation becomes a part of it, then the judges themselves, like the lawyers and other citizens, have sworn to and are obligated to uphold it, just as they are obligated to uphold the Constitution as written, whether they like it or not. It would appear axiomatic that, if they are not so obligated, neither is anybody else, because the obligation of each to uphold it is the same. Is the Constitution which the lawyer swears to uphold the same or a different Constitution from that which the judges of the Supreme Court swear to uphold?

There is only one Constitution of the United States of America, and all citizens, regardless of their position, not excluding judges of the Supreme Court, are all alike dutybound to uphold it.

Does a lawyer, official, soldier, or citizen have the right to say, "I will not uphold this provision, or this interpretation, because it is out of date and should be changed?" It is evident that he does not.

Does a judge of the Supreme Court have the right to say, "I will not uphold this provision, or this interpretation, because it is out of date and should be changed?" It is still evident that he does not.

Suppose that the night before a reversal is made by the Supreme Court, a lawyer is upholding the Constitution as originally interpreted by such Court, which had correctly interpreted it as having the meaning it had when it was adopted. But the following morning, without his knowledge, the Supreme Court reverses such prior interpretation and gives it a meaning opposite to the original interpretation. Thereupon, still without knowledge of the change, the lawyer continues upholding the constitutional interpretation as he was the day before. Who would be upholding the Constitution, the lawyer or the judges who attempt to change the prior interpretation? Is it the lawyer's duty to uphold the Constitution or to uphold the judges?

It is inconceivable to this writer's mind that the judges can emit judgments, orders, or whatnot, which everybody, except themselves, is dutybound to uphold. Our laws are applicable to all citizens, generally. We do not have a two-class citizenship, one composed of nine judges who are above the law and yet who, at the same time, can make what amounts to law binding on everybody else, the second-class citizens. I do not believe that we have a nation of 180 million second-class citizens, including writer, and nine first-class citizens. In a society of our background and traditions, it cannot be that the judges of the Court can set the limits of their own power, for in such a case there would be no limits to such power. Would the government then be by the people? How could it be, if the people have no effective will, no power, as a matter of RIGHT to decide on their government? How could this be if any expression of their will must depend on the will of nine men, and any expression of their will can be disregarded, nullified and destroyed by those nine men? And the quaint idea in the Declaration of Independence that every just power is derived "from the consent of the governed," where would it fit in?

I beg you earnestly to consider the following reasoning.

There are at least three reasons why the Supreme Court cannot change, that is, amend by interpretation, by construction, the meaning of a provision of the Constitution, or its equivalent, a prior interpretation, which, as such an interpretation, has become of constitutional status, or as it is sometimes stated, "a part of the Constitution."

The first reason is that the Constitution contains no provision giving the Court such right. This was no oversight because the Constitution does provide how it is to be amended, and the Court is not mentioned in this connection. Is this not proof that the authors, great and learned men, who labored so earnestly and ably to make the Constitution clear, simple, and comprehensive, as well as the people who adopted it, had no intention of giving the Court such power, under the well recognized rule of legal construction, "Inclusio unius est eclusio alterius."

But the fundamental question as raised by the Court itself, is this: "Can the Supreme Court change the meaning of the Constitution, including prior interpretations, in order to make the Constitution better, to make it suit what the Court considers to be our current conditions and the better current sociological thought?"

Whether a particular decision was good or bad, or whether any particular change in the Constitution should have been made is not herein considered. We here are only interested in whose right it is to make changes in meaning in the Constitution.

Writer has never heard of anyone who claims that the authors who wrote the original Constitution, and the people who adopted it, thought they were providing that the Supreme Court could amend the Constitution. If they did, why didn't they say so? Furthermore, in such case, why did they expend so much effort, care, and thought in writing out a full Constitution at all? It would have been much simpler, and equally as effective, to have provided something like this: "There shall be one Supreme Court and its word shall be the Constitution and the supreme law of the land; and such Court may, as and when it sees fit, change or amend such Constitution, in the manner it sees fit, by its word alone."

Can anyone believe that Madison's hand could, in seriousness, have written anything meaning that? Can anyone believe that Washington, Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Franklin, John Adams, and other patriots would have agreed to it? And that grizzled, lean, austere, uncompromising, old Samuel Adams, whose life was so enmeshed with the struggle for freedom that one can hardly think of the one without thinking of the other, would he have agreed to it, or would he have died first?

Who can believe that the people, after revolting and undergoing nearly 8 years of suffering, hardship, and war to get freedom would have adopted such a provision denying them that freedom?

It is certain that that did not happen, and I will waste no more time on whether the Constitution, at the time of its adoption, meant that it could be amended by the Supreme Court. If the Court ever acquired such right, it happened in some other way and later. We will in this discussion, I believe, arrive at a correct conclusion as to whether this happened.

If the Court has the right to change, or amend, a prior interpretation, or construction, that is, an explanation of the meaning of the Constitution, which has become a part of the Constitution, it can also change a part of equal dignity, an express provision of the Constitution. If it can change it to what one person believes is good, it can change it to what another person believes is good, although it may seem bad to the first person. We are all aware that the 13th amendment provides that slavery may not exist in the United States. Does the Court have the right to say (not, will it do so) that such provision is now changed and it means, "Slavery may exist anywhere within the territorial limits of the United States, notwithstanding any objection by any particular State"?

If the judges of the Court can decide what is forward, they can decide that backward is forward, because, if their will is the test, that which is backward and that which is forward depend upon the ideas and whims of the judges of the Court. It may just as well be the reverse of what those who support discretionary power for the Court believe, just as some of its reversals are the reverse of what some other people believe.

But the Constitution is inviolate. It is this inviolability of the Constitution, or what the cases call inviolatus, and not stare decisis, which makes the Constitution invulnerable against changes without constitutional amendment. The Doctrine of inviolatus means that the Court cannot make changes in the meaning of the Constitution because it is sacred as it is. Stare decisis has no application to constitutional construction.

The second reason that the Supreme Court has no such right is that any right of the Court to make such a change would be diametrically opposed to, inconsistent with, the duty of the Court to interpret, to ascertain and to apply the true meaning of the Constitution so as to preserve it inviolate, and to protect it, the only function which the Supreme Court has with respect to the Constitution. Consider this a moment. The Court, as a court, has no choice whatever with respect to the Constitution other than to decide the form, not the meaning, of its interpretations. The meaning has already been set by the Constitution which the Court is interpreting or ascertaining. There are rights under the Constitution in the judges, as citizens, and those rights are no different from those in other individual citizens. But, as a court, its relation to the Constitution is principally that of a duty owed. The duty is to perform a function. That function, as above stated, is to apply the Constitution and to interpret it so as to preserve it, preserving its meaning. The function is commensurate with the duty and extends only as far as the duty extends. Where there is no duty, there is no function to perform. The duty arises in necessity to ascertain and make clear and apply the true meaning of the Constitution, and the function goes no further than the duty and the necessity. The right which is correlative to the Court's duty is in the people and it is to have the Court faithfully interpret the Constitution.

Expressed in another way, the function of the Court to interpret the Constitution is necessary in order for it to perform its duty to apply the true meaning of the Constitution to the facts coming before the Court. Such facts vary. Rarely, if ever, are the facts before the Court in the exact words, or the exact opposite of the words of, the Constitution. Hence the necessity that the Court ascertain, or interpret, the meaning of the Constitution with reference to such facts. This necessity is the only excuse or reason for the Court's construing, that is to say interpreting, the Constitution. The function of the Court arises in and exists only from and to the extent of such duty, and the duty arises in and is dependent upon such necessity. Therefore, the function to interpret the Constitution goes only to the extent of such necessity. Such necessity sets the limits of the function of the Court to interpret.

If there is no such necessity, there is no call for an interpretation, and, therefore, no duty or function to interpret. It is not necessary to misinterpret to interpret. From this it is evident that the Court's duty and function does not extend to misinterpreting, that is changing the meaning of, a provision of the Constitution, for this would be contrary to and would destroy the meaning which the Court is dutybound to ascertain, or interpret, and to apply. The function to interpret the Constitution is the exact opposite to and is inconsistent with any function to misinterpret or to give another meaning to, to change, the Constitution. The Court cannot discharge its duty to apply, to interpret and to protect, preserve and uphold the Constitution by attacking it and destroying it. Therefore the Court has no such function, much less a right, to change, or amend, the Constitution.

The third reason that the Court cannot amend the Constitution, or an interpretation with constitutional status, is because the Constitution positively, and clearly, though not in so many words, prohibits the Supreme Court from doing so. What provision is that?

It is the one directly and affirmatively stating how the Constitution is to be amended. It provides that it can be amended by the people through their representatives. One may say, "Yes, but this is not a statement that the Court can't." Yes, it is, in effect, for consider this:

I am not relying only on the well known rule of construction, "Inclusio unius est exclusio alterius." Such rule is, of course, applicable. But there is a much more compelling and fundamental reason why such right in the people excludes the same right in the Court. This reason is that, if the Court can have such power as a right, then the people cannot, despite the clear and express provisions in the Constitution that they can. If the Court can, by interpreting, change the meaning of a provision or an amendment adopted by the people, the Court can reject such provision or amendment and the people's act would be futile. Hence either the one or the other of such claimed rights must yield. Of course, if such claimed rights conflict and are inconsistent, then the claimed right in the Court would have to cede in view of the clear, direct statement in the Constitution that the people can amend it.

How do they conflict? If the Court, at will, amends, or changes the Constitution, or an interpretation which has become a part thereof, it must be because the Court decides to make a change in its meaning. If the Court can change it because it is bad or wrong or for any other notion of its own, then it is the idea of the judges which limits the right to make the change. If the judges' idea as to what change they want to make is the test, then they could make a change whenever they take a notion to do so; they could do it immediately upon the adoption of an amendment or later when the notion struck them. This would amount to the right of veto over any amendment by the people. Then the right of the people would be ineffective and such right would exist only so long as the judges decided not to veto it. It is clear then that the right of the people to amend would not then exist as a right at all, but only as a matter of sufferance or grace on the part of the judges of the Court. A so-called right that does not exist, except by sufferance or grace of another man or men, is no right. Then the two rights would be antagonistic and the Court's right would be destructive of the people's so-called right. But the Constitution expressly provides that the people have such right and says nothing about the Court's having any such right. Therefore the claimed right of the Court is necessarily denied by the recognition of the inconsistent right in the people. The provision that the people have such right cannot be twisted to mean they cannot.

The Court does have the same right that all its predecessors had—the right to construe, to interpret, that is, to ascertain, the meaning of the Constitution, to reinterpret the meaning of it, or of a prior interpretation, and to respect their own constitutional acts, as many times as may be necessary to apply the meaning of the Constitution to the varying facts which may come before

that Court, but not to change, that is to amend, such meaning.

There are two exceptions, as writer sees it, when a later Court can set aside a prior interpretation: If the interpretation were made through fraud, and if the prior interpretation was wrong in that it did not give a provision the meaning it had when it was adopted. If there were such a cause of fraud, there would have been no interpretation at all and, consequently, such purported interpretation could be ignored by a subsequent Supreme Court. In the second case the Court would not have performed its function to give a provision its true meaning, and the Court cannot intentionally or through mistake change the meaning of a provision of the Constitution. But these exceptions do not authorize the Court to make changes in the meaning of an interpretation for other reasons, certainly not because the Court thinks a provision is "bad" and should not have been adopted by the people, and certainly not because the Court believes that "the better modern sociological thought" has changed and now considers a provision "bad" that was before thought to be "good." Any misinterpretation by a later Court is likewise vulnerable and can be corrected, if the Court does not give a provision the correct meaning it had when it was adopted.

The supporters of discretionary power for the Court do not seem to understand that, when they advocate the Court's having the right, at will, to interpret out of existence prior interpretations, which have reached constitutional status, they are in reality advocating the destruction of the entire process of constitutional interpretation by the Supreme Court and hence the destruction of constitutional government. How does this follow:

If the limitations are removed as to the present Court, they likewise are removed from the next and ensuing Courts. If the prior interpretations mean nothing to this Court, then this Court's interpretations would mean nothing to the next and future Courts. Each Court would be able to interpret the Constitution and prior interpretations as it sees fit, thereby being able to disregard the prior acts of the Court and to interpret them out of existence. The will of the judges would then become the only law. The Constitution, and prior interpretations, including those of all past, present and future Courts, would become surplusage. A Constitution that is surplusage and which cannot furnish a binding rule is no Constitution and might just as well never have been written. As a result of too much power in the Court, the entire constitutional system would have disappeared. A true Constitution is a limitation on the Court. If there is no limitation, there is no Constitution. An interpretation, to be effective as an interpretation, must have binding effect. If it does not have binding effect, then that which has equal dignity, a written provision of the Constitution, would have no binding effect and we would have government by fiat, or order, by the word of a few men, changeable at their discretion. What the discretionary power of a judge means has been considered before. On other occasions I have called to your attention that one such case is that of *State* v. *Cummings*, 36 Mo. 263, in which it is said:

"The discretion of a judge is the law of tyrants; it is always unknown; it is different in different men; it is casual and depends on constitution, temper and passion. At best it is often caprice; in its worst it is every vice, folly and passion to which human nature can be liable."

THE CENTURY OF HUMAN RIGHTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have taken the privilege of calling the attention of the House to some of the public expressions of our Vice President.

I am satisfied that these expressions of Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON are not going unnoticed by the Members of this House, but I feel it important that they be recorded in the RECORD of the Congress since they constitute important parts of the history we are every day living.

Vice President JOHNSON has time and again demonstrated his keen skill in taking the pulse of our history. He is particularly well situated to perform this service, for no other man in government is so privy to the expressions, the moods, the beliefs, and the actions of both the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

Our Vice President is sensitive to the nuances of current events and is in a position to comment on them as they recede from time to time to form the history of our time. His comments on this century as "The Century of Human Rights" are a worthy addition to the records of this day.

THE CENTURY OF HUMAN RIGHTS

(Address by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON upon receiving the B'nai B'rith Human Rights Award, New York City, April 4, 1963)

You do me a very great honor by this award tonight. For deeply personal reasons, it is a most gratifying honor—most gratefully received—and I thank you for it.

In responding to what has been so generously said, I realize that I cannot divorce my personal words from my public station nor can I disregard the public nature of this occasion. But insofar as it is possible, I would like to speak with you as I might do privately.

This century in which we live has been given many names. One predecessor in the office I hold described it eloquently as the "century of the common man." Others have applied different descriptions of both hope and despair. For myself, I feel it may be most accurately and aptly described as the "century of human rights."

It may seem paradoxical to refer to a century which has seen the rise of two of the greatest tyrannies in history—fascism and communism—as the century of human rights. But in the light of historic human behavior, it becomes apparent that there is no paradox whatsoever—in fact, that the rise of these forces is evidence of the growing strength of the cause of equality.

The intense fury with which the totalitarians of both the right and the left deny the concept of human rights is the measure of their realization that their cause is doomed. People who are truly confident, people who truly believe they represent the wave of the future, do not resort to mass denial of age-old religious practices, mass denial of political rights, or mass extermination. These are the weapons of frustration—the last resort of men who know, however loudly they may deny the fact, that they have reached the end of one of the blind alleys of history.

It is difficult for our generation—which has known of Dachau and Warsaw, of the imprisonment of cardinals and the fate of Passover in the Soviet Union—to realize the tremendous advance of the concept of equal rights in the mid-20th century.

A few short decades ago, the thought that all men and women—regardless of race, creed, color or origin—were entitled to equality of treatment was a novel idea.

There was a concept of tolerance, but to far too many people it was a tolerance for "lesser breeds without the law" who were to be treated with kindness and humanity but not with equal regard as fellow human beings.

There are very few thinking men today who regard this kind of tolerance as a virtue, however much it may have contributed at one time to "peaceful" relations. The whole moral drive of the Western World is focused on the concept that we are all children of God—however we may worship our God—and entitled to judgment on our individual merits without regard to irrelevant considerations of ancestry.

This is the true "wave of the future"—the fulfillment of the dreams and hopes of moral men throughout the ages. However much we may fall short of our ideals, we are striving to attain them with an intensity heretofore unknown to history. They have become an accepted part of the fabric of our society. And however vehement may be the forces of bigotry, the fact remains that those forces are on the defensive. They are fighting a losing battle.

That is why I am confident our century—the century of human rights—will be remembered for the legacy it leaves to the future more than for its inheritance from the past.

SEASON OF CHANGE

I would like to speak for these few moments about certain of our special American responsibilities to the greater fulfillment of this century of human rights.

It is abundantly clear that in the course of our Nation's affairs, we have arrived at a season of change in our policies and our relationships with the world—especially the non-Communist world. A period of searching reassessment has begun. However, we lose—and others lose—a necessary and indispensable perspective, when we neglect the fact that this is also a time for reassessment by all nations of the free world community.

All of us together are emerging from a period which has seen history's greatest explosion of political rights. We are also emerging from the early phase of what has been called the explosion of economic aspirations. In a very brief period, new world standards of political equality and equality of economic expectations have been established and we cannot neglect the implications.

We of America welcome what has happened. We are proudly conscious that both the revolution of political independence and the revolution of economic expectations had their beginnings on these shores. We are conscious of special responsibilities to these forces which have reshaped the destinies of so many men. Our national policies since World War II have sought to honor those special responsibilities.

As the authentic revolutionaries of the world, however, we of America must make it clear to those who have chosen freedom that the revolution of freedom is fundamentally and above all else a revolution of human rights.

And we must make it clear not only by words but by example and precept. Our own house must be in order.

HARD DECISIONS

When our system was created, many hard decisions were required. None was harder—none was more revolutionary—than the decision embodied in our Bill of Rights that the Central Government should be prohibited

from serving as the instrument for perpetuation of the prejudices and bias and discrimination of any sect or segment of American society. This decision was—and has continued to be—fundamental to our American unity, fundamental to our American capacity for economic growth, fundamental to the eternal harmony of our society, and fundamental to our capacity for exercising leadership on behalf of freedom beyond our own shores.

We must not acquiesce passively to any concept that the world can enjoy a new freedom while remaining the accomplice and prisoner of old prejudices.

To say this is to point no finger of scorn—nor to cast first stones of criticism. We make for ourselves no claim of national perfection.

But if a better world is to be built—and I am an unreserved optimist about the potentials—there must be a universal recognition that mankind must marshal the full potential of human resources and make full use of those potentials without regard to hereditary bias, prejudice, and discrimination.

If we of America are to rise to our full height as men in this century, we must face courageously the world's problem of human discrimination. We must speak clearly. We must speak in concrete terms. We must help the world to understand that the curing of the problems of discrimination is the beginning—not the end—of genuine freedom.

STEREOTYPES

As long as there have been societies more complex than tribal simplicity, majorities and minorities have relied on stereotypes to mold their opinions of one another. Such stereotypes have been convenient—but they have also been cruel.

We can take some measure of satisfaction from the fact that there is progress and that these stereotypes disappear as human understanding spreads.

For example, the two highest elective offices in the strongest free nation on earth are held today by men who have overcome the dead hand of the stereotype—for reasons of religion or region of birth. And I believe that each passing day will diminish the force of the stereotype for all of us.

As recently as last week when I attended the swearing in of an Ambassador of the United States it was noted in some accounts that I am "from a Southern State." The Ambassador himself was from a Southern State, also. But the accident of my birth became newsworthy, as did his, because I was born in the South of white parents—and he was born of Negro parents.

If to stand by his side and to shake his hand and wish him "Godspeed" make news, then that is news I am proud to make.

HIGHER SIGHTS

I say this to emphasize that the effort made by your national leadership today against discrimination, against bias, against division, and against the tyranny of stereotypes is, above all, an effort directed by men who know personally the enemy—and know his toll.

But, I say this also to suggest that perhaps we of America should consider raising our sights toward larger horizons. Certainly in this field there is much still to accomplish—but what remains undone does not detract from the magnitude of what has been done.

Much of our effort is directed today to the subtle forms of discrimination. This is a necessary and worthwhile effort—and we cannot be content until we have succeeded completely. But when we look to the world as a whole, the problem of discrimination is a massive problem—requiring massive effort on our part.

We cannot be content until we commit ourselves to massive support of the cause of human rights everywhere.

Our American vocabulary is filled with frequent expressions identifying illiteracy, illness, ignorance, and poverty as the oppressors of humankind. I believe we need to complete our vocabulary by acknowledging frankly that the greatest oppressor of all continues to be that of bias and prejudice.

We shall have failed our country and our cause if, from the position we are now privileged to enjoy in the world, we do not undertake the initiative in fulfilling the promise of this 20th century as the "century of human rights."

If we are to be remembered as constructive builders of a better world of peace and justice and freedom we shall be remembered not for the dollars we sent abroad but for the force of the influence and leadership we exercise to improve the lot of all mankind. It is this work that challenges us—it is this undertaking that summons us—it is toward this higher goal that we must lift up our sights and set our course.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WILLIS, for 20 minutes, tomorrow, April 9, 1963.

Mr. HALL (at the request of Mr. BROOMFIELD), for 30 minutes, on Thursday, April 11, 1963.

Mr. SCHADEBERG (at the request of Mr. BROOMFIELD), for 1 hour, on Thursday, April 11, 1963.

Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. BROOMFIELD), for 1 hour, on Thursday, April 11, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. RANDALL.

Mr. CURTIS and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROOMFIELD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. TUPPER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. PURCELL.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 72. An act for the relief of Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 74. An act for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 93. An act for the relief of Flora Romano Torre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 196. An act for the relief of Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 206. An act for the relief of Chang Ah Lung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 213. An act for the relief of Carmelo Schillaci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 215. An act for the relief of Mannor Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 292. An act for the relief of Yoo Chul Soo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 310. An act for the relief of Kaino Hely Auzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 504. An act for the relief of Domenico Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 671. An act for the relief of Mirhan Gazarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 686. An act for the relief of Millie Gail Mesa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 715. An act for the relief of Laszlo Janos Buchwald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 752. An act for the relief of Janos Kardos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 822. An act for the relief of Elvira Ciccotelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 866. An act for the relief of Enrico Petrucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 9, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1962, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submitted the following report for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85-804:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is a report to the Congress pursuant to section 4 of the act of August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 972), submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives pursuant to rule XL of that House.

During the calendar year 1962, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration utilized the authority of the above-cited statute three times:

1. Under date of January 3, 1962, it authorized an adjustment in the amount of $2,976.50 in a contract for documentation services with the National Aeronautic Association, Washington, D.C.

2. Under date of April 2, 1962, it authorized an adjustment of $24,640 in a contract for launching and related services with the Department of Supply, Government of Australia.

3. Under date of June 19, 1962, it authorized an adjustment in the amount of $1,585 in the contract for minor items of electronic equipment with the Vector Manufacturing Co., Southampton, Pa.

Very truly yours,

HUGH L. DRYDEN,
Deputy Administrator.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

653. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia transmitting a draft of a proposed

bill entitled "A bill to authorize the establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

654. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

655. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1932, relating to the control or possession in the District of Columbia of dangerous weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

656. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

657. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, relative to requesting that the pending legislation for authorization of fiscal year 1964 appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission be amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

658. A letter from the president, National Safety Council, transmitting a report of the audit of the financial transactions of the National Safety Council for the year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 259, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

659. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

660. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the automatic-separation provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

661. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to increase the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, from 10 to 20 miles"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

662. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449) as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

663. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 4, 1963, the following bill was reported on April 5, 1963:

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5517. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted April 8, 1963*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 5131. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize State and community youth employment programs; without amendment (Rept. No. 199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 310. Resolution to authorize additional traveling authority for Committee on Banking and Currency; without amendment (Rept. No. 200). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 311. A resolution waiving points of order on H.R. 5517, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 201). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 312. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 5207, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 202). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 313. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 5389, a bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 203). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 4, 1963, the following bill was introduced on April 5, 1963:

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 5517. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

[*Introduced and referred April 8, 1963*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 5518. A bill to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5519. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services Administration to dispose of Ellis Island for educational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 5520. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act so as to provide preference in the awarding of certain Government contracts to contractors in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 5521. A bill to determine the need for a channel from Lanark Village to St. George Sound, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 5522. A bill to protect postal patrons from obscene mail matter and Communist propaganda; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 5523. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5524. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to the determination of unrelated business taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 5525. A bill to provide for a resource and economic development program for the Appalachian Highlands area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 5526. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 65 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 5527. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 5528. A bill to abolish the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and repeal the Arms Control and Disarmament Act; to the Commmittee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 5529. A bill to provide for Federal assistance for the construction and expansion of public community junior colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5530. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.J. Res. 376. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation regarding the feasibility reports required in connection with applications for Federal small projects loans, and requiring such reports only when they are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take favorable action upon a request by the Director of the Bureau of Mines for funds to carry on a mineral resource study; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President

and the Congress of the United States relative to the territorial waters of Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the construction of modern sternramptrawlers for experimental commercial fishing and research; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to congressional action on H.R. 4901 which provides for a flat annual installment rate by employers, repaying Federal loans made to the State for its unemployment compensation program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the immediate cessation of printing of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the defeat of any legislation amending the enabling act so as to permit the State of Arizona to sell school and institutional lands granted to the State by the Federal Government without appraisal and public auction; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relating to Federal taxation and recommending that the Federal excise tax on women's handbags be abolished; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting favorable action on a bill for an act making the pay of the Federal workers at Pearl Harbor Naval Base comparable to that of Federal workers doing the same work in San Francisco Bay area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to requesting the amendment of Federal laws which grant subsidies to any industry so as to require compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to providing for ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, regarding the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation introduced by Senator CLAIBORNE PELL (S. 751) to amend the immigration and nationality laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5531. A bill for the relief of Maria Santina Filomena Tambellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5532. A bill for the relief of Evdokia Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 5533. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lydia Schmidt Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5534. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gerardo L. Yubero, his wife, Luz Fortuny de Lopez, and their two minor children, Gerard Lopez Fortuny, and Fernando Lopez Fortuny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 5535. A bill for the relief of Paul Ching-Szu Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 5536. A bill for the relief of Maria Anotonieta Ribeiro Da Costa Marques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 5537. A bill for the relief of Melbourne B. Siebbles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5538. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Licastri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

82. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Dracut Board of Selectmen, Dracut, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution relative to requesting efforts toward the location of the NASA Space Research Laboratory in the Central Merrimack Valley, which was referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 8, 1963

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

Almighty God, maker of all things, judge of all men: With solemnized hearts and reverent awe we bow at the beginning of this holy week, over whose grim days is the shadow of a cruel instrument of torture. With multitudes under all skies, we have followed the hallowed footsteps of man's Best Man, of love's Best Love, the crystal Christ, as in lowly pomp He rode into His nation's crowded capital. As we gaze on Him, in whose face Thy full glory is revealed, teach us anew the pretense of pride, the hollowness of self-centered ambition, the vanity of might, the deceit of riches, the ashes of fame.

In the set and steadfast countenance of that Servant of all, who rides on to die and to life no grave can hold, may we see anew the royalty of love and the majesty of meekness riding on, as His dreams which enthrall the heart are brought to earth—

"In mart and court and Parliament
The common good increase
'Til men at least shall ring the bells
Of Brotherhood and Peace."

In His spirit and vision we bring our prayer. Amen.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the orders of the Senate of April 4, 1963,

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported favorably, with an amendment, on April 5, 1963, the bill (S. 1) to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs, and submitted a report (No. 111) thereon.

Mr. SIMPSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported favorably, without amendment, on April 5, 1963, the bill (S. 982) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, and submitted a report (No. 112) thereon.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 3, 1963,

Mr. ALLOTT, on April 5, 1963, for himself, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, and Mr. DOMINICK, submitted minority views, and the individual views of Mr. SIMPSON, on the bill (S. 4) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, which were printed.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 4, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5366. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5367. An act to designate the Bear Creek Dam on the Lehigh River, Pa., as the Francis E. Walter Dam.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5366. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 5367. An act to designate the Bear Creek Dam on the Lehigh River, Pa., as the Francis E. Walter Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar was waived.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, by request, I must object to that unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objections? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION ON ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that under date of January 3, 1962, the Administration authorized an adjustment in a contract for documentation services with the National Aeronautic Association, Washington, D.C.; under date of April 2, 1962, the Administration authorized an adjustment in a contract for launching and related services with the Department of Supply, Government of Australia, and under date of June 19, 1962, the Administration authorized an adjustment in the contract for minor items of electronic equipment with the Vector Manufacturing Co., Southampton, Pa.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

IMPROVEMENTS OF FISCAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES IN THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449) as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities (with acompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES COMMITTED IN CONNECTION WITH HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide penalties for certain offenses committed in connection with highway construction (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 15

"Whereas both Houses of the 87th Congress of the United States of America, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which is in words and figures as follows, to wit:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

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

"'"ARTICLE—

"'"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

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

"*Resolved,* That said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is, hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Washington; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the presiding officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Passed the house February 23, 1963.

"WILLIAM S. DAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Passed the senate March 14, 1963.

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

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

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"To the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

"*Resolved,* That we, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, respectfully petition that the Congress of the United States call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following articles as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE—

"'SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in which the people have the right of initiative in the appointment of representation in its legislature.

"'SEC. 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy, relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature in a State in which the people have the right of initiative.

"'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this memorial prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Passed the house March 28, 1963.

"WILLIAM S. DAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Passed the senate March 30, 1963.

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

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 478

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation to amend the immigration and nationality laws. Legislation introduced by Senator CLAIBORNE PELL (S. 751)

"Whereas the birth, growth, strength, and defense of the United States has stemmed from the combination of skills and cultures of people from many nations; and

"Whereas many people from nations all over the world seek entrance to this great Nation in the hope that they may apply their skills and add their cultures to this free society; and

"Whereas the present immigration laws are archaic and arbitrary and are not in keeping with the American philosophy of the equality of man; and

"Whereas S. 751, a bill to amend the immigration and nationality laws, introduced by Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, grants more equality to all deserving potential immigrants and proportionately and categorically presents a fair system of immigration; and

"Whereas the provisions providing for pioneer immigrants will strengthen the immigration system and enrich the American economic system; and

"Whereas this bill which is in keeping with the principles advocated by Jefferson and Lincoln, strengthens the democratic cause around the world and leaves the United States in a better light since it will grant a fair share and equal rights immigration law that is in line with the true principles of a free society: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the general assembly place itself on record as respectfully requesting the Congress of the United States to enact into law S. 751, an act in amendment of the immigration and nationality laws (the Pell Act); and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state prepare certified copies of this resolution and send them to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate in the U.S. Congress, the majority and minority leaders of both Houses, the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and the members of the Rhode Island delegation in the Congress."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That the General Assembly of the State of Missouri respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a Convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE—

" 'SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

" 'SEC. 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy, relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it has been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; and be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress has proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a Convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That the General Assembly of the State of Missouri respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE—

" 'SECTION 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" ' "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

" ' "SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it has been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission" '; and be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress has proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO PROPOSED INCREASES IN RATES CHARGED BY SOUTHERN CARRIERS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the appropriate place in the RECORD a joint resolution by the Vermont Legislature with respect to proposed increases in truck rates charged by southern carriers. This relates to the proposal to institute highly discriminatory truck rates between certain Southern States and the States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. This proposal is also opposed before the Interstate Commerce Commission by the North Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association, Inc., the South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association, Inc., and the traffic department with headquarters at Atlanta, Ga., representing several hundred textile mills.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point excerpts from a brief filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Under the rules, the resolution will be received and printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the excerpts referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO PROPOSED INCREASES IN RATES CHARGED BY SOUTHERN CARRIERS

Whereas the Southern Motor Carriers Conference proposes to increase less-than-truck rates by 15 percent into Vermont, and truckload and volume rates by 6 percent on finished and unfinished textile products, effective April 15, 1963; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has set a deadline of April 3, 1963, for the receipt of protests to the proposed increase; and

Whereas this proposed increase is discriminatory against Vermont interest; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont hereby registers its protest to such proposed increase and requests that the Interstate Commerce Commission Board of Suspension suspend the proposed increase for the entire period provided by law pending investigation by the Commission into the facts relating thereto; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and hereby is instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Hon. George D. Aiken, Hon. Winston L. Prouty, and Hon. Robert T. Stafford; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and hereby is instructed to send a telegram to the Secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission, advising of the adoption of this resolution of protest.

Approved April 2, 1963.

The excerpts presented by Mr. AIKEN are as follows:

In addition to the violation of section 216(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act by providing rates prima facie higher than maximum reasonable on certain descriptions of traffic, obvious violations of section 216(d) also would result in that:

(a) The protested rates higher than the classification basis on textile products, as illustrated by appendix B, would create unjust discrimination and undue prejudice against this description of traffic.

(b) The discriminations and prejudice against localities are obvious from the fact that the increases apply only on shipments to or from points in the three States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. These States are a portion of New England territory and a smaller portion of eastern territory and no justification appears for imposing upon shippers or receivers of freight in those three States a special discrimination and disadvantage in the amount of charges required to be paid for transportation of shipments to and from the Southern States.

The application of the protested increases is not dependent upon ratemaking distances. This is also illustrated by appendix B. For example, between Danville, Va., and Bennington, Vt., for a ratemaking distance of only 626 miles, the increases would apply whereas from Atlanta, Ga., to Massena, N.Y., for a distance of 1154 miles, almost twice as great, the increases would not apply.

The selection of certain States for application of the increases produces higher rates for similar distances dependent solely upon whether the origins or destinations are in a particular State. For example, from Greenville, S.C., to Bennington, Vt., distance 825 miles, the present rate on finished cotton piece goods, less truckload, is $2.79 per 100 pounds, which is 1 cent lower than the $2.80 per-100-pound-rate from Greenville, S.C., to Massena, N.Y., for 1013 miles or 138 miles greater distance. The increased rate of $3.21 to Bennington is 41 cents higher than to the 138 miles more distant point of Massena, and it is 61 cents higher than the rate of $2.60 to Newburyport, Mass., for 104 miles greater distance.

This controvenes the basic principle and purposes of the act to protect the public interest and prohibit restrictions against the freedom of movement of commerce between all States in the Nation at just and reasonable rates without unjust discriminations, undue preference, or prejudice.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

S. 18. A bill to change the name of Harpers Ferry National Monument to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park (Rept. No. 114); and

S. 932. A bill relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police (Rept. No. 113).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 386. A bill to consolidate Vicksburg National Military Park and to provide for certain adjustments necessitated by the installation of a park tour road, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115).

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 138. A bill to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116).

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

S. 2. A bill to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research (Rept. No. 117).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CHURCH):

S. 1279. A bill to amend title 30, United States Code, relating to the exploration program for discovery of new minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1280. A bill to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1281. A bill to establish an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government authorized to conduct the elections of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

RESOLUTIONS

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXXIII, TO PROVIDE FOR REPORT AND QUESTION PERIODS

Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCGEE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. METCALF) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 120) to amend rule XXXIII to provide for report and question periods, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT AND HEARINGS ON "STATE DEPARTMENT SECURITY"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 121) authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of a report and hearings on "State Department Security" issued by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the 87th Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary eight thousand additional copies of the report (committee print) of its Internal Security Subcommittee of the Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, entitled "State Department Security"; five thousand copies each of part 1 ("The William Wieland Case"), part 2 ("The Office of Security"), part 3 ("The New Passport Regulations"), part 4 ("Testimony of Elmer Hipsley, Otto Otepka, John Leahy, Roger Jones, Scott McLeod, Andreas Lowenfeld"), and part 5 ("Testimony of William Wieland") of the subcommittee's hearings of the Eighty-seventh Congress on "State Department Security"; and five thousand additional copies of part 13 of the subcommittee's hearings of the Eighty-seventh Congress on "Communist Threat to the United States Through the Caribbean."

U.S. MINERS DESERVE AND NEED HELP

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a good businessman keeps an inventory. When a certain item is sold out or is in need of replenishment, the good businessman reorders the stock. The procedure is routine.

I suggest that the Federal Government would be wise to follow a similar inventory procedure in meeting its metals and minerals needs. This Nation confronts an increasingly perilous situation because of its growing dependence upon foreign sources for its metals and minerals, even as its own mineral resources have yet to be explored fully.

How can we correct this cart-before-the-horse approach?

One remedy, of course, is to learn the extent of our minerals reserves. Mining today is not the relatively simple business of 1890. The day of the prospector accompanied by his mule discovering a multimillion-dollar gold vein in the mountains of Colorado is passé. Mining in the 1960's is complicated and expensive.

The Congress of the United States has taken some remedial action to meet the new needs of this new era. Public Law 701 of the 85th Congress established the Office of Minerals Exploration in the Department of the Interior. The funding, although modest, has been helpful, and the work of the staff of the Office of Minerals Exploration is increasing.

I have discussed the program with its director, and, in response to my questions, Mr. George Fumich told me that he and his staff anticipate receiving more valid exploration fund requests than they can fill in fiscal year 1964 under the Office's proposed budget request.

His testimony before congressional committees this year on behalf of the OME fiscal year 1964 budget request includes reference to the growing number of requests for funding. The OME staff has worked to prevent a waste of funds on projects. A portion of the budget is used for professional assistance and technical guidance for applicants because OME deals with small firms and individuals who need and request such aid.

To facilitate better understanding of the program let me quote Mr. Fumich directly:

> Briefly stated, the OME offers financial assistance to firms and individuals who wish to explore their properties for one or more of 35 mineral commodities. This help is offered to applicants who ordinarily would not undertake the exploration under present conditions or circumstances at their sole expense and who are unable to obtain funds from commercial sources on reasonable terms.
>
> We contract with an eligible applicant to pay one-half of the cost of approved exploration work. The applicant pays the rest. The Government participation in a single contract cannot exceed $250,000. Interest, at rates which have ranged from 5¾ to 6½ percent, is charged from the time funds are made available.
>
> Funds contributed by the Government are repaid by a 5-percent royalty on production from the property. If nothing is produced, there is no obligation to repay. Royalty is paid on any production during the period in which work is being done under the contract; and if the Government certifies that production may be possible from the property, the royalty obligation continues until the Government's contribution is repaid with interest, or for the 10-year period usually specified in the contract.

Mr. President, under such a program, the Federal investment need not be a contribution, and I am confident that the miner would prefer to make repayment.

The Office of Minerals Exploration program is providing our ailing mining industry with some tools which to a limited degree have and will bolster the industry.

It is educational to see how the program has developed. Overfunded by the Congress initially, before OME could learn what its real role was to be, the Office barely touched the fiscal year 1959 appropriation of $4 million, obligating slightly more than $90,000. The obligated sum has increased and in March of this year OME had contracted for $612,000 of its $750,000 appropriation and had under investigation requests which would use the funding remaining—and more.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this time a copy of Public Law 85-701 and a table

showing the development by year of the OME program.

There being no objection, the public law and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 85-701, 85TH CONGRESS, S. 3817, AUGUST 21, 1958, 72 STAT. 700

An Act to provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its Territories, and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes

MINERALS EXPLORATION

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is declared to be the policy of the Congress to stimulate exploration for minerals within the United States, its Territories and possessions.

SECTION. 1. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed, in order to provide for discovery of additional domestic mineral reserves, to establish and maintain a program for exploration by private industry within the United States, its Territories and possessions for such minerals, excluding organic fuels, as he shall from time to time designate, and to provide Federal financial assistance on a participating basis for that purpose.

EXPLORATION CONTRACTS—INTEREST RATES

SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, and subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to enter into exploration contracts with individuals, partnerships, corporations, or other legal entities which shall provide for such Federal financial participation as he deems in the national interest. Such contracts shall contain terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate, including terms and conditions for the repayment of the Federal funds made available under any contract together with interest thereon, as a royalty on the value of the production from the area described in the contract. Interest shall be calculated from the date of the loan. Such interest shall be at rates which (1) are not less than the rates of interest which the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the Department of the Interior would have to pay if it borrowed such funds from the Treasury of the United States, taking into consideration current average yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with maturities comparable to the terms of the particular contracts involved and (2) plus 2 per centum per annum in lieu of recovering the cost of administering the particular contracts.

ROYALTY PAYMENTS—CERTIFICATION—AGREEMENTS

(b) Royalty payments received under paragraph (a) of this section shall be covered into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

(c) When in the opinion of the Secretary an analysis and evaluation of the results of the exploration project disclose that mineral production from the area covered by the contract may be possible he shall so certify within the time specified in the contract. Upon certification, payment of royalties shall be a charge against production for the full period specified in the contract or until the obligation has been discharged, but in no event shall such royalty payments continue for a period of more than twenty-five years from the date of contract. When the Secretary determines not to certify he shall promptly notify the contractor. When the Secretary deems it necessary and in the public interest, he may enter into royalty agreements to provide for royalty payments in the same manner as though the project had been certified.

(d) No provision of this Act, nor any rule or regulation which may be issued by the Secretary shall be construed to require any production from the area described in the contract.

ADJUSTMENT OF CONTRACT

(e) The Secretary shall establish and promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the puposes of this Act: *Provided, however,* That he may modify and adjust the terms and conditions of any contract to reduce the amount and term of any royalty payment when he shall determine that such action is necessary and in the public interest: *Provided further,* That no such single contract shall authorize Government participation in excess of $250,000.

(f) No funds shall be made available under this Act unless the applicant shall furnish evidence that funds from commercial sources are unavailable on reasonable terms.

EXPLORATION

SEC. 3. As used in this Act, the term "exploration" means the search for new or unexplored deposits of minerals, including related development work, within the United States, its Territories and possessions, whether conducted from the surface or underground, using recognized and sound procedures including standard geophysical and geochemical methods for obtaining mineralogical and geological information.

ADVISORY SERVICES

SEC. 4. Departments and agencies of the Government are hereby authorized to advise and assist the Secretary of the Interior, upon his request, in carrying out the provisions of this Act and may expend their funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, in accordance with such agreements as may be necessary.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to present to the Congress, through the President, on March 1 and September 1 of each year, a report containing a review and evaluation of the operations of the programs authorized in this Act, together with his recommendations regarding the need for the continuation of the programs and such amendments to this Act as he deems to be desirable.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, from any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Approved August 21, 1958.

Office of Minerals Exploration program development

Fiscal year	OME budget request	Bureau of budget allowances	Appropriated by Congress	OME contractual obligations	Fund carry-over
	Millions	*Millions*			
1959	$5.0		$4,000,000	$90,295	
1960	6.0	$1.5	1,100,000	275,000	
1961	1.5	1.1	550,000	220,000	$304,000
1962	1.5	1.0	750,000	726,325	197,632
1963	1.5	1.0	750,000	[1] 612,000	
1964	1.0	.9			

[1] To date.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the men who have worked with the program these past 5 years speak of its worth. When I asked them if the interest rate had been found too high—it is 6 percent or more—they admitted that the small operator time and again had found it so. When I asked as to the limitation of $250,000 for a single contract limitation, in view of the expense of mining, they told me the limitation was too low considering that exploration for gold, for example, may require work far below the surface of the earth. I asked why no language in the public law made specific reference to air exploration—since so much of our initial minerals exploration work comes with air overflights.

Air exploration gives the 20th century prospector 20th century methods. Through the use of the magnetometer he may measure the intensity and direction of magnetic forces, thereby locating anomalies having deposits of iron and other minerals. Large magnetometers are carried in airplanes, but smaller magnetometers may be carried for ground exploration. Air exploration with a refined Geiger counter, the syntometer, helped prospectors locate uranium deposits in Wyoming. And air exploration includes the taking of aerial photographs for geological mapping. These are but a few of the refinements which are modernizing mining today.

But this type of exploration must be specified in the public law.

Likewise there appeared to be need for amending legislation which would make possible Federal financial assistance for the development of domestic ores as well as language which would authorize technical assistance for exploration and development of mineral deposits and in their utilization.

I am, therefore, introducing today on behalf of myself, my colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] five amendments to Public Law 85-701.

Enactment of this proposed legislation would aid our ailing mining industry. It would help the operator who is confronted with a fixed price for his product and a continually increasing cost of production.

The miner today has to find higher grade ore. He must also find a means to reduce his cost. The Federal Government can help lick its growing dependence upon foreign sources for its metals and minerals by sharing the risk and cost, thereby stimulating exploration and, hopefully, increasing production.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments proposed and an explanation of each be printed in the RECORD at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1279) to amend title 30, United States Code, relating to the exploration program for discovery of new

minerals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 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 title 30, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 642(a) is amended as follows: In the last line after the word "contracts" delete the period, insert a colon, and insert the following: *"Provided,* That in no event shall the interest rate exceed 4½ per centum."

(2) Section 642(e) is amended as follows: In the last line after the word "of" delete the figure "$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$500,000."

(3) Section 643 is amended as follows: In line 2 after the word "or" delete the word "unexplored" and insert in lieu thereof the word "additional," and in line 5 after the word "the" insert the word "air" and a comma.

(4) Sections 644 through 646, inclusive, are renumbered as section 646 through 648, respectively.

(5) Add a new section 644 as follows:

"SEC. 644(a). The Secretary is hereby authorized and empowered to provide Federal financial assistance to individuals, partnerships, corporations, and other legal entities for the development of domestic ores.

"(b) In order to carry out the purposes of this section, and subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with individuals, partnerships, corporations, or other legal entities that shall provide for such Federal financial assistance as he deems in the national interest. These agreements shall contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate, including terms and conditions for repayment, together with interest, of the Federal funds made available under any agreement. Interest shall be calculated at a rate determined by the Secretary from the date that Federal funds are made available."

(6) Add a new section 645 as follows:

"SEC. 645. The Secretary is hereby authorized to provide technical information and assistance which would be useful in stimulating the exploration and development of mineral deposits and in their utilization."

(7) The redesignated section 647 is amended as follows: In line 2 after the first comma, delete the words "through the President,"; after the word "on" delete the words "March 1 and"; and in line 3 after the comma delete the letter "a" and insert in lieu thereof the words "an annual".

The explanation presented by Mr. GRUENING is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 85-701 INTENDED TO BE PROPOSED BY SENATOR GRUENING

Enactment of this legislation would be especially beneficial to the operator who is faced with a fixed price for his product and a continually increasing cost of production. He must find higher grade ore and also find means to reduce his cost. By sharing in the risk and cost of finding and developing mineral deposits the Government stimulates exploration and increased production thereby aiding depressed mining areas.

The proposed legislation would aid the miner by:

1. Placing a ceiling of 4½ percent on the interest rate he would pay on Government funds granted him for exploration. The present high rate of 6 percent or more is a psychological roadblock to the small operator and a burden on long-range projects.

2. Raising the single contract limitation from $250,000 to $500,000. The present limitation is not responsive to modern-day methods. Most of the surface gold deposits, for example, have been worked out. The great majority of new gold deposits of significant size will be deep below the surface and require expensive, high-cost exploration projects.

3. Redefining exploration to give clear authority for exploration by air. This would enable the Government to participate more fully in modern methods of exploration.

4. Authorizing Federal financial assistance for the development of domestic ores. This would be especially helpful to the small operator who needs some assistance to get into production or maintain his production but is unable to obtain the required funds from banks or other Government agencies.

5. Authorizing technical assistance for exploration and development of mineral deposits and in their utilization. This would enable technical assistance to be extended to the small operator who needs such assistance in finding higher grade deposits, developing his ore deposits, lowering his operating costs, beneficiating his ore, and producing a marketable product.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, perhaps some of the Members of this body read as I did in Sunday's edition of the Washington Post and Times-Herald that the domestic chrome market was becoming increasingly depressed as other producers dumped their chrome on the world market in what would appear to be a direct attempt to break the market.

This attack is injurious to democracy. It cannot be longer ignored. Our mining industry can meet any challenge if we give it a chance.

The bill I am introducing today is designed to help give that chance.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we of the Western States deeply appreciate the efforts which the distinguished Senator from Alaska has made, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Minerals of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on behalf of the advancement of the interests of the mining industry. All of us know of the serious problems confronting the mining industry and of the need for effective legislation in this field. I am pleased to say that the Senator from Alaska brings to this whole problem new and vigorous leadership and a determination to get something done. For this, we are thankful.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho. He has always been an advocate of an enlightened and progressive policy, not only with respect to our mining resources, but for all the resources of the West—indeed, of the whole Nation.

I think it is time we looked into this problem searchingly and seriously and came up with some constructive proposals that will take this great industry, mining, which once was so promising and productive, from its present doldrums.

I thank the Senator from Idaho for his unfaltering, helpful encouragement.

AGENCY IN LEGISLATIVE BRANCH TO CONDUCT ELECTIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would create an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government designed to insure that the right of all citizens to vote for Members of Congress shall be adequately protected.

Congress recently has given the executive branch additional enforcement tools to protect the rights of American citizens to participate in all Federal elections. These are contained in the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. The President, in his message to the Congress on February 28, outlined further amendments which the administration believes will be helpful in meeting continuing pockets of resistance to the full exercise of the right of franchise.

While all of this is progress, Congress has an additional responsibility that goes quite directly to the election of its own Members—to the problem of assuring full citizen rights in the election of the Members of Congress. The proposed act would give Congress the machinery to meet this problem, one which is and should be of special concern to the legislative branch of our National Government.

The Constitution, under article I, section 4, and under the 15th amendment, authorizes the Congress to make regulations as to the time, place, and "manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives or to alter regulations prescribed by the State legislatures for such purposes, except as to the place of choosing Senators."

The Federal judiciary cannot be expected to bear the full burden of litigating the dilatory actions of innumerable local registration officials intent on frustrating the desires of eligible voters.

This problem is the active election-by-election responsibility of the Congress, placed on the Congress by the Constitution, to insure the right to vote in each Federal election.

Nor is this a matter of States rights. The States have only that authority in this field of congressional elections expressly given them by the Congress. The Congress itself has the duty to see to it that those who sit as its Members are elected by all the people. The buck on this issue stops here.

There is a long history of widespread and flagrant denials of the right to vote. The record of the hearings held by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee over the years tells the story. Further, the hearings held by the Commission on Civil Rights, expressly established by the Congress to look into voting practices, emphasizes the need for congressional action.

The proposal I make to establish a Congressional Elections Commission as an arm of the Congress, is, as far as I know, a unique one. I first introduced it in 1959. The virtue of the bill I now introduce lies in the fact that it establishes a continuing agency of the Congress itself, designed to insure that registration and election procedures shall be reasonable, fair, and equally available to all our citizens. It can perform the same service for the Congress in the vital area of its elections which the Government Accounting Office, another agency of the legislative branch, does in matters involving the public purse.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with a summary of its provisions, be printed with my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1281) to establish an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government authorized to conduct the elections of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Congressional Elections Act".

TITLE I—STATEMENT OF PURPOSE: DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. Taking cognizance of the fact that, although ninety-three years have passed since the fifteenth amendment was adopted, American citizens otherwise qualified to vote continue to be denied that right because of their race or color, and that qualified voters are thus arbitrarily and discriminatorily being denied the right to cast a vote for the selection and election of their representatives in the Senate and the House of Representatives; and recognizing the authority and the obligation of the Congress under the fifteenth amendment, and more particularly under article I, section 4, to assure that Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives are nominated and elected in a manner and pursuant to procedures which best assure that every qualified elector is afforded full opportunity to cast his vote, the Congress hereby determines that it is necessary, in order to assure to all qualified electors the opportunity to participate in the selection and election of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, that Congress establish an agency to conduct registration and voting in the primary, special, and general elections at which nominees to the Senate and the House of Representatives are elected.

SEC. 102. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Commission" means the Congressional Elections Commission established by this Act.

(b) The term "special or general election" means any special or general election in any State or congressional district for the purpose of electing Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

(c) The term "primary election" means any election, whether by convention, meeting, popular primary, or otherwise, in any State or congressional district for the purpose of choosing party nominees as candidates for the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States.

TITLE II—ESTABISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS COMMISSION

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established, as an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, a Congressional Elections Commission, as an authority to conduct primary, special, and general elections for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two of the members shall belong to the same political party. The President is requested in appointing members to provide, insofar as possible, representation for the various geographical areas of the United States.

(c) Each member of the Commission shall be appointed for a term of nine years, except that—

(1) the three members first appointed shall be appointed for terms expiring respectively on December 31, 1965; December 31, 1968; and December 31, 1971; and

(2) a person appointed to fill a vacancy in the Commission occurring by reason of the death, disability, resignation, or removal of a member before the expiration of his term shall be appointed to serve for the remainder of such term.

(d) The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission as Chairman and one as Vice Chairman. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the absence or disability of the Chairman or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Chairman.

(e) Subject to the provisions of subsection (f), a vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall not affect its powers.

(f) Two members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum thereof.

SEC. 202. Each member of the Commission, other than the Chairman, shall receive compensation at a rate of $20,000 per year. The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at a rate of $20,500 per year.

TITLE III—REGISTRATION OF VOTERS BY THE COMMISSION

SEC. 301. The Commission is authorized to make and maintain temporary and permanent registers of voters qualified to participate in primary, special, and general elections in the various congressional districts. The Commission's making and maintenance of such registers of voters shall be in its discretion and it shall not be necessary, for the making and maintenance of such registers in any congressional district, for the Commission to have first determined to hold an election therein pursuant to title IV of this Act.

SEC. 302. No person shall be registered as a voter under section 301 who does not have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State in which the congressional district is situated. The Commission shall establish adequate procedures to assure that all persons placed upon its registers as qualified voters continue to have the residence and other qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State in which the congressional district is situated.

SEC. 303. No State or local laws or ordinance governing the time, place, or manner of the registration of voters shall be applicable to or limit the power of the Commission to conduct registrations of voters pursuant to this title, but the Commission shall endeavor as far as in its judgment is conducive to uniform and orderly election procedures, to conform its conduct of the registration of voters to the procedures governing time, place, and manner of registration, prescribed in the State or local laws or ordinances in effect in the congressional district.

TITLE IV—CONDUCT OF ELECTIONS BY THE COMMISSION

SEC. 401. The Commission is authorized in any congressional district to conduct the primary, special, or general elections for the purpose of selecting and electing Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives whenever—

(1) the Commission is officially requested so to do by the duly empowered official of the State in which the congressional district is situated; or

(2) the Commission determines that unless such election is conducted by the Commission, persons having the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State in which the congressional district is located are likely to be denied their right in such primary, special, or general election to cast their votes and to have them fairly counted.

SEC. 402. Whenever the Commission conducts a primary, special, or general election, such election shall be the sole primary, special, or general election for the congressional district for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the results thereof shall, in any primary election, determine the authorized nominees, and in any special or general election, determine the duly elected Member of the House of Representatives, and the official vote of such congressional district for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives at large.

SEC. 403. No person shall cast a vote in an election conducted pursuant to section 401 unless (a) he has been found by the Commission, pursuant to title III foregoing, to have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State in which the congressional district is situated, or (b) he is registered on a State registration list, which the Commission determines to be appropriate for utilization in the election conducted by it, as a person having the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State in which the congressional district is situated.

SEC. 404. The Commission shall, immediately upon determining to conduct an election pursuant to the authority contained in section 401 (a) or (b), give notice of such determination to the Governor of the State concerned.

SEC. 405. No State or local laws or ordinances governing the time, place, and manner of conducting elections shall be applicable to, or limit the power of, the Commission to conduct elections pursuant to this title, but the Commission shall endeavor, as far as in its judgment is conducive to uniform and orderly election procedures, to conform its conduct of elections to the standards of time, place, and manner prescribed in State or local laws or ordinances in effect in the congressional district.

TITLE V—CERTIFICATION OF RESULTS

SEC. 501. The Commission shall, upon the determination of the results of any primary, special, or general election conducted pursuant to title IV, certify the results of such election to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Senate, to the Governor of the State in which the election was conducted, and to other appropriate persons. Such a certification shall constitute the binding and conclusive determination of the results of the election.

TITLE VI—DELEGATION OF POWERS

SEC. 601. The Commission is authorized to delegate to any appropriate officer or officers of a State or local government, or to any agent, employee, or designee of the Commission, any or all of the powers granted by this Act, with the exception of the authority granted pursuant to section 301 to determine whether or not to make and maintain registers of voters in any congressional district, and the authority granted pursuant to section 401 to determine whether or not to conduct an election thereunder, which determinations shall be made only by a quorum of the Commission itself.

TITLE VII—JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 701. Any citizen of a State, having the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature, who has made appropriate application for inclusion upon a register of qualified electors maintained by the Commission for the congressional district in which he is a resident, who is denied such registration or who, having once been so registered, is removed from

such register or denied the opportunity to vote in a primary, special, or general election conducted by the Commission in such congressional district, shall have an action for declaratory and injunctive relief in the United States district court for such district.

TITLE VIII—PERFORMANCE OF COMMISSION FUNCTIONS

SEC. 801. The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to enable it to perform its functions and duties.

SEC. 802. In carrying out its functions the Commission is authorized to utilize on a temporary basis employees of the departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government. Each department and agency of the executive branch of the Government shall fully cooperate with the Commission to the end that it may effectively carry out its functions and duties and shall, at the request of the President, assign on a temporary basis employees of such department or agency to the Commission.

SEC. 803. In carrying out its functions the Commission is authorized to utilize the services of State and local governmental officers and employees and the facilities of State and local governments. The Commission is authorized to reimburse any State or local officer or employee whose services are utilized under the authority of this section for travel expenses incurred, and to pay to any such officer or employee per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same amounts as authorized by law for persons in the Government service serving without compensation. The Commission is authorized to reimburse any State or local government for the services of any officer or employee of such government, and for the facilities of such government, utilized under the authority of this section.

SEC. 804. (a) In carrying out its functions and duties, the Commission may sit and act at such times and places, hold such hearings, take such testimony, administer such oaths, require the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, or other written matter, procure such printing and binding, and make such expenditures as the Commission deems advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission. Subpenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses or for the production of written matter may be issued over the signature of the Chairman, or any member designated by him, and may be issued by any person designated by the Chairman or by such member.

(b) A witness attending any session of the Commission shall receive $4 for each day's attendance and for the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the same, and 8 cents per mile for going from and returning to his place of residence. Witnesses who attend at points so far removed from their respective residences as to prohibit return thereto from day to day shall be entitled to an additional allowance of $12 per day for expenses of subsistence, including the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the place of attendance. Mileage payments shall be tendered to the witness upon service of a subpena issued on behalf of the Commission.

(c) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued on behalf of the Commission, any district court of the United States or the United States court of any possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which the person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

SEC. 805. The Commission may promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, as it deems necessary or desirable for the performance of its functions and duties under this Act.

SEC. 806. The Commission shall, on or before January 31 of each year, submit to the Congress a report of its activities under this Act, together with any recommendations for suggested legislation which it finds desirable.

SEC. 807. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 808. No provision of law contained in section 5 of the Act entitled, "An Act for the Apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Census", approved August 8, 1911; section 26 of the Revised Statutes; and section 27 of the Revised Statutes, which is inconsistent with this Act, shall be applicable to elections conducted under this Act.

The analysis presented by Mr. HART is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS COMMISSION BILL INTRODUCED BY SENATOR PHILIP A. HART

It is the purpose of the Congressional Elections Act to establish an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government with authority to conduct the elections of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

TITLE I

Title I states that because of the continuing denial to American citizens, on grounds of their race or color, of their right to vote, particularly to vote in the election of Representatives and Senators, recognizing the authority of Congress under the 15th amendment and under article I, section 4 of the Constitution to assure fullest participation of qualified electors in congressional elections, the Congress determines it necessary to establish an agency to conduct registration and voting in the primary, special and general elections at which Representatives and Senators are elected.

TITLE II

Title II establishes the Congressional Elections Commission as an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government authorized to conduct primary, special and general elections for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Commission is composed of three members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, Commissioners to be appointed for a term of 9 years.

TITLE III

Title III authorizes the Commission to make and maintain registers of voters in various congressional districts who are qualified to participate in primary, special and general elections of Members of the Senate and House of Representatives. The Commission may maintain registration lists in various congressional districts whether or not it has determined to run an election in the district. It is also provided that no person can become or stay registered on the Commission's lists who does not have the qualifications for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. It is also provided that State and local laws and ordinances covering the time, place or manner of registration are not applicable to registrations conducted by the Commission, but the Commission is instructed to conform its conduct of registration as far as possible to the procedures in effect under State or local laws.

TITLE IV

Title IV authorizes the Commission to conduct primary, special or general elections in any congressional district for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives either when (1) the Commission is officially requested so to do by the State in which the district is located, or (2) the Commission determines that unless it conducts such an election, qualified voters are likely to be denied their right in such a primary, special or general election to cast their votes and have them fairly counted. Whenever the Commission conducts a primary, special or general election that shall be the sole primary, special or general election in the congressional district for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the results thereof shall determine the party nominees, the elected Members of the House of Representatives and the official vote of the congressional district for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives at large. No person may vote in an election conducted by the Commission unless he has either been registered under title III by the Commission or he is registered on a State registration list determined by the Commission to be appropriate for use in its own elections. The Commission, if it decides to conduct an election, shall immediately notify the Governor of the State.

TITLE V

Title V provides for the certification of results of election by the Commission to the Speaker of the House, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Governor of the State, and that such certification constitutes the binding and conclusive determination of the results of the primary, special or general election.

TITLE VI

Title VI authorizes the Commission to delegate to its own agents and employees or to appropriate officials of the State and local governments any of the powers provided by the act with the exception of the authority of the Commission to determine whether or not to maintain registers of voters or to conduct an election in any particular congressional district which powers shall be exercised only by the Commission itself.

TITLE VII

Title VII authorizes suits for declaratory and injunctive relief in the U.S. district court by any citizen qualified to vote who has applied for registration by the Commission and is denied it or after being granted registration is removed from the registry or is denied opportunity to vote in an election conducted by the Commission.

TITLE VIII

Title VIII contains miscellaneous provisions concerning the compensation of agents and employees of the Commission as well as officials of the State to whom Commission functions may be delegated; provisions for the taking of testimony by the Commission; attendance of witnesses; refusals to testify; promulgation of the Commission rules and regulations; reports to the Congress; and amendment of prior laws.

Mr. HART. Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the table until the end of business on Wednesday, April 10, so that Senators who might wish to join in sponsoring it will have an opportunity to do so.

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

REPORT AND QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to amend the rules so as to make

it possible to invite heads of departments and independent agencies to report and answer questions on the floor of the Senate. I ask that the resolution be held at the desk for 5 days, to enable other Senators to join in sponsoring it.

When I was a Member of the other body, I suggested that a similar procedure be adopted there; and that suggestion was very favorably received. At that time, more than 350 daily newspapers commented editorially on this suggestion, and all referred approvingly to it. A survey of the Gallup poll showed that 72 percent of those interviewed were favorable to the proposal, and only 7 percent were opposed. In addition, a poll throughout the country of leading citizens, political scientists, and men with governmental experience resulted in a virtually unanimous approval of this idea.

I think the report and question period would be even better suited to the Senate than it would be to the other body, because of the smaller membership and more intimate atmosphere of the Senate.

The resolution would allow the Rules Committee to provide for a report and question period on the floor of the Senate at least once every 4 weeks, but not more often than once a week. The sessions would not last more than 2 hours.

During the first half of the report and question period, members of the Cabinet or the heads of agencies would be invited to appear on the floor of the Senate and to answer written questions, which would have been prepared and submitted to them in advance. The last half of the question period would be taken up by questions by Members from the floor of the Senate, with the time to be allocated by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee.

I believe that much good would result if administrators were brought face to face with representatives of the people under an ordinary procedure, in order that the country might have the benefit of free and open consultation between them.

As a result, we in the Senate would have the benefit of a regular accounting from the heads of the departments as to how they are administering and interpreting the laws we pass. This would bring about better teamwork between the Congress and the executive departments, and would foster better public understanding of both.

It would also give the Senate a fresh source of initiative in governmental matters, and would give Members of the Senate direct and fuller information with regard to the operation of all departments—not just those supervised by their committees. It would also give the Cabinet members a chance to give their proposals directly to all Members of the Senate.

I am pleased that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] have joined with me as cosponsors of this resolution.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 120) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXXIII of the Rules of the Senate be amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"There shall be held in the Senate immediately following the reading of the Journal on at least 1 day in each period of 4 calendar weeks, but not oftener than 1 day in any 1 calendar week, a 'report-and-question period,' which shall not consume more than 2 hours, during which heads of departments, agencies, and independent establishments in the executive branch of the Government are requested to answer orally written and oral questions propounded by Members of the Senate. Each written question shall be submitted in triplicate to the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such question, and, if approved by such committee, one copy shall be transmitted to the head of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, with an invitation to appear before the Senate, and one copy to the Committee on Rules and Administration with a request for allotment of time in a report-and-question period to answer such question. Subject to the limitations prescribed in this paragraph, the Committee on Rules and Administration shall determine the date for, and the length of time of, each report-and-question period, and shall allot the time in each period to the head of a department, agency, or independent establishment who has indicated his readiness to deliver oral answers to the questions transmitted to him. All written questions to be propounded in any one period shall be approved by one committee. With the consent of the committee which has approved the written questions to be propounded in any period, the head of a department, agency, or independent establishment may designate to represent him in such period the head of a principal division of such department, agency, or independent establishment, and, in the case of a department, the head thereof may designate the Under Secretary or an assistant secretary of such department. The latter half of each period shall be reserved for oral questions by Members of the Senate, one-half of such time to be controlled by the chairman of the committee which has approved the written questions propounded in such period and one-half by the ranking minority member of such committee. Each oral question shall be germane to the subject matter of at least one of the written questions propounded in such period. The time of each report-and-question period and the written questions to be answered in such period shall be printed in two daily editions of the RECORD appearing before the day on which such period is to be held, and the proceedings during such period shall be printed in the RECORD for such day."

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1) to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide a healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WILDERNESS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MECHEM, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. THURMOND), submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 4) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ALLOTT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 4, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS—MINORITY AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that minority and individual views on Senate bill 1, the youth education bill, may be filed while the Senate is in adjournment.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and concurrent resolution:

Authority of April 1, 1963:

S. 1238. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the purposes for which surplus personal property may be donated: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

Authority of April 2, 1963:

S. 1250. A bill to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls: Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

S. 1251. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides: Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

S. 1255. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States: Mr. COOPER.

Authority of April 3, 1963:

S. 1262. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least 20 quarters of coverage, and for other purposes: Mr. LONG of Missouri and Mr. SCOTT.

S. 1268. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individ-

ual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes: Mr. LONG of Missouri and Mr. SCOTT.

Authority of March 21 and April 1, 1963:

S. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the President appoint a committee to evaluate our foreign aid program in each country and report its finding to the President and the Congress: Mr. CASE, Mr. FONG, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. RANDOLPH.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 777, TO AMEND THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold public hearings on Wednesday, April 10, on S. 777. This is an administration bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees. S. 777 was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY for himself and Senators CLARK and RANDOLPH on February 11, 1963.

The hearing will be held at 10:30 a.m. in room 4221 of the New Senate Office Building.

CHANGE IN HEARINGS DATE ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRODUCTION AND STABILIZATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to announce a change in the date for beginning hearings on S. 1163, a bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act.

The hearings will begin at 10 a.m., Tuesday, April 30, 1963, rather than Monday, April 22, as previously announced. The hearings will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, and will continue on the following days of that week.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on this bill are requested to notify Mr. Jonathan Lindley, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone CApitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

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. RANDOLPH:

Comments praising the six recipients of the 1963 Federal Woman's Award.

NOMINATIONS FOR BRIGADIER GENERALS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Senate nomination reference 41, containing the names of 49 Army colonels for promotion to temporary brigadier general in the Army. The Committee on Armed Services has unanimously recommended that this list be approved.

Mr. President, the Armed Services Subcommittee on Officer Grade Limitations held a hearing on this nomination list. I emphasize that the subcommittee did not challenge the fitness of any officer nominated for promotion. The hearing did involve a matter of policy, however, which I feel should be called to the attention of the Senate.

With respect to this list, the average age of those recommended for promotion to brigadier general is about 46½ years. This represents an average drop of about 2 years in age as compared with the lists of the last several years. Furthermore, speaking in terms of prior service before promotion, in 1961 and 1962 more than 75 percent of the officers had completed at least 24 years of service at the time of their selection. With regard to the pending list, however, only about 37 percent will complete 24 years or more of service. On the whole, therefore, the officers selected for general on this list were younger and had less years of service than those selected in prior years.

The point was raised as to whether the selection of a greater proportion of younger officers was wise as a matter of policy and was fair to the more senior colonels who would have been selected in greater numbers had the promotion policies of the last few years been followed.

Mr. Vance, Secretary of the Army, appeared before the subcommittee and stated in effect that it was necessary to select some of the younger officers in order to give those who were commissioned in 1941 a fair chance for consideration for promotion to general officer. There were fairly large numbers of officers commissioned in 1941 and the contention is that in order to give this group a reasonable opportunity over the next few years their promotion to brigadier general should begin at the present time.

In technical promotion terms, Mr. President, what happened is as follows: In 1960, the primary promotion zone ended at year group 1936, that is, those commissioned in that year; in 1961 it ended at year group 1937; and in 1962, year group 1938. But for those promoted in 1963, it ended at 1941. Three additional year groups were therefore put in the promotion zone for the recent selections. The result is that year groups 1939 and 1940 were competing along with 1941 for selection for promotion.

It was the contention of the Army that over the next few years the percentage of those selected from each year group will balance out and will be about the same. That is, year groups 1939 and 1940 will probably receive as great a percentage of selections to brigadier general as 1941.

Mr. President, I would like to make two points in connection with this promotion matter.

First. The first point is that approval of this list should not be construed as a commitment or blanket endorsement of any overall policy of early promotion. In other words, the committee's action on this list does not mean that future lists involving this question will not be carefully reviewed, depending on the circumstances involved.

Second. The second point, Mr. President, is that this promotion policy may well have two definite side effects which are not desirable. First, there is the fact that if the bulk of the colonels are to be considered at around 21 or 22 years of service, many of those not selected will feel that there is little hope for advancement for the remainder of their normal 30 years of service. Many of the colonels who feel this way will undoubtedly lean toward early retirement at a time when they are at the height of their experience and knowledge. Furthermore, where officers enjoy early selection to the grade of brigadier general, we may see a policy which will result in the early retirement of these same officers. The case is often made that early retirements are desirable in order to avoid promotion humps and permit advancement for the younger officers. Mr. President, the record should be clear that the subcommittee will closely observe the whole matter of early retirement which could result from the Army policy.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] on the floor. I note that on the Executive Calendar are a number of nominations reported by him from the Armed Services Committee. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider those nominations, beginning with the new reports on page 2.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports on page 2, will be stated.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States.

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

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

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

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

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

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

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

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

THE ARMY AND THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army and in the Navy, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The 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.

EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT OF CHESTER BOWLES TO BE AMBASSADOR TO INDIA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the designation of Chester Bowles by President Kennedy to be our Ambassador to India is a very worthy appointment. Just as Governor Bowles, in his earlier capacity as Under Secretary of State, has helped select such uniquely qualified men as Edwin O. Reischauer, our Ambassador to Japan, and William Attwood, our Ambassador to Guinea, so the President has now shown similar imagination and excellent judgment in asking Governor Bowles to return, once again, to India, to be our Ambassador. He previously served in that vitally important post from 1951 to 1953. During that time, a decade ago, he was instrumental in establishing vital bonds of understanding between India and the United States.

Let me say that it seems to me that Chester Bowles became the model of what an Ambassador should be. He mingled very closely with the people of India. He took his family with him, and they learned the language and magnified the warm and friendly Bowles association with Indians. As Ambassador, Governor Bowles spoke to large numbers of groups in all walks of life—students, labor, business and many others. He did a splendid job in winning friends for us in India and in demonstrating in act as well as word to the people of India what American democracy means.

As we know, India has been challenged by a serious threat from the Communist regime on the mainland of China. India finds herself in the midst of an arduous and probably long-run effort to preserve her independence and her way of life against the Communist threat. In this time of peril for India, a time when the people of the subcontinent of India are united as never before by new ties of national spirit, it is especially fitting that the United States return Governor Bowles to the Embassy where he served with such great flair and distinction 10 years ago.

Governor Bowles has had a long and remarkable career of public service, ranging over nearly all parts of our Government. After a career in high Government posts in Washington and abroad, he served as Governor of Connecticut and as a Congressman from Connecticut. As our Ambassador to India, he will take with him the good wishes of his many colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses of Congress.

Mr. President, yesterday there was published in the New York Times a most interesting article on Mr. Bowles. The article was written by the distinguished head of the Washington Bureau of the New York Times, James Reston. In the article he pointed out that Mr. Bowles is one of those rare souls who is a deep and profound thinker who says what he thinks. As Mr. Reston points out in the article, of course those who have new ideas and express them vigorously and honestly are always subjected to criticism; and Mr. Bowles has a large number of critics. However, I think the fact that he does have critics is an index to the sort of stimulating and thoughtful person he is. I believe we should also recognize that Mr. Reston is the one who put to rest the vicious story that Chester Bowles had talked publicly about opposing the President's decision about the Bay of Pigs invasion. Mr. Reston is the one who had first developed the story that Mr. Bowles had opposed this tragic mistake; and Mr. Reston went to Mr. Bowles to ask him directly about it. Mr. Bowles in fact refused to comment on the situation or to discuss it.

Yet, on that score, Mr. Bowles has been criticized very severely and obviously very unjustly—because Mr. Reston is certainly the authority in this case.

Mr. President, I am happy to support this nomination with enthusiasm.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, this past weekend President Kennedy announced his intention to appoint Chester Bowles as Ambassador to India.

With this important assignment, Chet Bowles continues what is one of the most varied and remarkable careers of public service of any American. He has served with great distinction as head of the Office of Price Administration, Director of Economic Stabilization, Governor of Connecticut, Ambassador to India, U.S. Representative from Connecticut's Second Congressional District, Under Secretary of State, and Special Assistant to the President for Asian, African, and Latin American Affairs.

In returning to the crucially important post of Ambassador to India, Chet Bowles takes with him one of the most creative and imaginative minds in our country. He has thought and written and spoken about foreign affairs with insight, courage, and dedication. He has the vision that produces ideas and the energy and determination that turn ideas into action.

Chet and I have been close political and personal friends for many years. I have always valued his advice and wise counsel.

The President is to be congratulated for selecting for this assignment such an eminently qualified person, and Chet Bowles deserves the appreciation of his country for his willingness to take on yet another challenging task in a brilliant record of distinguished public service.

Mr. President, I hope and expect the Senate will speedily confirm this nomination. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PASSAGE TO INDIA

The appointment of Chester Bowles as Ambassador to India will give this country an able, gifted and articulate spokesman in New Delhi. His previous service as Ambassador to India in the fifties, his profound knowledge of the economic, political and social problems of the subcontinent and his friendly relations with the Indian people all eminently qualify him for this assignment.

India has made much progress in the decade since Mr. Bowles last served as Ambassador there, but the basic problems remain. It still is struggling to achieve industrial growth, rural development and social progress. The problem of Kashmir remains a constant complication. The Chinese invasion has added to the old problems the new one of military organization.

This country needs an informed, able and perceptive observer in New Delhi. And India needs the kind of an American Ambassador who can understandingly and sympathetically interpret its situation to Washington. It would be difficult to find a public man better suited for the challenges of the post to which he has been assigned.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT—TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has led an almost single-handed fight to persuade the Senate and the country to recognize the wisdom of a treaty to suspend nuclear testing. He has done a great job with very, very little recognition nationally. Max Freedman, a columnist for the Washington Post, in an article printed in this morning's issue of the Washington Post, discussed the fight in which the Senator has engaged. Mr. Freedman has stressed the effort of the Senator from Minnesota to serve the national

interest as well as the cause of peace throughout the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the fine column by Max Freedman entitled "HUMPHREY And Disarmament" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HUMPHREY AND DISARMAMENT

(By Max Freedman)

Without Senator HUMPHREY the debate on disarmament would proceed against hopeless odds. He has been President Kennedy's chief supporter in Congress for a prudent and responsible treaty. When Mr. Eisenhower was President he gave the same kind of courageous support to a Republican administration. It is not the least of his merits that he believes that disarmament, like defense policy, should be above mere partisan skirmishing. In view of this record he is entitled to a thoughtful hearing when he makes a major statement on the disarmament negotiations at Geneva.

Yet this careful examination of his proposals is precisely what has been lacking. It almost seems as if the cynical principle is being followed of ignoring Senator HUMPHREY's points because one cannot answer them. Some time ago he delivered an elaborately documented analysis of the disarmament deadlock but his address met with little response in the Senate and with only scattered attention in the country. This surely is shabby treatment for a Senator who is carrying the lonely burden of protecting the public interest in a safeguarded disarmament treaty.

It may therefore be some contribution to the public debate if one summarizes the main points which Senator HUMPHREY is now making.

He points out that in 1958 it was the belief of both Russian and American scientists that there would have to be an international inspection system with about 180 control posts, of which 19 would be in the Soviet Union. It would have taken between 4 to 6 years to install this system; scores of international technicians would have been included in the project; the system would have cost $2 billion to build and several hundred million dollars a year to maintain. Today no such system needs to be established at all.

The United States, like Russia, can now identify nuclear tests in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space. If Russia would agree to a treaty outlawing such tests, the risks of successful evasion or cheating would form no problem. The real concern is with tests conducted underground where they may be harder to detect or may be confused with earthquakes.

Senator HUMPHREY reports that in the past 5 years the United States has greatly improved its ability to identify earthquakes in Russia. It is a generous figure to suggest that these unidentified occurrences in any one year will be only a few dozen at most. Under the British-American treaty each of these mysterious events would be subject to inspection. From a scientific or technical standpoint, the problem of security is wholly manageable. Russia would soon learn this fact if it were willing to give the proposed treaty a fair trial.

Senator HUMPHREY asked the Kennedy administration to make available the results of studies of underground events in Russia from 1958 through 1962. He has quoted "a competent administration official in whom I repose the highest confidence" as saying that the United States has the present ability to monitor a test ban agreement with full safeguards for American security.

Under these new arrangements it would be necessary to supplement these monitoring devices by inspections inside Russia carried out by inspectors who could be accompanied by Soviet observers. The inspected area would be small and would be located by using the records of at least four detection stations. There would be no more than seven inspections each year. The treaty would lapse and the United States would be free to resume its tests if Russia refused to agree to any suggested inspection or was caught in a secret test.

Since the 1960 campaign Mr. Kennedy has shown much more eagerness than the general public to reach a disarmament agreement with Russia, above all on a test ban treaty. The public has tended to view the Geneva talks with resigned apathy as a meaningless charade. Yet all the time hard working and often misunderstood officials have been closing the gap between the Russian and American positions, while always striving for a treaty that would be endorsed by two-thirds of the Senate. It is high time that we realize that American public indifference is very helpful to Russia in resisting a treaty. For Russia can twist and equivocate at Geneva without being called to account by a bored American press.

WASTE IN THE SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, over the weekend there were a number of developments, calling into question the wisdom of proceeding with as generous and, I think, as wasteful an appropriation for space as the Congress has been in the habit of doing. On Friday the New York Times, in a very unusual story, reported that the Air Force had documented $77 million of duplication in the space budget. The article stated chapter and verse specific duplication, citing the place, the facility, and the degree of duplication in dollars and cents.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarkable story entitled "Air Force Scores Building by NASA" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AIR FORCE SCORES BUILDING BY NASA—SAYS SPACE AGENCY'S PLAN WILL DUPLICATE FACILITIES

WASHINGTON.—The Air Force, in a formal memorandum, has charged that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is asking for construction of $77,671,000 worth of facilities that duplicate Air Force facilities.

The memorandum appears to support charges that the civilian space program, initiated during the Eisenhower administration and endorsed by the Kennedy administration, needlessly incorporates many projects already being studied by the military.

In reply to a reporter's questions about the memorandum, Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of NASA, said that his organization had frequent coordination meetings with the Department of Defense and that "no such statement has been made to us."

He described the Air Force memorandum as representing "a point of view of junior people who can't get their superiors to support their desires."

On a point made in the memorandum about offering bioastronautics facilities to the Space Agency, Dr. Dryden said:

"We have offered to carry half the cost of bioastronautics laboratories but this was not accepted by the Department of Defense."

One reason for the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in 1958 was the desire to emphasize this country's belief in peaceful rather than military exploration of space. The early U.S. space programs were all conducted by the military services.

Little by little NASA has taken over such space facilities as the former Army installation at Huntsville, Ala. The military services, however, have retained many major projects and still support NASA with missiles and base facilities.

Over the years, however, as the United States has pressed its space efforts, a controversy has developed as to whether the major space responsibilities should not have been retained by the military services.

It has been pointed out that the Soviet Union's space programs are believed to be directed chiefly toward military ends.

In recent congressional hearings, members of the House Science and Astronautics Committee have questioned NASA officials regarding possible duplication of facilities already controlled by the Air Force.

Robert Seamans, Associate Administrator of the space agency, has testified that all of the construction requests have been carefully coordinated with the Defense Department. The agency's construction requests total $800 million.

The Air Force memorandum, apparently prepared in connection with the President's budget proposals for the fiscal year 1964, beginning next July 1, starts with this question:

"What is the Air Force's opinion of NASA's need for the facilities listed in the NASA fiscal year 1964 construction program, which is attached?"

GIVES OWN ANSWER

It gives this answer:

"Specific characteristics and capabilities of the individual facilities on the attached NASA construction program are not available to the Air Force in the majority of the items. However, from limited information available, location of proposed facility, title assigned and knowledge of the NASA center's responsibilities, it is highly likely that similar or duplicating facilities to present Air Force facilities are being requested by NASA."

The memorandum cites the following examples:

(a) Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, Calif.

(1) Life sciences research facility—$4,880,000. The Air Force has a large facility and technical capability in the bioastronautics area, which has been offered several times to support NASA programs. The space agency has not accepted these offers.

(2) Space Materials Laboratory—$3,600,000. The Air Force Materials Laboratory complex at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, could support the space agency in this area.

OTHER FACILITIES CITED

(b) Langley Research Center, Langley Field, Va.

(1) Vehicle antenna test facility addition—$1,758,000. The Air Force has capabilities in this area at the Wright-Patterson base, and at the Rome, N.Y., Air Development Center.

(c) Launch Operations Center, Cape Canaveral, Fla.

(1) Central instrumentation facility—$31,508,000. This facility appears to provide NASA with an excess of capability, in view of the Department of Defense's capability at the Atlantic missile range. The range's telemetry system was jointly planned with NASA, thus the requirement for additional telemetry by the space agency is unknown. In addition, this facility contains $5 million for electronic tracking items. Tracking is a range responsibility and the range has adequate electronic tracking capability.

(2) Calibration and standards laboratory—$2,867,000. It would appear that the best interest of the Government would be served

by expanding the existing Department of Defense capability to satisfy the requirements of all missile-range users, rather than establishing a separate capability.

DUPLICATION FOUND

(3) Optical and Electronic Component Servicing Facility—$855,000. Department of Defense has a similar capability at the Atlantic missile range.

(d) Lewis Research Center, Cleveland.

(1) Propulsion component and subsystem environmental facilities—$2,320,000. The Rocket Laboratory at Edwards Air Force Base in California has capabilities in this area.

(e) Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex.

(1) Mission Control Center—$8,409,000. It is probable that the missile range capability could fulfill this need.

(2) Launch environment and antenna test facilities—$7,482,000. Air Force facilities at Wright-Patterson base and Rome Air Development Center are available for similar efforts.

(3) Mission simulation and procedures training facilities—$2,216,000. The Air Force Aerospace Research Pilots School at Edwards base has similar facilities. Many NASA pilots have utilized this Air Force facility.

(4) Atmospheric reentry materials and structures evaluation facilities—$2,915,000. The Air Force has excellent facilities at Arnold Engineering Development Center and at Wright-Patterson base.

(5) Ultrahigh vacuum space chamber facilities—$2,685,000. Similar facilities are available at Arnold Engineering Development Center.

(f) Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.

(1) Acceleration test and calibration facility—$1,700,000. Comparable facilities are available at Wright-Patterson, Edwards, and Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask also that an article published in the Milwaukee Journal entitled "Stress on Space Called Dangerous to Science," in which Dr. Barry Commoner, professor of plant physiology at Washington University in St. Louis, Mo., a very competent and able scientist, discusses the adverse consequences to science of excessive emphasis on space.

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

STRESS ON SPACE CALLED DANGEROUS TO SCIENCE

PHILADELPHIA, PA.—American science, in the opinion of a prominent biologist, is in danger because of the emphasis and money being allocated to the exploration of space.

Dr. Barry Commoner, professor of plant physiology at Washington University in St. Louis, Mo., warned of the danger in a speech to the National Science Teachers' Association convention.

His speech reflects widespread concern within the scientific community over implications of the rapid growth of Government support of science in recent years. The growth has been stimulated by the advent of space technology. Government funds for research and development have quadrupled in the last decade.

NOT JUST GROWTH PAINS

Commoner contends that U.S. science is "not merely suffering the natural pains of rapid growth."

"Certain weaknesses at the very heart of the scientific enterprise may threaten the future of science and its usefulness to the Nation and to the world," he says.

His basic objection is that American science and the Government's support of research is becoming oriented too sharply toward a specific mission, particularly the exploration of space and the landing of a man on the moon, rather than being aimed at the broader objective of the pursuit of knowledge.

"We are engaged in a spectacular balancing act," he says. "Education is supported by science, science by space and space by the man on the moon.

PINCHPENNY EFFORT

"We should recognize this policy for what it is—a shortsighted, pinchpenny effort to buy a few selected fruits of the tree of knowledge without accepting the honest responsibility of nourishing the whole living, growing organism."

As evidence of how "project oriented research" is tending to dominate and to distort the overall course of American science he points to the emergence of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as one of the principal patrons of basic research and graduate education.

In 1962, he says, more than one-third of the total Federal obligations of $900 million for basic research come from NASA while the National Science Foundation, the agency created to support basic research, received less than $90 million.

SOURCE OF FELLOWSHIPS

The space agency also has become the major source of graduate fellowships in science, he adds.

The space agency program, he argues, no longer follows the principle, laboriously established legislative debate on the National Science Foundation bill, "that a national program of support for science should be science oriented rather than mission oriented."

Commoner also complains that education and science are becoming "constricted" by the present policies of support.

"Science is a subsidiary part of education and one would suppose that any effort to strengthen science should be predicated on adequate support for the entire educational base," he says. "But we seem to have turned this relationship upside down.

"While exhibiting a considerable reluctance to provide the total support needed to sustain our schools and universities, the Nation is eager to expand that part of the educational system which deals with science."

Most universities have become so dependent on Government research funds that "if such funds were withdrawn their total competence as educational institutions would sharply decline," he contends.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

As further evidence to support his view, he cites:

A "glut" in scientific literature which results from the tendency to ignore the interrelationships of scientific knowledge.

"Serious failures" in the proper application of science, such as in the failures to anticipate the harmful effects of detergents, insecticides and atomic fallout.

A tendency toward authoritarianism and neglect of theory—again resulting from the "excessive isolation of scientific fields" and the "fragmentation of knowledge."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, James Reston has very well stated the position that more and more thoughtful people are beginning to take regarding the space program.

There are many Americans who favor space exploration, and favor being first to the moon. But it seems to me the real issue about the space budget is summed up in Mr. Reston's conclusion:

This is the real issue about the space budget: not whether it should explore space, but whether the degree of exploration should be so great as to spend tens of billions on propaganda as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Reston published in the New York Times, issue of April 5, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE MAN ON THE MOON AND THE MEN ON THE DOLE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The debate on the Nation's space program is getting out of hand. Some Republicans are attacking the program as if it were a vast boondoggle, and President Kennedy is defending it as if it were the Bill of Rights.

Most of the extreme arguments, however, are sheer political moonshine. The main issue is not one of politics but one of priorities. The question is not whether the exploration of space is important, but whether it is more important to put a man on the moon than to get several million men off the dole.

When the President was asked in his news conference this week about General Eisenhower's attack on the budget in general and the space budget in particular, he seemed annoyed and immediately went into a political orbit.

His reaction was to compare his budget record with the worst of President Eisenhower's, and to imply that anybody who wanted to cut the space budget was willing to hand over the space race to the Russians.

The space debate, however, deserves a more serious response. For a large and influential sector of the scientific community of the Nation, while enthusiastic about the exploration of space, believes that the scientific objectives of the program can be achieved at a fraction of the cost by putting instruments, rather than man, on the moon.

SCIENCE OR PROPAGANDA

Thus, the issue, as they see it, is whether the man on the moon is essential for scientific purposes, and whether the immense additional cost of the man-landing should take a higher priority than using a part of the savings on other essential tasks that would invigorate the economy and create jobs.

Dr. Warren Weaver, former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, recently said: "I believe that most scientists consider the proposed expenditures quite unjustified on the grounds of scientific considerations; and also consider the frantic pace of the program to be wasteful."

Dr. James R. Killian, former president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has asked: "Will several billion dollars a year additional for enhancing the quality of education not do more for the future of the United States and its position in the world than several billions a year additional for man in space?"

In 1960, the administration spent on space, $523 million; the next year the ante went up to $964 million; in the present fiscal year, the bill will be $3,700 million; and for the coming fiscal year, the administration has requested $5,712 million.

ESTIMATING THE COSTS

Estimates of total space costs for the sixties vary. The Deputy Administrator of the space agency, Robert C. Seamans, Jr., has put it between $50 billion and $60 billion. Fortune magazine puts it at $75–$100 billion for a decade in which the Nation shall also have spent $50 billion on missiles.

It is not only some Republicans, but prominent Democrats, such as Chairman J. W. FULBRIGHT of the Foreign Relations Committee, who are asking whether the non-

scientific part of this immense total should be spent on a lunar man landing rather than on projects that will ease the unemployment, education, slums, housing, and transportation problems here below.

The scientific objectives are not primarily in question, but the propaganda objectives are. FULBRIGHT, for one, is opposed to paying such a price for what he regards as a kind of lunar Olympic race to land a man on the moon, especially since he believes the Nation's prestige will never be greater than its ability to house, transport, educate, and employ its own people.

VALUES AND PRIORITIES

What has happened here is fairly clear. The violent popular reaction to the first Soviet sputnik has deranged the administration's sense of priorities and values, and the preference of the Congress for spectacular victories over the Russians has aggravated the imbalance.

Clearing slums and wiping out unemployment raise more controversies on Capitol Hill than shooting John Glenn to the moon. Accordingly, the administration has said, in effect: "Ask not what is best for the country, but what is easiest to get through Congress."

It is an understandable position, the political struggle being what it is, but it does not satisfy even the President's own closest scientific advisers. For they see the defense, atomic energy and space programs taking most of the creative scientific brains of the country; they do not believe the space experiments will help the civilian economy as much as the space addicts believe; and, like FULBRIGHT, they are not convinced that the cost of space propaganda will bring as much prestige as a booming economy.

"The differences today," said the President at Yale, "are usually matters of degree." This is the real issue about the space budget: not whether it should explore space, but whether the degree of exploration should be so great as to spend tens of billions on propaganda as well.

SALEM (W. VA.) COLLEGE PARTICIPATES IN NEW LEASING PLAN FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF DORMITORIES—CIT ANNOUNCES PROGRAM

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we are all painfully aware of the challenge which faces the field of education as a result of rapid and widespread increases in population. Without imaginative and far-reaching action by the Congress and segments of the private economy the situation in 10 years will be grave—in 20 years it could be disastrous.

We must, therefore, be governed in our actions of today by the needs of tomorrow, and must address ourselves steadfastly to the task of producing meaningful legislation which will add impetus to the progress and expansion of education facilities in the United States.

Mr. President, in light of the current needs for expanded educational capability it is heartening to note that certain elements of the business community are making significant contributions toward acceptable solutions. The CIT Financial Corp. is one such firm, having recently announced the establishment of a pay-as-you-go plan for the construction, rental, and future ownership of units, which is being offered to colleges and preparatory schools. It is designated "the CIT campus homes program."

I am gratified to report that Salem College, a small and progressive institution of higher learning in Salem, W. Va., is among the first to take advantage of this remarkable opportunity. Dr. K. Duane Hurley, its vigorous and devoted president, has said:

The plan will be a tremendous help in moving forward toward our goal of doubling our facilities to meet the expansion of our enrollment expected in the years ahead.

He further pointed out that the student enrollment of 850 is expected to rise to approximately 1,200 in the next 5 years, and to double within the next decade.

I ask unanimous consent that explanatory fact sheets of April 3, 1963, released by CIT Financial Corp., and explaining the new leasing plan for dormitories, be printed in the RECORD.

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

CIT ANNOUNCES NEW LEASING PLAN FOR DORMITORIES

A pay-as-you-go program under which colleges and preparatory schools can acquire the early use and eventual ownership of additional student dormitory facilities without capital investment was announced in New York today by L. Walter Lundell, president of CIT Financial Corp.

The program, as outlined by Mr. Lundell at a press conference attended by college officials and other educational leaders, will make it possible for these institutions to meet their increasingly pressing needs for additional housing solely from normal room rental fees paid by the students who will occupy the buildings.

A newly formed company subsidiary, CIT Educational Buildings, Inc., will arrange for construction of CIT-owned dormitories, lease them to the colleges for a specified number of years, up to a maximum of 12, and then give title to the buildings to the colleges without further cost or charges, Mr. Lundell said. The overall project has been named "The CIT Campus Homes Program."

"This unique, self-liquidating plan, we believe, will make a significant contribution to solving the serious and growing student residence problems facing many colleges and schools," he said. "It is the essence of the plan that standard room rentals approximating those charged students occupying other rooms on the same campus should be sufficient to cover all rental payments under the lease, as well as provide income to the college for building service and maintenance costs."

TWO PROJECTS LAUNCHED

While negotiations currently are underway with a number of colleges, Mr. Lundell announced that contracts and leases have been signed for two substantial building projects that will get underway at once for completion by the opening of the college year next fall. The two projects will be built for Ricker College, located at Houlton, Maine, and Salem College at Salem, W. Va.

Construction of both dormitory complexes will be handled by Southern Mill & Manufacturing Co., of Tulsa, Okla., leading industrial and home construction firm, of which A. R. Tandy is chairman and president.

The buildings on the Ricker campus, to be erected as an open quadrangle, will house a minimum of 120 students in double rooms. Proctor's rooms also will be provided. Construction will feature an exterior of brick and cedar shingles to blend with existing campus buildings.

OUTSIDE BALCONIES

The three Salem dormitories, also to be erected in a U-shaped plan, will have exteriors of brick and rustic wood. They will house a total of 140 students. The architectural plan for these buildings will feature outside balconies for access to all interior rooms and the students will live in four-room, eight-occupant suites, built around a common lounge and separate bathroom facilities for each living unit.

CIT officials pointed out that variations in building costs, college requirements and other factors will necessarily result in varying per-student room charges from one project to another. However, it was said that all investigation to date suggested that most buildings could be leased for annual per-student charges in the $225-$250 range with payments on the Ricker and Salem projects falling within these limits. This range will fix the total per-student, or per-bed cost to a college somewhere between $2,500 and $3,000 over the 12-year period of the lease. At the end of this period, it was noted, the title to the building will be turned over to the college without further payments, so that all the income in future years will accrue to the college itself.

EXPERIENCED BUILDERS

Southern Mill, prime contractor in the educational building program has had extensive experience in mass production of homes, schoolroom facilities, and municipal, industrial and military housing, Mr. Tandy said. He pointed out that the company was a pioneer in the pre-engineered construction industry.

As one of the country's leading constructor-contractor-builders, Mr. Tandy said, Southern Mill, among other major projects, completed a $12 million mobilization housing project, comprising 3,862 family units in Kansas; built an entire community of 66 homes and 4 service buildings at Mexican Hat, Utah, and has constructed more than 400 school classrooms in Tulsa. More recently, he said, the company has expanded its activities to construction of college housing, including 20 dormitories at Denton, Tex., apartments, motels and other major units. Its buildings now serve more than 1,000 communities in 37 States, he added.

"The broad experience of the Southern Mill Co., the skilled organization it represents and their imaginative approach to architectural and construction considerations have made an important contribution to the development of CIT's campus housing program," Mr. Lundell said. He added that CIT representatives and Mr. Tandy and his associates had visited scores of colleges across the country to study campus housing problems, building designs and other dormitory requirements, and had consulted with many college building authorities in the course of the development of the program.

Mr. Tandy noted that while flexibility in dormitory design is essential to provide buildings compatible with each college's overall architectural atmosphere, standardization of the basic structures will result in substantial savings and is contemplated for most projects, in the interests of savings for the colleges and students.

COLLEGE DESCRIPTIONS

Ricker, founded in 1848, is a 4-year, liberal arts college with an enrollment of 380 students but expects to increase that total to 500 by 1967. Dr. C. Worth Howard, former president of American College, Cairo, Egypt, is president. Business manager is Charles W. Heath, who handled negotiations with the builder.

"After having tried unsuccessfully to adapt large homes within the town to our student housing needs, we welcome CIT's campus homes program as a providential answer to our problem," Dr. Howard said. "At last we are able to build student housing facilities to fit our specific needs and ultimately to own our own dormitories. This

is obviously the solution to our housing requirements and undoubtedly to those of other small colleges in the Nation."

Dr. K. Duane Hurley, president of the 75-year-old Salem College, said that student housing is "one of our most pressing problems." He added:

"We at Salem College are extremely enthusiastic about this 'pay-as-you-go' plan to help us provide badly needed additional dormitory space. It will be a tremendous help in moving forward toward our goal of doubling our facilities to meet the expansion of our enrollment expected in the years ahead." He said the present student enrollment of 850 is expected to rise to approximately 1,200 in the next 5 years and to double within the next decade.

CIT officials pointed out that other builders also are expected to participate in the program as it develops. One of those interested, the company said, is National Homes Corp. of Lafayette, Ind., a leading organization in the manufactured homes industry, operating nationally.

CIT has long had a close corporate relationship with the educational world. Through two other subsidiaries, Tuition Plan Inc. and the recently formed Tuition Plan of New Hampshire, Inc., CIT makes installment financing of college educations available to all families with college-age children. The CIT Foundation, the company's philanthropic affiliate, participates in the national merit scholarship program and, in addition, makes challenge grants of $5,000 each to all newly accredited, 4-year, liberal-arts colleges. Under the latter plan, the school is asked to raise at least an equal amount from local business sources in order to receive the CIT award.

SALEM COLLEGE, SALEM, W. VA.

Salem College was founded in 1888 and this year is celebrating its 75th anniversary.

It is a 4-year liberal arts college that was founded by the Seventh Day Baptists. It is coeducational.

Its present enrollment is approximately 850 students. The college is in a period of considerable growth and it is expected that its enrollment will reach approximately 1,200 students in the next 5 years and will at least double in the next decade.

President of Salem is Dr. K. Duane Hurley, who has been active in the founding and growth of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.

In December of 1962 Salem was selected by the Association of American Colleges to receive the seventh annual quality improvement award amounting to $25,000 in unrestricted funds. The award, made possible by a grant by the U.S. Steel Foundation, "is designed to encourage and reward a college striving for excellence and to help it obtain full recognition from its regional accrediting association." Salem College was fully accredited in March of this year by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Salem College joins Ricker College of Houlton, Maine, as the first schools to participate in the new CIT Educational Buildings, Inc., program of providing "pay as you go" campus housing to colleges and schools.

The CIT Financial Corp. subsidiary will arrange construction of three dormitories for Salem, lease them to the college for up to a maximum of 12 years and then give title to them to the college.

The buildings will consist of a center structure in brick colonial style, with two other separate dorms angling out from either side. The 3 will house 140 students.

Contractor is Southern Mill & Manufacturing Co., Tulsa, Okla., a leading industrial and home builder. Architect for the college is W. H. Grant, Jr., Clarksburg, W. Va.

Construction is to start this spring with completion scheduled for September 1963.

The new dormitories will be constructed on the 100-acre Salem campus, located in the Salem and Clarksburg, W. Va. area.

CIT EDUCATIONAL BUILDINGS, INC.

Newly formed subsidiary of CIT Financial Corp., the Nation's largest industrial and commercial financing firm.

Officers of Educational Buildings: L. Walter Lundell, president. Mr. Lundell also is president of CIT Financial Corp.

Offers unique plan to U.S. colleges and schools to provide the use and eventual ownership of dormitories and other campus housing facilities.

Educational Buildings will construct campus housing, lease to the college for a stated number of years—to a maximum of 12—and then give title to the building(s) to the college.

Buildings will be constructed on college property, built to specifications worked out between college and construction company.

Rental payments will be made to educational buildings on a semiannual or quarterly basis. The payments will be made from funds derived from normal student room rent charges, expected to range from $225 to $250 a year. Thus the buildings can be self-liquidating for the colleges.

Under the plan, colleges eliminate any outlay of their own funds and their general credit is not committed or impaired in any way.

Initial projects are construction of three-unit dormitory buildings for Ricker College, Houlton, Maine, and Salem College, Salem, W. Va. Completion is scheduled for September, 1963. Contractor for both projects: Southern Mill & Manufacturing Co., Tulsa, Okla.

The campus housing program was developed by CIT after 2 years of study in cooperation with college and other educational officials, builders and architects.

A number of colleges and schools already have expressed interest in the plan, and it is expected other construction projects will be undertaken during the year. It is also expected that other builders will participate with CIT in the program as it progresses.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this year the Rockefeller Foundation is celebrating its 50th anniversary. The work of this foundation is a striking example of the type of service that American foundations can perform for the advantage of all mankind. As a former overseer of Harvard University, I have some small idea of what contribution the Rockefeller Foundation has made to education.

The Rockefeller Foundation was founded in 1913 by John D. Rockefeller, with an initial endowment of $35 million. Its various funds have spent more than $763 million to date. The money has been used to advance the cause of public health and hygiene, medical research to stimulate advanced scientific studies through fellowships and scholarships, and to support science in general. Twenty-eight recipients of the Rockefeller-financed fellowships and scholarships have received a Nobel prize. The foundation has also lent assistance in the fields of the arts and to programs in humanities and social sciences. Their funds have helped make possible our Arena Stage here in Washington, D.C., and the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts in New York City, to name but a few. It has also been extremely active in the international field and much progress which we see in certain of the newly developing nations can be credited to the Rockefeller Foundation support.

We hear today about certain abuses of privileges granted nonprofit organizations. We can be certain that the Rockefeller Foundation does not fall in any such category. We turn with pride and confidence to this foundation as one which is working in the best interest of all of our citizens here in this country and throughout the world.

I commend the Rockefeller Foundation for its extremely fine work in the past and wish them another 50 years of equal progress.

VERY DISTINGUISHED COLUMNIST POINTS UP SENATOR HUMPHREY'S SIGNIFICANT DISARMAMENT ROLE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, today's Washington Post carries an article by the noted columnist, Mr. Max Freedman, entitled "HUMPHREY and Disarmament."

Mr. Freedman very properly gives the senior Senator from Minnesota, who also serves as chairman of the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee, major credit for keeping the current disarmament discussions in perspective. As Mr. Freedman points out, Senator HUMPHREY has been "carrying the lonely burden of protecting the public interest in a safeguarded disarmament treaty."

Many informed observers believe that the Senate speech delivered by the Minnesota Senator on March 7 is the most important statement made on the Senate floor in this session of the Congress. Certainly, it is a speech that fully documents the position taken by our administration in the Geneva negotiations. It is a statement that ought to be studied carefully by all those who believe in a realistic and safeguarded disarmament agreement.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Freedman's column be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 8, 1963]

HUMPHREY AND DISARMAMENT

(By Max Freedman)

Without Senator HUMPHREY the debate on disarmament would proceed against hopeless odds. He has been President Kennedy's chief supporter in Congress for a prudent and responsible treaty. When Mr. Eisenhower was President he gave the same kind of courageous support to a Republican administration. It is not the least of his merits that he believes that disarmament, like defense policy, should be above mere partisan skirmishing. In view of this record he is entitled to a thoughtful hearing when he makes a major statement on the disarmament negotiations at Geneva.

Yet this careful examination of his proposals is precisely what has been lacking. It almost seems as if the cynical principle is being followed of ignoring Senator HUMPHREY's points because one cannot answer them. Some time ago he delivered an elaborately documented analysis of the disarmament deadlock but his address met

with little response in the Senate and with only scattered attention in the country. This surely is shabby treatment for a Senator who is carrying the lonely burden of protecting the public interest in a safeguarded disarmament treaty.

It may therefore be some contribution to the public debate if one summarizes the main points which Senator HUMPHREY is now making.

He points out that in 1958 it was the belief of both Russian and American scientists that there would have to be an international inspection system with about 180 control posts, of which 19 would be in the Soviet Union. It would have taken between 4 to 6 years to install this system; scores of international technicians would have been included in the project; the system would have cost $2 billion to build and several hundred million dollars a year to maintain. Today no such system needs to be established at all.

The United States, like Russia, can now identify nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in outer space. If Russia would agree to a treaty outlawing such tests, the risks of successful evasion or cheating would form no problem. The real concern is with tests conducted underground where they may be harder to detect or may be confused with earthquakes.

Senator HUMPHREY reports that in the past 5 years the United States has greatly improved its ability to identify earthquakes in Russia. It is a generous figure to suggest that these unidentified occurrences in any 1 year will be "only a few dozen at most." Under the British-American treaty each of these mysterious events would be subject to inspection. From a scientific or technical standpoint, the problem of security is wholly manageable. Russia would soon learn this fact if it were willing to give the proposed treaty a fair trial.

Senator HUMPHREY asked the Kennedy administration to make available the results of studies of underground events in Russia from 1958 through 1962. He has quoted "a competent administration official in whom I repose the highest confidence" as saying that the United States has the present ability to monitor a test ban agreement with full safeguards for American security.

Under these new arrangements it would be necessary to supplement these monitoring devices by inspections inside Russia carried out by inspectors who could be accompanied by Soviet observers. The inspected area would be small and would be located by using the records of at least four detection stations. There would be no more than seven inspections each year. The treaty would lapse and the United States would be free to resume its tests if Russia refused to agree to any suggested inspection or was caught in a secret test.

Since the 1960 campaign, Mr. Kennedy has shown much more eagerness than the general public to reach a disarmament agreement with Russia, above all on a test ban treaty. The public has tended to view the Geneva talks with resigned apathy as a meaningless charade. Yet all the time hard-working and often misunderstood officials have been closing the gap between the Russian and American positions, while always striving for a treaty that would be endorsed by two-thirds of the Senate. It is high time that we realize that American public indifference is very helpful to Russia in resisting a treaty. For Russia can twist and equivocate at Geneva without being called to account by a bored American press.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a thorough overhaul is overdue in America's foreign aid program. This is my conclusion after I carefully studied the Clay report—a report of the Committee appointed by the President to look into our foreign assistance programs.

I am convinced that the money Congress has been appropriating for foreign aid is not being as effectively used as it should or could be used.

While I have served in the U.S. Senate, I have consistently supported our foreign aid program. I believe in it.

In a world where relentless Communist imperialism manipulates the poverty and instability of nations to subvert their freedom, I see foreign aid as an important arm of American foreign policy.

It should keep open avenues of trade to market our products and reliable sources of raw materials needed for our industry. It should assure America of free, independent, and strong allies, and thus strengthen our defense posture around the globe.

In a world in which poverty, sickness, and turmoil are rife, I see foreign aid as the spiritual and humanitarian thing for America to do. As the Clay report pointed out, it is an "American tradition to be concerned with the plight of those less fortunate than ourselves."

Our extensive foreign aid programs, lasting for well over a decade, may be accredited with impressive accomplishments—the Marshal plan, the point 4 technical assistance plan, the capital loan assistance plan, to name a few.

Yet, even with these and other successes, "much remains to be accomplished." We do not really know how effectively much of our funds are being used; we know that some recipient nations have not adopted the necessary fiscal, administrative, political, and social reforms for a successful program.

Nor have they planned well in some cases, or planned sensibly—so that some nations are not using their own resources to help themselves, while other countries have programs ill suited to their needs and conditions.

To meet these inadequacies and problems, I am cosponsoring a bipartisan resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, with a group of other Senators to appoint a series of small committees, one for each country receiving American foreign aid. Each of these committees would take a long, close look at the receiving country, reviewing and evaluating the development program in that country.

The committees would study three questions:

First. Does the country receiving U.S. aid have a practical and sensible development program that will help raise the country's living standards?

Second. Is the recipient country doing all it can to help itself?

Third. Has it adopted all the reforms needed for the program to succeed?

If we are to get as much mileage out of our foreign aid dollar as we can, I believe it is imperative that we stop and take a good, hard look at the effectiveness of our foreign assistance program in each country.

THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS BILL NEEDED NOW: THIS BILL IS ALL GOOD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Senate is fortunate to be able to take up this week, among the first major bills before it, S. 1, the Youth Employment Act. The Senate will be able to show its wisdom and concern for the country by the speedy passage of this bill. By thus acting, we can take another step toward improving the economy of our country.

For too many years, this Nation's economy has been in a stagnant condition. We have been faced with an unemployment rate that seems to creep upward regardless of the general business conditions. Of course, this Democratic administration and Congress have viewed this situation as intolerable, and have commenced in the last 2 years a series of specific programs carefully tailored to have a lasting impact on the unemployment problem. The Area Redevelopment Act, the Accelerated Public Works Act, the Housing Act, the Manpower Training and Development Act, these and other intelligent steps have been taken to lay the groundwork for full employment. In this Congress, we have the opportunity to act in the area of greatest need for stimulation in employment; our youth.

The young people of this country compose the most serious unemployment problem we face in the immediate future. Their rate of unemployment is twice the national average; more than 13 percent of the 16-to-21-year-olds in the labor market are without jobs. There are 700,000 unemployed youths between 16 and 21 years of age. And this year 3,800,000 young people come of age, 1 million more than last year.

So we are proposing to take a modest number of these youths and put them at jobs that beneficially serve the public interest. In the Youth Conservation Corps, we shall put some 15,000 to work outdoors improving our resources for conservation and recreation, but the second year, this number would rise to 50,000. Initially, in addition, we shall help 45,000 young people do community service near their own homes, in the Home Town Service Corps. Of course, we hope that this will have some small effect on the unemployment rate, but even more worth while are the public benefits to accrue both to the young people joining these programs, and to the localities where their service is performed.

What more useful calling could be devised for a young man than to be employed in healthy outdoor conservation work? And what better contribution can be made to our national investment in conservation and recreation facilities than the products of these youths' labor? One can look about in the National and State parks of my State and see that a very large proportion of the permanent facilities there are legacies of the work of the CCC more than 20 years ago. I dare say the situation is the same in many other States.

We knew the CCC well in Texas, where 156,000 young people worked in the

camps between 1933 and 1942. They built over 6,000 miles of Texas roads and track trails. Texans knew their work and appreciated it—perhaps it should never have been stopped, putting us to the effort of starting it again.

The other title of this bill would institute a new and worthwhile program, the home town service corps. State and local public agencies would be provided funds on a 50–50 matching basis to provide worthwhile job opportunities and training for youths between 16 and 21. These 45,000 young people would be employed in their own communities in needed capacities at hospitals, libraries, children's homes and other community service institutions, public and private. Community service institutions are usually pressed for funds and personnel; local programs of this design have proved to be quite successful. They channel youth into beneficial public work, while improving the employability of the young person. Regular workers will not be displaced, and pay and working conditions are to be reasonably comparable with the community standard.

There have been needless fears expressed that this program will provide a haven for juvenile delinquents. Perhaps that has arisen because the proponents of this bill have expressed their hope that it will provide a constructive outlet for the energies of school dropouts. In spite of the bad social conditions created thereby, I do not equate school dropouts with any predisposition to juvenile delinquency. If one looks at our educational statistics he can see that this country has been built mostly by the labor of so-called school dropouts. They have performed useful services for America in the past; they shall do so in the future under the terms of this bill. I sincerely hope that we shall avoid the sort of social stigma on these youths that some have already started to hint. The provisions of the bill are sufficient safeguard against undesirables; those serving in the two phases of the program will be performing very desirable services for this country.

As an example, I am pleased to note that Secretary of the Interior Udall, in his testimony for the bill, suggested that the Youth Conservation Corps might well be employed in establishing recreation facilities in the newly created national seashores at Cape Cod, Point Reyes, and Padre Island, Tex. Texas this week completed the necessary legislative action by it to establish the Padre Island National Seashore, an event which pleased me very much as the original sponsor of that legislation. Texas would be benefited indeed if the recreation facilities needed to implement fully the National Park Service plans for Padre Island were to be built by the Youth Conservation Corps volunteers as contemplated by this bill.

The Youth Conservation Corps created by the Youth Employment Act will build conservation facilities in the great national parks, dams and bridges, roads and trails, and even cabins and other recreational facilities. But more than that, it will build in the boys and young men who live close to nature in the camps, a love for the outdoors, and appreciation of nature, a will to work, a drive for higher ideals in life. The Corps will build character along with muscle; it will build into its graduates employability in our society, and good citizenship for our Nation.

S. 1 is a proposal that will truly offer to young people the means for attaining human dignity, individual self-reliance, and citizenship training. It is a necessary step toward beginning to solve some of the problems our urban industrialized economy has created for today's youth. This bill is all good. I urge its adoption.

PASSOVER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, sundown today marks the start of the Festival of Passover to commemorate the liberation of the ancient Israelites from slavery in Egypt. In this traditional ceremony of the Jewish religion, families will observe rites that have been upheld for centuries and passed on in days of slavery and persecution as well as in freedom.

Even as these high holy days are observed with the age-old scriptural responses and the traditional foods, we are all reminded that elsewhere in the world this freedom does not exist. For the second year in a row the Soviet State bakeries in Moscow have prohibited the baking of matzohs, the unleavened bread that is eaten in remembrance of the haste with which the people of Israel fled from Egypt.

Passover, perhaps, more than any other religious holiday, symbolizes liberation, the redemption of a people from alien oppression and slavery. Yet freedom poses its responsibilities—responsibilities for self-restraint, tolerance, community service, and integrity. It is most fitting that on this start of the Passover season, we all, regardless of religion, assess again our continuing obligations as individuals and as citizens of a free nation to the ideals of religious and political freedom which are such a deep and meaningful part of the historic celebration of Passover.

TO BE OR NOT TO BE: THE INDIANA DUNES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a deeper understanding of the issues concerning the effort to preserve the Indiana dunes from the destruction spearheaded by the economically unjustified Burns Ditch Harbor is taking shape throughout Indiana. This increased understanding is in large part the result of the dedicated and skilled efforts of Mr. Thomas E. Dustin, of Fort Wayne, Ind., who is the voluntary public relations director of the Save the Dunes Council.

The fight to save the dunes was started by Indiana citizens and has largely been carried forward by Indiana citizens, although strong nationwide interest and active support has developed. The Save the Dunes Council and others working to rescue the dunes, including myself, do not oppose a new harbor for Indiana. We do oppose the unnecessary and economically unjustified construction of a harbor in the heart of the irreplaceable and beautiful dunes. As has been pointed out many times, there are several alternate locations for a harbor which will preserve the dunes and give Indiana a large new harbor and industrial site.

In its current issue, Fort Wayne, a magazine devoted to the good life in northeastern Indiana, carries an excellent article by Mr. Dustin which discusses the issues in relation to recent proposals made by Governor Welsh, of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent that this article from the April issue of Fort Wayne be printed in the RECORD.

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

TO BE OR NOT TO BE—THE INDIANA DUNES

In mid-February, the Governor of Indiana addressed the people of the State in support of what was termed an economic development fund.

The basic purpose of this program was to obtain tax support from the citizens and the business of Indiana, to finance construction of a port project, east of Burns Ditch, in the Indiana Dunes adjacent to Lake Michigan.

This program was rejected in the regular 1963 session of the Indiana General Assembly, but taxpayers may well expect new State administration angles to finance the same project, in the special session of the legislature, called by the Governor, partly for this very purpose.

A port in Indiana at the particular location proposed has met opposition from conservationist groups, because construction at that chosen place would destroy much of the irreplaceable Indiana dunelands, as well as skiing, boating opportunities and other water recreation activities on our Indiana Lake Michigan shores. This view has been expressed by the Izaak Walton League, by the American Camping Association, the Save the Dunes Council, and by almost every other similar group in this State and throughout the Nation, as well as by more than 70,000 Indiana citizens.

But if the port was first opposed by those who only wanted to save our dunes, it is now opposed by uncounted thousands who want to save our money.

It is now well understood that there are already four harbors on our Indiana Lake Michigan shoreline, two of which have been fully public for many years, and both of which are federally funded, not State tax subsidized, for deepening to ocean vessel depth, or for studies of other improvements.

It is also well known that the Tri-City area of Lake County is now under intensive study by the Army Corps of Engineers, who are determining the feasibility of a deep water port at that site. That port project would have an initial size 10 times the greatest size which could be attained at Burns Ditch.

But the tempo to get millions of dollars of State tax money for construction of yet another port continues at fantastic levels.

In light of the fact that our State already has two public harbors now, both of which are federally funded for improvement, Indiana taxpayers ask why the State should spend $25,500,000 to finance a Federal project.

This project—which was the fundamental purpose of such proposals as the Economic Development Fund, has not even been given an unqualified approval by the Army Engineers. There are many conditions which have not been met—only one of which is an integrated steel mill.

We are having chaotic troubles in Indiana, raising $1,400 million for absolutely essential uses. Why should we be expected to pay for

a two-company port which remains unapproved by the Federal Government, now considering budgets approaching half a trillion dollars?

Are we to spend this money just so we can enjoy the dubious privilege of thumbing our noses at imagined "out of State" enemies? * * * and at a time when millions are being slashed from university appropriations.

Several specific phases of the Burns Port program are worth discussing, both on its own merits, and on the effects it would have on a great natural resource. As citizens of a proud State, we have a right and a duty to show concern, not only for the size and quantity of our growth, but also for the shape and quality of that growth.

The Burns Port is feasible only under a very strict set of conditions. One of these many conditions is an integrated steel mill.

What are the prospects for meeting that requirement before today's 10-year-olds have graduated from our universities?

According to State house estimates, which predicted the Economic Development Fund, a port would not be in operation for a dozen years or more, under the very best conditions.

An authoritative trade journal said less than a year ago, that Midwest Steel Corp. integrated mill plan is a "way out" expansion, and added the company would use the port if it built a basic steelmaking facility—an integrated mill.

On January 10, little more than 2 months ago, the chairman of the board of Bethlehem was quoted in the Wall Street Journal, as saying that their integrated mill was only a dream well off in the future.

And this was confirmed in a letter of February 18, to the Governor from Bethlehem Steel, which we obtained, and which said this: "It is obvious that we cannot now predict, with any degree of accuracy when we will reach step 6, which will be the fully integrated steel mill."

This same letter also indicated that production worker employment for the committed mills might be on the order of 2,100 to 2,300, but that possible labor agreements "will have a bearing on whether the local labor supply, where qualified, will be given preference for these jobs."

There are simply no guarantees either as to when or if any integrated mills will be built.

But even if the firms did make hard commitments to build integrated mills, it would be adverse to our interests to use State funds for building their harbor, whether through an Economic Development Fund, or through some other grand-sounding legislation.

No one has made a target of either of these two great firms. Conservationists as well as all other citizens wish both a long and prosperous history in our State. But establishing a spirit of good will and a favorable economic climate are far different than providing a vast subsidy, which a Burns Port represents.

We don't think our administration should ask us to pay a 3-cent cigarette toll—or a special corporate tax to finance such a doubtful objective. Conservationists have in mind a new fighting slogan, paraphrasing a famed historical exclamation: "Millions for education—but not 3 cents for tribute."

Let's turn now to the Army Engineers reports and the figures attributed to the Burns Ditch port project.

In both its 1960 and its 1962 reports, the corps set an integrated steel mill as a basic requirement for port feasibility. There was nothing strange in this. Fully 94 percent of all the proven tonnage for the port is set forth for limestone, ore and coal, required only for an integrated mill. Yet, the administration expressed shock when the engineers called this detail to their attention a couple of months ago.

This was quite an oversight at best.

An agreement between the State and Midwest, lying in the files of the Indiana Port Commission, even mentions the possibility of nice, clean, open hearth blast furnaces if an integrated mill is built. These are the only devices which would consume ore, limestone and fuel at the site.

The Army Engineers state the project would save Midwest Steel $6,700,000 a year if they used the port. And they say the project would save all other shippers just $610,000 a year, less than one-tenth of the total.

But even of this small nonsteel benefit, two-thirds is listed for transshipped coal alone. This leaves about 2 or 3 percent of the benefits for all the rest of the agriculture and manufacturing industry of the entire State of Indiana.

If the mills do not integrate, and if the coal shippers used more of the capacity of the present Michigan City harbor, we'd have little more than a ghost harbor up there. But even with complete fulfillment of every qualification, we lose money if we build the port with State funds.

Here is why this is so:

The Army Engineers computed the benefit-to-cost ratio at 1.5:1; that is, the port would save $1.50 to shippers for every dollar of cost. But while this computation is based on the Federal portion of the cost only, it includes all the benefits. The Federal part is $25,500,000; but the rest of the cost is conservatively estimated at $38 million. The total cost of the project then, is at least $63 million.

Weighing all the costs as well as all the benefits, the benefit-to-cost ratio falls below 1 to 1. That is, in complete terms, the port will cost far more than it will return.

Let's review this again. The total annual income from the port is estimated at $1,500,000, while cost against only the Federal portion of the investment is $1 million a year. But what about the rest of the costs, $38 million in revenue bonds and what about maintenance costs? The annual interest costs, principal costs, and maintenance costs come to $3,700,000; but we are still working with only a total income of $1,500,000.

Now, if we approve State taxing for the Federal portion of the project, total costs of operation for which we are responsible—in one way or another—amount to $4,700,000, the sum of the Federal and the bonding charges—a net overall loss in excess of $3 million a year.

This reality becomes quite clear when you think of the State (Indiana taxpayers) going it alone.

Neither of the steel companies will pay any terminal fees. This is established, and it means that only terminal fees from the small fraction of nonsteel users would be available for bond retirement, channel maintenance and other costs.

Now, here is the $63 million question: Who has first claim on the scanty $1,500,000 income which is supposed to cover $4,700,000 in annual costs, we the taxpayers—or they, the bondholders?

Let's return to Uncle Sam. If he builds the breakwaters, nobody pays anything to enter the port area; this is established by both statute and custom. If the State builds the breakwaters, and attempts to levy fees for entry, we have a whole new problem to contend with.

Even the small group of nonsteel alleged users, base their interest on a federally financed outer breakwater program, which would require no entry fee. What will they say if they now find they would have to pay a terminal fee and an entry fee? The margin of alleged advantage at Burns Ditch is so small to begin with, any such additional charges will clearly make the port uneconomical for any but the two steel firms.

With a $3,200,000 spread in the red, where do we make up the losses? From more corporate taxes? From university appropriations? More tribute from smokers? Or do we just issue more bonds in a never-ending series?

But there's more on the costs. Much more. In its 1960 report, the Army Engineers estimated that it would cost at least $6,400,000 for the first dredging costs of the port. This figure remains unchanged by the 1962 report; but the engineers commit the Federal Government to only $3,700,000 of these costs, and they say that if the job can't be done by hydraulic pumping means, the cost could double, to $12,800,000. Even with Federal financing, we have to pay at least $2,700,000 for first dredging, and we could be hit with up to $9,400,000 for this; without Federal financing, we get the bill for the whole thing, no matter what it is.

They don't talk much about this in the State capitol.

Besides first dredging costs, the Army Engineers said 27,000 cubic yards of shoreline erosion would be caused by the riparian filling and construction; and they exclude the Federal Government from any responsibility for this. Who is going to pay to correct the erosion?

Then, of course, there's the question of continued harbor dredging. No one has figured what this amounts to; but it is a fact that every other port in the lower Lake Michigan area requires extensive and continued dredging to maintain suitable depths. How much is that going to cost the taxpayers?

After all, the State house emotionalism and diversionary charges of "outside pressure" are set in perspective, here is the basic sediment of the Burns Ditch port:

(1) The annual revenues predicted for the port are less than one-third the known annual costs;

(2) There is no solid commitment, with dates, for construction of an integrated steel mill; but even if there were, this would not increase revenue because neither steel company would pay terminal fees.

(3) Neither the costs of first dredging, nor of continued dredging, nor of erosion control and corrections are known or even guess-estimated.

(4) The nonsteel users are unproved, particularly for coal, and especially if the State builds the port—with our money—and tries to collect entry fees.

Any one of these uncertainties is more than reason to wait before we lay out at least $25,500,000 of our State tax money for the project.

Let's go into this alleged coal tonnage for Burns Ditch in a little more detail.

We have obtained a copy of the 1961 annual report of the Monon Railroad. The Monon is called The Hoosier Line, because it serves Indiana, almost exclusively, with 90 percent of all its tracks in Indiana.

The Monon is the only railroad with existing direct rails between our southern Indiana coal areas and a public harbor on our shore of Lake Michigan—the harbor at Michigan City, which has been serving the Indiana coal industry for years.

The Monon's annual report says, under a paragraph entitled "Michigan City":

"The general plans and specifications for a deep water dock facility at Michigan City have been prepared. This facility, as designed, would initially handle the transfer of coal from railroad cars onto lake steamers."

Elsewhere in the report, the company explains that its expansion, accomplished with its own investment—not State subsidized—would enable it to transfer 2 million tons of coal a year at Michigan City.

The Monon is an Indiana company, willing to invest millions of its own money in terminal and other facilities so that it can expand its existing coal carrying operations.

Furthermore, this public harbor is now federally funded for improvements. Neither

of these operations are being paid for out of Indiana State taxes; and new jobs will result from the program, at no drain on us.

What's significant about the Monon's plan at Michigan City? Only this: Ditch port backers allege that Burns Ditch is the only port project capable of coal transshipment; and coal is the only major nonsteel commodity listed for shipment from the Burns project.

But, there is the Michigan City harbor program. Why should we put up State funds for a carbon copy coal handling capability, thus discouraging private enterprise from solving the problem in the tried and true way?

Here's one more shocker: A full year ago, the president of the only real shipper who had expressed intent in the part, Rail to Water, Inc., of Chicago, wrote Clinton Green, of the Indiana Port Commission, that port feasibility from their point of view relied upon Federal participation. The firm also said our commission would have to buy out Rail to Water's Calumet facilities first, and morever that it did not consider itself a "public utility" bound to handle just anybody's coal. Just where does all that leave Indiana and our sick coal industry?

It would be interesting, now, to turn back to the 1957 Indiana General Assembly, which appropriated $2 million for the purchase of Burns Ditch port lands.

"This appropriation," the legislation reads, "shall not be expended or available for expenditure by the Board (now the Indiana Port Commission), in whole or in part, unless and until the Corps of Army Engineers has approved the economic feasibility and justification for a public harbor or terminal on said real estate."

The requirements for feasibility, as set forth by the Army Engineers have not been met, and they have not requested construction funds for the project.

Yet, the port commission has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for the purchase of these lands. They have jumped the gun, and now we are asked to produce an additional $25,500,000 for a project that has not even fulfilled the requirements of the first $2 million.

It has been 6 years and four legislatures ago since that $2 million was appropriated, we still don't have assurances that the Army Engineers requirements will be met.

No amount of scapegoating and charges of "outside interference" can cover these hard, cold facts.

It would be hard to see how Indiana needs another port under the best of conditions. In combinations, both our public ports and the two private ports now handle millions of tons a year, of coal, gypsum, limestone, iron ore, general cargo, petroleum products, steel, gravel, and other materials.

If we do need yet another port, we can have it in the East Chicago-Whiting-Hammond area of our State. This project is now under study.

How many gateways to world trade do we need?

Won't the State House be satisfied until we have nothing but one long string of ports from one end to the other on our 42-mile Lake Michigan shoreline?

What are the prospects for employment by the known industry for the port? We can only go to the record for this. The 1962 employment at Midwest Steel, the only plant now operating there, was listed authoritatively at less than 500, and many of these folks are known to be from out of State.

In combination with the unbuilt, but committed plants of the other firm, this indicates a total of about 3,500 production workers. But that's only one-tenth of the employment forecast by the administration, and just 3 percent of the prediction by the Lieutenant Governor.

C. W. Efroymson, an economist at Butler University, offers a professional opinion on employment from the proposed development in the dunes. He says:

"In view of the probable advance in automation, particularly in steel, and the probable future of the steel industry as a whole, it seems likely that the number of jobs available in that industry will gradually decline."

"While it is probable that steel employment will decline over the years," he comments, "the opposite applies to employment in recreational facilities such as the dunes are fitted to offer."

Mr. Efroymson asks: "Shall we destroy a continuing certain source of jobs and income for employment in an industry which can be closed down when some executive committee in Pittsburgh or New York decides it would be cheaper to build a new mill in Utah or Texas?"

Let's turn from the opinion of this professional economist, and examine what other trained experts say about our Indiana dunes and shoreline, and what the Burns Ditch port would mean.

Commenting on the effects of the proposed port, an associate director of the National Park Service said this:

"Development of a public harbor in the location proposed by the Governor of Indiana would level several hundred acres of the remaining tree-covered dunes, and would destroy nearly a mile of the finest sand beach on the Great Lakes."

He also said, and this is especially important, "There is a grave probability that the water and air pollution created by harbor activities and adjacent factories will make the Indiana Dunes State Park less desirable, and might well make beach activity unsafe."

In his official, written statement to Lt. Gen. W. K. Wilson, Chief of Engineers, Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall said this on July 20, 1962:

"The inevitable pollution which would necesarily follow the construction of the harbor at this location would have a detrimental effect on the public recreation potential in this area."

The Secretary said, "There are alternate sites within the same general area for artificial harbors which have not been studied in detail; there is no substitute for the scenic and recreational opportunities which the Indiana dunes can be made to provide."

"It is our recommendation," the Secretary continued, "that approval of the proposed reports be withheld until thorough study can be given by the Corps of Engineers to alternative sites for the harbor, and until the impact of the Burns Waterway project on the proposed lakeshore is fully evaluated."

The Bureau of the Census now forecasts that within a very few years, there will be virtually a continuous strip of cities from Milwaukee, Wis., to Buffalo, N.Y. On our own Lake Michigan shore, Gary on the west and Michigan City on the east, will form links of this urban system.

With most of our existing shoreline already given over to ports, cities, and industry now, it is easy to see that the rarest and most priceless asset in a few years is not going to be one more port or one more factory.

The unusual, and therefore the most valuable tract will be the last green legacy we can provide for our people and the people of the country.

Make no mistake about the dunes as an economic asset. This place is right now in the main flow of transcontinental traffic, and this is going to increase. Even now, highway expansion feeding the dunes area is being considered, though the Governor vetoed certain highway improvement in that area.

It is the simplest of logic which indicates we should acquire those lands which are known to be in demand now, and which can be proved of demand in the future.

For instance, if we give credibility to statements made by the Handley administration only 3 years ago, and the Welsh administration today, the Indiana Dunes State Park increased in development and use from 10 to 33 percent in that short period of time.

The Dunes State Park was acquired in the mid-1920's, and has not been added to since that time. It contains about 3 percent of the total park area in our State, but it gets 25 percent of the human traffic. This means that the average acre of the Dunes State Park gets 10 times more human traffic than the average of all our other State parks.

This means money to us—lots of it—incoming money, from other States to our own State.

The average tourist spends $12 a day when he visits, and on this basis our duneland attraction should now result in about $62,500,000 of business for our State each year * * * one-fourth of all the skimpy tourist business we get in Indiana.

What are we to do? * * * seal this off little at a time, or capitalize on it while there is still time? Should we write off our whole shoreline for industry and more ports as the position of Congressman HALLECK seems to suggest?

Beyond the money, we have an obligation on our shoreline. Indiana is not an isolated republic. It is a member of the community of States. We have an asset in the dunelands of which all America is proud, and which we should want to use and share.

Thousands of Indiana educators, scientists, conservationists and other citizens have publicly expressed their hope that this asset be protected for our enjoyment and for the use of future generations.

Not a month ago, 13 biologists from the University of Notre Dame, which represents virtually the entire biology staff at the university, went on record favoring shifting of the port to another site because of its effects on the dunes and lakeshore.

A month or two ago, almost 200 educators and scientists from more than a dozen other major public and private universities echoed this wish in a joint letter to President Kennedy.

Dr. James Dewey Watson, one of Indiana's few Nobel Prize winners, who earned his doctorate at Indiana University, sent the following message in November. He said:

"I would view the loss of the Indiana dune region to industrial exploitation as both a personal and a national tragedy." Dr. Watson said the natural variety of the area stimulated him to become a scientist, and he added that "There is no honest reason why subsequent generations should forever lose this same opportunity."

What have other areas of the United States done about similar problems?

New York, under Mr. Rockefeller's leadership, has established a multimillion-dollar fund for acquiring much of the Adirondack Mountain region as a vast State park system for the benefit of all.

The State of Oregon has set aside 162 State parks, almost 10 times our meager effort, and many Federal areas as well.

California has saved many of the redwoods for our enjoyment.

The people of Wyoming have set aside the incomparable Tetons for us, and Yellowstone; Massachusetts has preserved our Cape Cod heritage; Florida, our Everglades; Minnesota, our Quatico Superior National Forest; North Carolina, our Great Smokies and Cape Hatteras * * * all against many of the same kinds of self-interested influences and real estate wheelers now faced by the people of Indiana.

Who are we, and what manner of people are we, to turn backs on our special share of this great national responsibility—the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore?

Can we afford the continued destruction of this priceless natural resource? Or are we to act at last with Hoosier conscience, and say "No" to further ruin of this place * * * financed by the very taxes we pay?

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

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

THE WILDERNESS ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business, Senate bill 4, Calendar No. 88, be laid down and be made the pending business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4) to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I would advise the attachés on both sides to have Senators come to the Chamber, because this may well be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the role.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, when hearings were set on S. 4, the wilderness bill, request was made to witnesses to confine themselves to new material. The hearings, accordingly, do not involve as much material as heretofore.

The measure has been before the Senate 6 years. We have held 10 hearings on it and accumulated 2,825 pages of printed record. It passed the Senate by a 78 to 8 vote on September 6, 1961. Nearly everything which can be said about the measure has been said several times in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and repeated a time or two here on the floor. The report on the bill makes available to the Senators a section-by-section analysis and explanation.

In presenting the bill today I am seeking to impose on myself the same rule we proposed to witnesses at the hearings, and will try to confine myself largely to a statement on what is new.

The effect of the bill is to provide for setting aside, for preservation in their primitive condition, areas in the national forests, national parks and monuments, wildlife refuges and game ranges which are already being administered to preserve their wilderness character, as a national wilderness preservation system.

The bill sets criteria for their management to preserve their natural character and has two practical effects: It provides that areas finally and fully accredited for wilderness preservation shall have been reviewed both by the executive agencies in charge, and by Congress. It provides that once designated, the areas shall be protected against disturbance or exploitation except when one of the two highest authorities in the land, the President or the Congress, determines that other use is in the greater public good.

Because these areas are public lands already restricted as to commercial exploitation, the bill will cost nothing and cause no economic disturbance to communities, counties, States or private enterprises. Private rights, a half dozen mines, some grazing and a few inholdings, are not disturbed.

The net effect is essentially increasing the degree of protection given to existing wilderness. It becomes a statutory requirement with congressional approval, not just a bureau policy that can be set aside with a stroke of someone's pen.

Two years ago one of the principal points of attack made on this bill was that it was hasty—that the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was making a $2.5 million study of recreation facilities, including wilderness needs, and that we ought to delay action on a wilderness preservation bill until that report was filed.

But the minority report on the bill—then S. 174—said:

> We feel that the "sense of urgency" that lies behind the drive for enactment of this legislation is artificial and fictitious.

The minority continued:

> We do not attempt to challenge the motives of our colleagues who sincerely support this legislation, but we firmly believe that the "problems which will make the enactment of (such) legislation even more difficult" in the event of further delays are among the following:

The minority, speaking in 1961 before the ORRRC report was issued, then listed as the No. 1 problem which would make enactment of this bill more difficult this year as:

> 1. An analysis of the 1962 report of the ORRRC may well disclose that the 7 million acres presently classified as wild, wilderness, or canoe will be more than adequate to meet the recreation needs of those rugged few who seek the solitude of these areas.

The report of the Commission created under a bill which I introduced and on which I had the honor to serve with many fine Members of the Senate, is now available. It was filed in January 1962. The minority's question is answered, and one of the bits of new material which I can submit on this subject today is just what the Commission said in regard to wilderness.

On page 131 of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission's report is the Commission's recommendation 8 to 6, which reads:

> Congress should enact legislation providing for the establishment and management of certain wilderness areas as primitive areas.
>
> Primitive areas satisfy a deep-seated human need occasionally to get far away from the works of man.
>
> Prompt and effective action to preserve their unique inspirational, scientific, and cultural values on an adequate scale is essential, since once destroyed they can never never be restored.
>
> Portions of national forests, parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, game ranges, and the unreserved public domain meet the basic criteria of primitive areas. The natural environment has been undisturbed by commercial utilization, and they are without roads. Some of these areas are managed for the purpose of wilderness preservation under broad statutory authority. Certain areas of more than 100,000 acres in the national forest have already been set aside by the Secretary of Agriculture as "wilderness areas." Others between 5,000 and 10,000 acres have been set aside by the Chief of the Forest Service as "wild areas."

And now, Mr. President, comes the answer to the minority speculation about the Commission finding 7 million acres of wild and wilderness area to be more than adequate.

The Commission reported:

> There is a widespread feeling, which the Commission shares, that the Congress should take action to assure the permanent reservation of these and similar suitable areas in national forests, national parks, wildlife refuges, and other lands in Federal ownership.

Mr. President, the ORRRC went beyond S. 4, the wilderness bill which is now the pending business of the Senate. Ater enumerating the types of lands covered by this bill, it reported that:

> Congress should take action to assure the permanent reservation of these and similar suitable areas.

It also went beyond S. 4 by suggesting that, in addition to the forest, park, wildlife and game lands covered by S. 4, there should be some areas of the unreserved public domain set aside.

There are no unreserved public domain lands put into the wilderness system by S. 4 for a very good reason.

The lands which are designated as wilderness in the pending bill are all areas already reserved, already restricted, as to commercial exploitation.

There are no such reserved areas in the unreserved public domain.

We cannot be certain, as we are about areas actually covered by S. 4, that if a wilderness area is designated in the unreserved public domain it will not disturb some economic activity or arrangement.

Where designation of unreserved, unrestricted areas are involved, the sponsors of this bill have felt that the same procedure as is followed in establishing a national park—an act of Congress—is the proper procedure. This bill so provides. No unreserved lands, no areas not already restricted as to economic activity, are involved in S. 4. If there is effort to add the additional lands to our wilderness holdings as recommended by the Outdoor Recreation Commission, it will hereafter have to be by an act of this Congress apart from S. 4.

The point of these remarks is that the speculation of the minority in 1961, and I imply no criticism of my colleagues for being careful in their approach—has not only not been sustained by the ORRRC report, it has proved to be rather wide of the mark.

ORRRC found that the wild, wilderness, primitive, canoe, park, and wildlife areas covered in this bill should be reserved and protected as wilderness through prompt and effective action.

Since the findings of the Commission have been released, we have had witnesses before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee who have contended that ORRRC found that "we do not need wilderness very much." The argument goes that the Commission found that the major part of our recreation problem is within 50 miles of our great urban centers.

The Commission did find that the largest number of recreational activity occasions will be an afternoon or evening walk, a drive, tennis, golf, a swim, or some simple pleasure close to home.

But besides these 1-day activity occasions, there are weekends, and there are vacations of 1, 2, 3, and 4 weeks and even longer on which only 9 percent of the participants stay within that 50-mile radius. Two-thirds travel more than 250 miles. One-third travel more than 750 miles; 27 percent travel more than 1,000 miles, and 10 percent make a trip of 2,000 miles or more.

The erroneous argument that we do not need recreation facilities except close to big cities was used against the Sleeping Bear Dunes proposal, by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], at hearings a week ago. The Public Lands Subcommittee was told that a lakeshore recreation area was not needed in northern Michigan because it was more than 50 miles—240 miles, in fact—from Detroit. The implication was that no one would go there.

I hope that no one in the Senate will make such an argument. We need city playgrounds inside city limits. We need golf links, tennis courts, pools, and general outdoor recreation areas in or close to the suburbs. We need reasonable accessible vacation areas a day or two away from population centers, and we need far away places like our great national parks and wilderness for vacations.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission proposed a system of classification of recreational areas illustrating the variety of our needs. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD at this point the Commission's recommendation of a system of classifying recreation lands in six categories to facilitate planning, administration, and understanding in the recreation field. It will clearly indicate the Commission's finding of the range of our needs.

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

The following system of classifying outdoor recreation resources is proposed:

Class I—High-density recreation areas: Areas intensively developed and managed for mass use.

Class II—General outdoor recreation areas: Areas subject to substantial development for a wide variety of specific recreation uses.

Class III—Natural environment areas: Various types of areas that are suitable for recreation in a natural environment and usually in combination with other uses.

Class IV—Unique natural areas: Areas of outstanding scenic splendor, natural wonder, or scientific importance.

Class V—Primitive areas: Undisturbed roadless areas characterized by natural, wild conditions, including "wilderness areas."

Class VI—Historic and cultural sites: Sites of major historic or cultural significance, either local, regional, or national.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I served on the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and it was a real privilege, for which I am grateful to the Senate, for it was a truly outstanding Commission which did a very wonderful job.

The Commission was composed of four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House, equally divided between political parties, and seven members appointed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Mr. Laurance Rockefeller served as Chairman, and he rendered the Nation a great service in that capacity, as he is continuing to do as Chairman of a citizens' group which is pressing for implementation of the ORRRC report.

The members of the Commission, and also of a larger advisory council which assisted the Commission, included conservationists, public officials, and businessmen interested in the use and utilization of the natural resources of our forests and mineral lands.

The report itself says:

After 3 years of research and an aggregate of 50 days of discussion among the Commissioners, the Commission has developed specific recommendations for a recreation program. The 15 members brought different political, social, and resource-use opinions to the meeting table, and proposed recommendations were put through the test of this range of opinions. During the course of the study and discussion, views of individual members developed and the collective opinion crystallized. The final recommendations are a consensus of the Commission.

That consensus, Mr. President, agreed with the policies and programs which would be established by S. 4 in detail.

The Commission recommended, as S. 4 provides, that wilderness areas remain under the administration of the agencies which now administer them. It commented immediately following the recommendation that "this concept is incorporated in pending legislation which provides that wilderness areas shall be administered by different Federal bureaus."

The Commission declared that wilderness areas should "be managed for the sole and unequivocal purpose of maintaining their primitive attributes. There should be no development of public roads, permanent habitations or recreation facilities. Mechanized equipment of any kind should be allowed in the area only as needed to assure protection from fire, insects, and disease."

All of these statements support features of S. 4.

The Commission had an independent study made of the wilderness problem. It discussed that report and the many subordinate problems involved in preserving an adequate area of untouched, natural lands. This discussion covered competing uses and needs for the lands. Those competing uses and needs are not entirely commercial, exploitive users like mining, timbering, and grazing. One of the greatest pressures on the wilderness areas in the national parks, and on the backlands in the wildlife ranges and refuges, is from the burgeoning number of recreationists themselves, and the pressure for mass recreation facilities.

It was because of this pressure, as well as other use pressures, that ORRRC found that the type of protection given the wild and wilderness areas in the national parks and wildlife lands by S. 4 to be highly desirable.

Mr. President, deep down inside of most Americans is a love of the out-of-doors.

This is the really essential fact one needs to know to pass judgment on this bill, and give it his support.

It is an effort to protect and preserve, unspoiled, just a little bit of the vast wilderness which stretched from ocean to ocean on this continent less than 300 years ago, so that this love of the great, unspoiled, out-of-doors which is a part of us can be gratified.

In September 1961, when this measure first passed the Senate, I was forced to be away and the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] handled the measure on the floor.

I have a great obligation to him for the splendid presentation of the measure which he made, and the skillful manner in which the bill was handled. He had able assistance from the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]; from the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]; the present chairman of the Interior Committee [Mr. JACKSON]; and others.

As I read the RECORD, I felt, as I still feel, a deep sense of appreciation to all of them.

One passage in the debate impressed itself in my mind. That was a passage during which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] very fervently and very eloquently stated the fundamental case for the preservation of wilderness.

It is the one bid of old, not new, material which I shall use in these remarks for it is well worth repeating; it was one of those relatively infrequent but memorable passages in our usually workaday record. It was devoid of statistics, and devoid of legalistic arguments but it got down to fundamentals. The Senator said, and I read from the RECORD:

Have those who seek the sanctuary of the wilderness no right in a country as vast and rich as the United States?

We will deny those people their right if we fail to act in a timely fashion upon a wilderness bill.

Most of the people in the Eastern United States are denied the right now because the wilderness has largely disappeared. It is vanishing in the West. Unless we take some action to establish legislative safeguards around it, within a few years it will disappear entirely. Once it has been dissipated, once roads have been built, once organized life starts, it is gone forever. It is not a renewable resource.

So, if we are to preserve for future generations the uplifting experience which has come to those of us who have known the wild lands, we must act now, else our children and grandchildren will be forever deprived.

So I say that, in a country which has come to be characterized by the congested life of cityism by the domesticated life of nicely clipped countrysides, let us reserve some places here and there and elsewhere around the country where the land remains as God

gave it to us, and make sure that it stays that way; so that those who want to escape from the banality of beer cans and cigarette commercials will have a chance to do so.

Mr. President, without wilderness this country will become a cage.

This passage from the distinguished Senator's remarks has been reprinted and quoted many times for the reason that it stated what a great many Americans feel and believe but cannot state so forcefully.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of further consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 11, after line 18, strike out:

"(i)(1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall each, in submitting any recommendations to the President with respect to any area's retention in or incorporation into the wilderness system include with such recommendations the independent views of the Governor of the State in which such area is located with respect to the Secretary's recommendations generally, unless no reply is received from such Governor within ninety days after such recommendations are submitted to him and his views thereon requested."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"(i)(1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall, prior to submitting any recommendations to the President with respect to any area's retention in or incorporation into the wilderness system—

"(A) give such public notice of the proposed action as they deem appropriate, including publication in the Federal Register and in a newspaper having general circulation in the area or areas in the vicinity of the affected land;

"(B) hold a public hearing or hearings at a location or locations convenient to the area affected. The hearings shall be announced through such means as the respective Secretaries involved deem appropriate, including notices in the Federal Register and in newspapers of general circulation in the area: *Provided,* That if the lands involved are located in more than one State, at least one hearing shall be held in each State in which a portion of the land lies;

"(C) at least thirty days before the date of a hearing advise the Governor of each State and the county, or in Alaska the borough, governing board of each county, or in Alaska the borough, in which the lands are located, the United States Forest Service, the United States Soil Conservation Service, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Mines, the United States Geological Survey, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Federal Power Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration and the Federal Communications Commission, inviting each to set forth its views at the hearing. It shall be the responsibility of each named Federal agency to submit its independent views concerning the designation of an area as 'wilderness', giving an analysis of the comparative values that may be involved as between wilderness and that type of development or uses for which the Federal agency has administrative responsibility."

On page 13, line 21, after "(j)" strike out:

"In any case where State owned land is completely surrounded by lands incorporated into the wilderness system such State shall be given either (1) such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access to such State-owned land by such State and its successors in interest, or (2) vacant, unappropriated and unreserved land in the same State, not exceeding the value of the surrounded land, in exchange for the surrounded land."

And insert:

"In any case where State-owned land is completely surrounded by land incorporated into the wilderness system, such State shall be given either (1) such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access to such State-owned land by such State and its successors in interest, or (2) vacant, unappropriated, and unoccupied Federal land in the same State, equal in value of the surrounded land: *Provided,* That if the State does not reserve mineral rights in the surrounded land conveyed to the United States, the United States need not reserve mineral rights in the land conveyed to the State in exchange."

On page 14, line 21, after the word "the", strike out "Congress." and insert "Congress: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to confer a right of condemnation with respect to privately owned land within the boundaries of a wilderness area, or to impair any customary right or privilege heretofore enjoyed by the owners of such land, respecting access to it or to its ordinary use and maintenance."; and on page 17, line 14, after the word "where", strike out "well"; so as to make the bill read:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Wilderness Act'.

"WILDERNESS SYSTEM ESTABLISHED

"STATEMENT OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. (a) The Congress recognizes that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions except those that are designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition. It is accordingly declared to be the policy of the Congress of the United States to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Wilderness Preservation System to be composed of federally owned areas in the United States and its possessions to be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character, and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness.

"DEFINITION OF WILDERNESS

"(b) A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's works substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value.

"NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

"EXTENT OF SYSTEM

SEC. 3. (a) The National Wilderness Preservation System (hereafter referred to in this Act as the wilderness system) shall comprise (subject to existing private rights) such federally owned areas as are established as part of such system under the provisions of this Act.

"NATIONAL FOREST AREAS

"(b)(1) The wilderness system shall include all areas within the national forests classified on the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe: *Provided,* That the areas classified as primitive shall be subject to review as hereinafter provided. Following enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within ten years, review, in accordance with paragraph C, section 251.20, of the Code of Federal Regulations, title 36, effective January 1, 1959, the suitability of each primitive area in the national forests for preservation as wilderness and shall report his findings to the President. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the continued inclusion within the wilderness system, or exclusion therefrom, of each area on which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definition of boundaries: *Provided,* That the President may, as a part of his recommendations, alter the boundaries existing on the date of this Act for any primitive area to be continued in the wilderness system, recommending the exclusion and return to national forest land status of any portions not predominantly of wilderness value, or recommending the addition of any contiguous area of national forest lands predominantly of wilderness value: *Provided further,* That following such exclusions and additions any primitive area recommended to be continued in the wilderness system shall not exceed the area classified as primitive on the date of this Act. The recommendation of the President with respect to the continued inclusion in the wilderness system, or the exclusion therefrom of a primitive area, or portions thereof, shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided,* That if Congress rejects a recommendation of the President and no revised recommendation is made to Congress with respect to that primitive area within two years, the land shall cease to be a part of the wilderness system and shall be administered as other national forest lands: *And provided further,* That, primitive areas with respect to which recommendations are submitted to Congress on the eighth, ninth, and tenth years of the review period herein provided shall retain their status as a part of the wilderness system until the expiration, in respect to each area, of a full session of Congress, two years for resubmission of revised recommendations to Congress by the President, and, if so resubmitted, until the expiration of a full session of Congress thereafter. Recommendations on all primitive areas not previously submitted to the Congress shall be made during the tenth year of the review period. Any primitive area, or portion thereof, on which a recommendation for continued inclusion in the wilderness system has not become effective within fourteen years following the enactment of this Act shall cease to be a part of the wilderness system and shall be administered as other national forest land.

"(2) The purposes of this Act are hereby declared to be within and supplemental to but not in interference with the purposes

for which national forests are established as set forth in the Act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11), and the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960, Public Law 86-517 (74 Stat. 215).

"NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM AREAS

"(c) (1) There shall be incorporated into the wilderness system, subject to the provisions of and at the time provided in this section, each portion of each park, monument, or other unit in the national park system which on the effective date of this Act embraces a continuous area of five thousand acres or more without roads. Within ten years after the effective date of this Act the Secretary of the Interior shall review the units of the national park system and shall report his recommendations for the incorporation of each such portion into the wilderness system to the President. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the incorporation into the wilderness system of each such portion for which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definitions of boundaries. The recommendation of the President with respect to each such portion shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

"(2) The Secretary of the Interior shall include, as part of his recommendations to the President under the provisions of this subsection, a description of the parts of each park, monument, or other unit submitted which should be reserved for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations. Such parts shall be determined in accordance with the procedures for rulemaking under section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003), except that the public notice required under such section shall be at least ninety days prior to the determination proceedings. No designation of an area for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, or administrative installations shall modify or affect the application to that area of the provisions of the Act approved August 25, 1916, entitled 'An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes' (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 and following). The accommodations and installations in such designated areas shall be incident to the conservation and use and enjoyment of the scenery and the natural and historical objects and flora and fauna of the park or monument in its natural condition. Further, the inclusion of any area of any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system within the wilderness system pursuant to this Act shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for the use and preservation of such area in accordance with such Act of August 25, 1916, the statutory authority under which the area was created, or any other Act of Congress which might pertain to or affect such area, including, but not limited to, the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 U.S.C. 432 and following); section 3(2) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C., sec. 796(2)); and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C., sec. 461 and following).

"NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES AND GAME RANGES

"(d) There shall be incorporated into the wilderness system, subject to the provisions of and at the time provided in this section, such portions of the wildlife refuges and game ranges established prior to the effective date of this Act under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior as he may recommend for such incorporation to the President within ten years following the effective date of this Act. Before the convening of Congress each year the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the incorporation into the wilderness system of each area recommended for such incorporation by the Secretary of the Interior during the preceding year, together with maps and definitions of boundaries. The recommendation of the President with respect to each area shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

"MODIFICATION OF BOUNDARIES

"(e) Any proposed minor modification or adjustment of boundaries of any portion of the wilderness system established in accordance with this Act shall be made by the appropriate Secretary after public notice of such proposal by publication in a newspaper having general circulation in the vicinity of such boundaries and public hearing to be held in such vicinity not less than ninety days after such notice if there is sufficient demand during such ninety days for such hearing. The proposed modification or adjustment shall then be recommended with map and description thereof to the President. The President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to such modification or adjustment and such recommendations shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

"EFFECTIVE DATE OF PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS

"(f) Any recommendation of the President made in accordance with the provisions of this section shall take effect upon the day following the adjournment sine die of the first complete session of the Congress following the date or dates on which such recommendation was received by the United States Senate and the House of Representatives; but only if prior to such adjournment neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives shall have approved a resolution declaring itself opposed to such recommendation: *Provided,* That in the case of a recommendation covering two or more separate areas, such resolution of opposition may be limited to one or more of the areas covered, in which event the balance of the recommendation shall take effect as before provided: *Provided further,* That where a resolution of opposition to any such recommendation has been introduced, a hearing thereon shall be held within thirty days by the committee to which such resolution has been referred. Any such resolution shall be subject to the procedures provided under the provisions of sections 203 through 206 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C., secs. 133z-12—133z-15) for a resolution of either House of Congress.

"EFFECT OF PUBLIC NOTICE OF PROPOSED ADDITION TO WILDERNESS SYSTEM

"(g) Public notice when given by either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture that any area is to be proposed under the provisions of this Act for incorporation as part of the wilderness system shall segregate such area from any or all appropriation under the public land laws to the extent deemed necessary by such Secretary. Such segregation shall terminate (1) upon rejection of such proposal by the President, (2) upon approval by the Senate or the House of Representatives of a resolution opposing the incorporation of such area in the wilderness system, or (3) five years after the date of such notice if the proposal to incorporate such area as part of the wilderness system has not been submitted to both Houses of Congress prior to the expiration of such five years.

"ADDITION OR ELIMINATION NOT PROVIDED FOR IN THIS ACT

"(h) The addition of any area to, or the elimination of any area from, the wilderness system which is not specifically provided for under the provisions of this Act shall be made only after specific affirmative authorization by law for such addition or elimination.

"ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO RECOMMENDATIONS

"(i) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall, prior to submitting any recommendations to the President with respect to any area's retention in or incorporation into the wilderness system—

"(A) give such public notice of the proposed action as they deem appropriate, including publication in the Federal Register and in a newspaper having general circulation in the area or areas in the vicinity of the affected land;

"(B) hold a public hearing or hearings at a location or locations convenient to the area affected. The hearings shall be announced through such means as the respective Secretaries involved deem appropriate, including notices in the Federal Register and in newspapers of general circulation in the area: *Provided,* That if the lands involved are located in more than one State, at least one hearing shall be held in each State in which a portion of the land lies;

"(C) at least thirty days before the date of a hearing advise the Governor of each State and the county, or in Alaska the borough, governing board of each county, or in Alaska the borough, in which the lands are located, the United States Forest Service, the United States Soil Conservation Service, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Mines, the United States Geological Survey, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Federal Power Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Federal Communications Commission, inviting each to set forth its views at the hearing. It shall be the responsibility of each named Federal agency to submit its independent views concerning the designation of an area as 'wilderness', giving an analysis of the comparative values that may be involved as between wilderness and that type of development or uses for which the Federal agency has administrative responsibility.

"(2) Views submitted to the President under the provisions of (1) of this subsection with respect to any area shall be included with any recommendations to Congress with respect to such area.

"STATE LANDS SURROUNDED BY WILDERNESS SYSTEM

"(j) In any case where State-owned land is completely surrounded by land incorporated into the wilderness system, such State shall be given either (1) such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access to such State-owned land by such State and its successors in interest, or (2) vacant, unappropriated, and unoccupied Federal land in the same State, equal in value to the surrounded land: *Provided,* That if the State does not reserve mineral rights in the surrounded land conveyed to the United States, the United States need not reserve mineral rights in the land conveyed to the State in exchange.

"ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PRIVATELY OWNED LANDS WITHIN THE WILDERNESS SYSTEM

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to acquire as part of the wilderness system any privately owned land within any portion of such system under his jurisdiction, subject to the approval of any necessary appropriations by the Congress: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to confer a right of condemnation with respect to privately owned land within the boundaries of a wilderness area, or to impair any customary right or privilege heretofore enjoyed by the owners of such land, respecting access to it or to its ordinary use and maintenance.

"GIFTS OR BEQUESTS OF LAND

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior may each accept gifts or bequests of land for preservation as wilderness, and such land shall on acceptance become part of the wilderness system. Regulations with regard to any such land may be in accordance with such agreements, consistent with the policy of this Act, as are made at the time of such gift, or such conditions, consistent with such policy, as may be included in, and accepted with, such bequest.

"USE OF THE WILDERNESS

"OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW

"SEC. 6. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purposes stated in the establishment of, or pertaining to, any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system, or any national forest, wildlife refuge, game range, or other area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the wilderness system shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purposes as also to preserve its wilderness character. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the wilderness system shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use. Subject to the provisions of this Act, all such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation.

"PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN USES

"(b) Except as specifically provided for in this Act and subject to any existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise within the wilderness system, no permanent road, nor shall there be any use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any temporary road, nor any structure or installation, in excess of the minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of this Act, including such measures as may be required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within such areas.

"SPECIAL PROVISIONS

"(c) The following special provisions are hereby made:

"(1) Within the wilderness system the use of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have already become established may be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions as the appropriate Secretary deems desirable. In addition, such measures may be taken as may be necessary in the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such conditions as the appropriate Secretary deems desirable.

"(2) Within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, (A) the President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including but not limited to exploration for oil and gas), mining (including but not limited to the production of oil and gas), and the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water-conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof, upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial; and (B) the grazing of livestock, where established prior to the effective date of this Act with respect to areas established as part of the wilderness system by this Act, or prior to the date of public notice thereof with respect to any area to be recommended for incorporation in the wilderness system, shall be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions and regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary having jurisdiction over such area.

"(3) Other provisions of this Act to the contrary notwithstanding, the management of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, formerly designated as the Superior, Little Indian Sioux, and Caribou roadless areas in the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, shall be in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the general purpose of maintaining, without unnecessary restrictions on other uses, including that of timber, the primitive character of the area, particularly in the vicinity of lakes, streams, and portages: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall preclude the continuance within the area of any already established use of motorboats. Nothing in this Act shall modify the restrictions and provisions of the Shipstead-Nolan Act, Public Law 539, Seventy-first Congress, July 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 1020), the Thye-Blatnik Act, Public Law 733, Eightieth Congress, June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and the Humphrey-Thye-Blatnik-Andresen Act, Public Law 607, Eighty-fourth Congress, June 22, 1956 (70 Stat. 326), as applying to the Superior National Forest or the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Modifications of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area within the Superior National Forest shall be accomplished in the manner provided in section 3(e).

"(4) Commercial services may be performed within the wilderness system to the extent necessary for activities which are proper for realizing the recreational or other purposes of the system as established in this Act.

"(5) Any existing use or form of appropriation authorized or provided for in the Executive order or legislation establishing any national wildlife refuge or game range existing on the effective date of this Act may be continued under such authorization or provision.

"(6) Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

"(7) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the several States with respect to wildlife and fish in the national forests.

"(8) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent, within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, any activity, including prospecting, for the purpose of gathering information about mineral or water resources or to prevent the completely subsurface use of such areas, if such activity or subsurface use is carried on, in a manner which is not incompatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment.

"RECORDS AND REPORTS

"SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall each maintain available to the public, records of portions of the wilderness system under his jurisdiction, including maps and legal descriptions, copies of regulations governing them, copies of public notices of, and reports submitted to Congress regarding, pending additions, eliminations, or modifications. Within a year following the establishment of any area within the national forests as a part of the wilderness system, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and legal description of such area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such descriptions shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however*, That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal descriptions and maps may be made with the approval of such committees. Within a year following the establishment of any area in the national park system or in a wildlife refuge or range as a part of the wilderness system, the Secretary of the Interior shall file a map and legal description of such area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. Clerical and typographical errors in such legal descriptions and maps may be corrected with the approval of such committees. Copies of maps and legal descriptions of all areas of the wilderness system within their respective jurisdictions shall be kept available for public inspection in the offices of regional foresters, national forest supervisors, forest rangers, offices of the units of the national park system, wildlife refuge, or range.

"CONTRIBUTIONS AND GIFTS

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to accept private contributions and gifts to be used to further the purposes of this Act. Any such contributions or gifts shall, for purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, be considered a contribution or gift to or for the use of the United States for an exclusively public purpose, and may be deducted as such under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, subject to all applicable limitations and restrictions contained therein.

"LAND USE COMMISSIONS

"SEC. 9. With respect to any State having more than 90 per centum of its total land area owned by the Federal Government on January 1, 1961, there shall be established for each such State a Presidential Land Use Commission (hereinafter called the Commission). The Commission shall be composed of five persons appointed by the President, not more than three of whom shall be members of the same political party, and at least three of whom shall be residents of the State concerned. The Commission shall advise and consult with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture on the current utilization of federally owned land in such State and shall make recommendations to the appropriate Secretary as to how the federally owned land can best be utilized, developed, protected and preserved. Any recommendations made to the President by the Secretary of Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture and any recommendations made to the Congress by the President pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be accompanied by the recommendations and reports made with respect thereto by the Commission.

"SEC. 10. At the opening of each session of Congress, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior shall jointly report to the President for transmission to Congress on the status of the wilderness system, including a list and descriptions of the areas in the system, regulations in effect, and other pertinent information, together with any recommendations they may care to make.

"SEC. 11. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as superseding, modifying, repealing, or otherwise affecting the provisions of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792–825r)."

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. CHURCH addressed the Chair.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator from Vermont permit me to yield to the Senator from Idaho first?

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly.

Mr. CHURCH. I merely wish to say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that I appreciate his opening remarks. All of us on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee know of the fine leadership we have had in him that has resulted in bringing this bill to the floor today. The Senator from New Mexico is one of the most distinguished

conservationists in the Senate today, and no chapter he has written over the course of a long and brilliant career will win for him greater esteem in the hearts of the people, than the leadership he has given to this measure. I just wanted to express my feeling, which I know is shared by many other Members of the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Idaho. I yield now to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico for his ability and persistence in this effort. This bill, if enacted into law, will enable future generations of Americans to see at least a few wilderness spots in America.

As I understand, very little area east of the Mississippi and north of Kentucky would be eligible for inclusion in wilderness areas. Am I correct in my understanding that the Mount Desert Island area in Maine and the White Mountain area in New Hampshire will be eligible for such inclusion?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is correct. A few States have some space that is wilderness area, like New York State, for example, which will be eligible for preservation under their own State system, but not under the national system.

Mr. AIKEN. But it would require additional legislation to put in the wilderness area any tracts which are not now included?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, it would. One of the things we made sure of is that it requires positive legislation to add new areas.

Again I thank the Senator from Vermont for his fine leadership. I have been associated with him many times in agricultural legislation, and it has been a great pleasure to be associated with him in conservation legislation. I pay tribute to him.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall support the legislation even though no area of my State would be eligible to be included in the wilderness area. We have other ways, however, of preserving forest reserves and wild areas in Vermont.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New Mexico for the diligent work he has given to the bill pending before the Senate. In the Southeast, and especially in South Carolina, we would be benefited very little, if at all, by the bill; but I am mindful of the fact that if something had been done years ago in this particular field, it would have brought much benefit to South Carolina and the Southeastern States. We let it slip through our fingers, so to speak. Today we can do very little about it, but, at the same time, the West is at the present time trying to preserve forests. I am glad to see them do it. I commend especially the senior Senator from New Mexico for his diligent efforts in this field.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his kind remarks, which are typical of him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Have the committee amendments been adopted en bloc?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments were agreed to en bloc. The bill, as amended, is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment. The bill is now open to further amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, if I may, at this time, I should like to make some statements about the pending bill and my own position on it, and also with respect to possible amendment which might be added to it.

First of all, I wish to say that I had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives in the last 2 years on both the Public Lands Subcommittee and the Interior Committee, which considered the bill when it came to the House from the Senate last year.

There is little or no doubt in my mind that although I personally would like to see a wilderness system set up under legislative authority, the pending bill, as it is now written, would, if passed by the Senate, encounter considerable difficulty in being approved by the appropriate committee in the other body.

I say that for a variety of what I consider to be very good reasons. First, I served with a great many of the Members in the House; secondly, there is basic disagreement on the question of which branch of Government should have primary authority in creating a legislative system under law.

We have at the moment in the pending bill a proposal which I believe it would be wise to modify in at least one important respect, and which could have vast significance in insuring for future generations a wilderness system in which people could enjoy the forests and mountains and lakes as a part of our Nation's heritage.

However, the difficulty is that we are grouping together and putting into one system, without any particular legislative scrutiny, a vast area of land known as the primitive lands, which have not been classified by the executive department or reviewed by Congress, to see whether this is the most useful purpose for that particular group of public lands.

What we have proposed in committee, and what the other body was doing its best to try to put into effect in previous hearings and previous discussion of the bill, is the proposal that the legislative body, Congress, should have the right to determine, after recommendation by the executive department, which of these primitive lands or which group of these primitive lands should be brought into the wilderness system, and that they should not all be blanketed in at the same time.

As an example of that, I would like to point to—and I believe the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] would agree—what I consider to be a good system, namely, the method by which we decide on the establishment of reclamation projects. There is a possibility, I suppose, that under reclamation law the Executive could simply decide what is to be done by way of reclamation projects and then send the proposal to Congress, and, unless Congress vetoed it, the projects would go through. However, as a matter of fact, that is not the way we have established the reclamation system. What we have done is to say that the Executive shall determine whether a particular project is feasible. At the end of that study it sends the project to Congress. Then Congress both authorizes the project involved and appropriates the money for it. During the course of that time, however, Congress very carefully inspects and studies the details of each project that is presented to it.

It is my feeling, and I believe the feeling of a great number of us in Congress, whether it be in the Senate or in the House, that that is the same type of system that we ought to use in connection with the wilderness system. However, it is not. What we are being asked to do here is to say that we will blanket everything in, and then the Executive will review it and say either that additional public lands will be brought in or that some of them should be taken out; and that the only way Congress will have the right to act in a negative way on the matter will be by way of a veto.

I believe that a comparison of such a proposal with the Reorganization Act shows it to be basically wrong. The reason it is basically wrong is that under the Reorganization Act the executive department is, in fact, dealing with the executive departments of Government. In that kind of situation perhaps the Reorganization Act, which gives Congress only the right to veto, has some possibility of being fruitful and the expedient way of handling executive departments.

However, in this particular situation what we are dealing with is wholly different. We are saying that we will take a vast amount of public land, belonging to the people of the United States all over the country, and blanket it into a system, as the result of which the majority of the people can no longer use those lands for any purpose whatsoever.

The evidence has shown, in the House and in the Senate, if I may use a colloquial term, that only about 2 percent of the visitors to public lands never go into the wilderness lands at all.

This taking of action by Executive decree is beyond the principle and scope of the effort which we in this great body should undertake. We should determine whether particular lands are to be isolated and carried out of use by people of the United States, and isolated into a situation where only 2 percent of the people can have any benefit out of them.

There are other problems involved in connection with this situation. I was able, during the course of the hearings, to ask the distinguished head of the Forest Service as to whether passage of the bill would later prevent the construction of electric transmission lines across wilderness systems which might be incorporated in the pending bill. I asked whether we would be able to continue the necessary water development of the West if we passed the bill. I asked that particularly because of the need that we have for water development in the western area of the United States, in particular.

The answer that I received was that the bill, if passed, would supersede other laws now on the books, and that this would mean that no construction could go on in these wilderness areas, of any kind, unless the President of the United States himself determines that this construction of transmission lines or water development facilities, or whatever it might be, was in the public interest to the extent that there should be permitted an invasion of the wilderness concept of any particular land. This could easily in the State of Colorado, and in any other Western State, seriously hamper the necessary construction of facilities for the accumulation of water for the benefit of the entire economy of the Western area of the United States.

It is a really serious question as to whether it will be possible to continue water development if any of the wilderness systems which are contemplated under the terms of the bill will in fact hamper the construction of transmission lines or the development of water facilities. We already know that within some of the wilderness systems which would be brought within the terms of the bill as it is now presented to the Senate, there are in existence water development projects which it will be necessary, in some manner, to maintain so as to insure their continuance. There is no such guarantee in the bill at the present time. Therefore, it would be necessary to promulgate special regulations or to get special exceptions in order to be able to take care of existing water developments in certain portions of wilderness areas at the present moment. This is one reason why I have serious doubt whether the bill, if it remains in its present form, even with the amendments adopted by the committee, will be able to pass the other body of Congress.

I say again, publicly, that I favor a legislative system to preserve wilderness areas; but I have strong doubts as to whether the pending bill will accomplish that result. I say that because I have strong doubt as to whether the bill in its present form will ever pass the other body of Congress.

We have a very simple amendment, which was offered in committee by my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], which would reserve the process which is proposed in the bill. It would bring into the wilderness system all lands which are now classified as wilderness or canoe, but would leave out all lands now classified as primitive. It includes specific instructions that primitive lands shall remain primitive under their present usage, but that they would be reviewed by the executive department, and that each year, as Congress meets, Congress would be presented with recommendations as to those lands, not only by the executive department but also by the Governors of the States and by representatives of the local areas which are involved, after hearings. The recommendations would be presented to Congress for authorization to be included within the wilderness system.

If this type of amendment were adopted by the Senate, it seems to me that without any doubt not only would there be almost unanimous approval for the passage of the bill in this body, but that the chances of the passage of the bill in final form through the other body would be greatly enhanced. At the moment, I do not conceive of any particular difficulty in getting a bill of that type through the other body. However, I anticipate substantial difficulty in having a bill of the present nature, even with the committee amendments which have been adopted, passed by the other body.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Do I correctly understand that the committee amendments as shown in the committee report—Report No. 109—have already been adopted by voice vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been adopted. The bill as amended is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The plan was to have the committee amendments adopted en bloc. The bill then would be regarded as a new bill, to which amendments to any section thereof would be in order. Amendments which were then offered would not be barred as third degree amendments, or anything of that nature.

Mr. DOMINICK. Have the amendments which were included in Report No. 109 been explained to the Senate?

Mr. ANDERSON. They have not been explained. A motion was made that they be adopted. The explanation should properly take place during the discussion of the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. Has that motion yet been voted upon?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, it has. The committee amendments have been adopted en bloc, and the bill is all new text, as carried in the report, for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. That relieves my mind.

Mr. President, most of us, particularly those of us who represent the Western States, are probably more conscious of the beauty and magnificence of the proposed wilderness areas than perhaps any other group in the United States. Most of us from that area use the public lands for hunting, fishing, and exploring. Some of the public lands are used for grazing purposes. Those who conduct grazing operations on the lands have participated in the process of soil conservation within those areas and have performed a very fine service in many cases. Therefore, I believe that the general attitude which has been created by some conservationists, namely, that those who are opposed to this type of bill are a group of Neanderthals, and who do not have any idea of what the greatest heritage of our country is, are simply wholly wrong in their approach to the problem. They do not understand what we are trying, basically, to do.

I do not suppose there is any group of people who are more conscious of the need of preserving the public lands and of the need for having as a national heritage public lands, public parks, and systems of this kind, which can be preserved and used for their beauty and for the solitude that is contemplated in the bill, for hunting, for fishing, and all the other desirable uses that these lands would make possible. But this does not derogate from the conflict with the basic principle, namely, whether Congress will retain affirmative control over the public lands, or whether Congress proposes simply to delegate the whole operation to the executive department, and retain nothing except the right of veto. It seems to me that that is the basic principle with which we in this body are concerned, and which will be of great concern in the other body.

I add one more observation. I have explored, I have fished, I have hunted, I have hiked, I have camped all through these systems. I have been doing it for most of my life. I think most of us in the Senate have done so, in one form or another. We who feel that the bill should be amended are not trying to prevent its passage. We are simply trying to insure the adoption of a system which will not prevent the great majority of the people of the country from enjoying these areas, from enjoying the lands which will actually be included in the system, and insure that the lands will be those which should more properly be within that system.

We are also very carefully trying to outline for the Members of this body the basic conflict in the matter of principle. Will Congress retain control and authority over the public lands in an affirmative sense, or will we turn control over to the executive department, as is now proposed in S. 4, even as amended?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have asked the Senator to yield for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent request. The proposal has been cleared with the two Senators from Colorado, with the minority leader, and the acting minority leader; with the majority leader; with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who has done so much in behalf of the bill; and with the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business of the Senate has been completed today, the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, 1 hour be allocated to each amendment, 30 minutes to a side, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]; and that there also be 1 hour on the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not

object, does the majority leader contemplate any morning hour tomorrow at 10 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. KUCHEL. It is proposed that the Senate adjourn today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; and the time for debate will begin at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. KUCHEL. So, Mr. President, assuming that yea-and-nay votes are ordered, the Senate should be on notice, as I understand, that on or about 11 a.m. the Senate will begin to vote on the proposed amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The acting minority leader is correct in his assumption.

Mr. KUCHEL. Very well.

I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The chair hears none, and without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, on Tuesday, April 9, 1963, at the hour of 10 a.m., the Senate resume the consideration of the bill S. 4, the so-called Wilderness Act, and that thereafter debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. CHURCH: *Provided,* That in the event Mr. CHURCH is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Colorado has made three arguments which I think require some comments for purposes of clarification, if for no other purpose.

First of all, he has called for amendments to the bill, on the ground that unless we amend the bill in certain important respects, it will not be acceptable to the other body.

Mr. President, it is always open to the other body to modify in anyway it may see fit measures passed by the Senate; and if we in the Senate are to do our constitutional job, it certainly is not incumbent upon us to pass measures in such form as we think might be acceptable to the other body. Instead, we should pass measures which in our judgment will constitute the best and most desirable legislation for the country. In doing so, we do not impinge upon the prerogatives of the other body; instead, we discharge our own responsibilities in the best and highest sense of that term.

Second, the junior Senator from Colorado has argued that we should handle primitive areas in the way we handle reclamation projects; namely, by having special authorization by Congress prior to the time any given project is constructed.

I would agree if we were considering the establishment, for the first time, of primitive areas; if we were faced with a situation in which there were no primitive areas; and if Congress were being asked now to establish them. If this were the situation, it might be entirely appropriate to take the position that these areas should be established only upon the affirmative act of Congress.

But today we have in our national forests over 6 million acres which have been designated by the executive agencies of the Government as primitive areas. These areas have been established for periods of between 20 and 30 years. In my State alone, Mr. President, there are in excess of 3 million acres in primitive areas. The authority to establish these areas, to enlarge them, to create new ones, and to modify their boundaries was delegated years and years ago to the executive branch by the Congress.

What we are attempting to achieve by this bill is a measure of congressional control which does not now exist. In Idaho, we have waited for nearly 30 years to have these primitive areas reviewed by the Forest Service. Only this year has the Forest Service managed to complete its review of one of them, namely, the Selway-Bitterroot Area, involving portions of Idaho and Montana—an area which originally comprised 1,875,000 acres. The Forest Service has for the past 2 years studied the area, held special hearings in Montana and Idaho, and finally made recommendations—which were approved only 2 months ago by the Secretary of Agriculture—committing 1,240,000 acres of the area to wilderness, excluding and restoring to ordinary forest lands 447,000 acres which were found to be more suitable for multipurpose use, and leaving 190,000 acres in primitive area status.

Mr. President, this example should suffice to demonstrate that the executive agencies not only have the power to establish primitive areas, but also can redesignate the primitive areas as wilderness areas, without having the matter even come to Congress for any sort of consent, surveillance, or review.

The Secretary of Agriculture has announced his intention to convert another primitive area in Idaho—the Sawtooth Primitive Area, comprising 200,942 acres of land—into a wilderness area. Again he proposes to do so—using authority he now has under existing law—by the stroke of his pen; and the matter will never come to Congress for any vote or any review.

So I suggest that it is totally unrealistic to argue that this bill somehow diminishes congressional power over the public lands. The very contrary is the case. The bill seeks to restore to Congress surveillance over the portions of the primitive areas which are to be permanently included in the wilderness system; and the bill does so by providing that before the President, acting through the Secretary of Agriculture, may convert a primitive area into a wilderness area and may make it permanently part of the wilderness system, he must submit his recommendation to Congress, where it will be subject to review by both Houses, and where either House can, by majority vote, veto the proposal.

So, Mr. President, by means of this bill we are attempting to accomplish a restoration of authority to Congress, thus reclaiming to Congress a power which heretofore has been delegated to the executive branch.

Finally, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Colorado has argued that the bill constitutes some sort of impairment with respect to the development of water resources within the areas affected by the bill. He has pointed out, quite correctly, the importance of water impoundments—dams, power generators, and reclamation projects—to the West. But, Mr. President, I suggest that there are two portions of the bill which adequately assure the West continued water development, and I submit that even within the wilderness system the bill does not constitute any impediment whatever.

First of all is the provision which preserves intact the authority of the Federal Power Commission to license water projects.

In the course of the hearings it was made clear that the Federal Power Commission, which Congress has charged with the authority to license water development projects on the rivers of the West, would retain its full jurisdiction. There is no provision in the bill to the contrary which would affect that jurisdiction. So with respect to the major water developments that must be licensed by the Federal Power Commission, the bill would in no way interfere.

Second, there is provision that the President of the United States may open a wilderness area to minor water resource conservation measures, small watershed developments, so that once we would place areas into wilderness, they would not forever be removed from such activity.

Finally, need it be said that with respect to major public water projects, the Congress always retains authority—and, indeed, it is the practice of the Congress—to authorize such projects by legislation. Nothing in the bill could affect the power of Congress to authorize public water projects in wilderness areas by specific enactment. That is our practice anyway. So I suggest there is no basis for the arguments that the Senator has advanced. I hope that the Senate will not amend the bill in the ways that he has suggested.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I was particularly interested in two phases of the very interesting discussion of the Senator. First was the question of fact as to whether we would regain authority under the bill from the executive department or whether we would not. I would say that

I think we probably would. I think that is probably a correct analysis of it.

But the point I am making is that we would not regain the type of authority that we should take. With respect to the analysis of the Senator from Idaho as to what the executive department can do now and what the Congress would be permitted to do under the bill as it stands in its present form, I ask the following question: Is it not true that at the present moment there must be positive action by the Congress of the United States in order to create a national park, even though it may be out of lands classified as public lands in one form or another?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct. There must be an affirmative enactment on the part of Congress to establish a new national park. But there need be no action at all on the part of Congress, in fact, no congressional action is now taken when areas within the national forest are placed in wilderness status. That authority has long since been delegated away to the Secretary of Agriculture, and this bill would restore the prerogative of Congress.

Mr. DOMINICK. But my question really is as follows: If we must take positive action to create a national park, why should we not also take positive action in order to create a wilderness area?

Mr. CHURCH. The answer to that question is that the primitive areas are already there. In this bill we are attempting to have them reviewed within a 10-year period, and a determination made by those reviews as to what portions of the areas shall be permanently included in the wilderness system. Given those facts, if we were to require affirmative action on the part of Congress before primitive areas that are already there may be included within the wilderness system, we could not assure ourselves that each of the recommendations would ever come to the floor of either House for action.

The Senator from Colorado, having been a Member of the other body, is fully aware that many legislative proposals and many executive recommendations never get to the floors of Congress for a vote. If we were to require positive action, which would call for an affirmative vote in both the Senate and the House of Representatives before a recommendation could take effect, there would be no way by which we could assure ourselves that those recommendations would ever be acted upon in the Congress. After the 10-year review period has expired, without some action by the Congress, the bill provides that primitive area lands not acted upon would automatically be returned to regular National forest status. So the only way that we could guarantee that primitive areas would be reviewed and the Congress would act upon them is by the device that is provided in the bill giving a veto to either House, but not requiring affirmative action on the part of both Houses.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I would merely say in passing that if we should determine that that was the necessary procedure to get something before Congress in this case, it seems to me that perhaps any measure which the Senator from Idaho favored ought to be treated legislatively along those lines. Such action would seriously reduce the power of Congress.

But the other point that I wished to make was with reference to the question of whether or not the proposal might inhibit water development, reclamation projects, and the construction of transmission lines on projects that have already been authorized and constructed.

I call to the attention of the Senator from Idaho the questions that were asked of the Secretary of the Interior as they appear on page 29 of the hearings. I pointed out that water development includes more than merely plain damsites. It includes the construction of conduits—transmission lines—a great number of pieces of which must go across lands which would be included within the wilderness system under the bill as it is now written. I asked him whether the provision would not give a right of veto to the President of any particular reclamation project that might be passed by Congress. The President could say, "All right. We do not mind the reclamation project, but we are not going to permit you to build facilities for the reclamation project across the wilderness system." The answer was that obviously that could be true.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I respectfully disagree with the Secretary of the Interior in that regard. Had he had an opportunity better to consider the question and his answer, I believe he would have concluded otherwise.

First, if we are to have any new public water project in a wilderness area, it would require positive action of the Congress, and that requires Presidential consent; he must sign the bill. It is hard for me to feature why a President would sign a bill authorizing a public project and then turn around and refuse to permit the building of the project by virtue of the fact that it is located in a wilderness area. That would be an act of complete contradiction.

Second, if the project is a private project, it must be licensed by the public power commission. The bill preserves the full prerogative of the Federal Power Commission without any inhibition or limitation whatsoever.

I suggest to the Senator that his fears are not well grounded with respect to this proposed legislation.

Mr. DOMINICK. I sincerely trust that the Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I intend to speak at some length on this subject. I wish to begin by remarking that no bill that has been before the Congress in the past 2 years has had as many words said about it which shed as little light or little understanding of what the bill is about as the particular measure before us.

I first encountered this matter in the spring of 1957. Since then various groups in support of a wilderness system have grown up, like mushrooms, all over the country.

What is a wilderness system? The bill describes it in some of the most wonderfully idealistic language anyone ever could conjure up:

> A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man.

There are those of us who have opposed this concept of a wilderness system for years. I shall always oppose it, because I think it is wrong. It is wrong because it is a travesty upon the great majority of the American people. I shall go into this later.

Secondly, it is wrong because the bill, as now drawn, violates the fundamental precepts of our American constitutional system.

It is also wrong because it would give to a very few people in the United States the unbridled use of land to the detriment of every other public use, whether it be mining, grazing, forestry, or plain recreation.

All those factors add up to sufficient reason, in my mind, for opposing the bill in its present form.

I say again—because it seems necessary to say it at least a hundred times to get it through the minds of some people who will not and do not wish to purvey and repurvey the truth—I am in support of a limited wilderness system. I have always been in support of a wilderness system. I am in support of a wilderness system of from 7 to 8 million acres. There is one now existing of 8 million acres.

I think we should set aside forever for the people of this country an area which will be essentially untouched by man and unbothered by man, which will be used solely for a measure of enjoyment by man of nature in its primitive state.

The facts are that there are some 65 million acres, using round figures, in primitive areas, wild areas, canoe areas, wilderness areas, wildlife refuges and game areas, and national parks which are susceptible of inclusion in the wilderness system.

The pending bill seeks to include and would include immediately in the wilderness system all of the primitive areas, all of the wilderness areas, all of the wild areas, and all of the canoe areas.

The question is, What should we do? There is one big question, aside from the problem of improving the language of the bill and making it more workable. The big question is, How should we include these areas within the wilderness system? How should we add to the 8 million acres?

I wish to point out a few things about the 8 million acres which are now in the wilderness system. Some 1¼ million acres were added in the past year by administrative action taken in the Department. This is one reason why I want a bill passed. I say to those who are sponsors of the bill, they are no more anxious to have a wilderness bill passed than I am, except that I should like for Congress to take a hard, affirmative look

at every acre of land which is to come under the system afterwards.

The testimony has been undisputed before the committee for several years that not more than 1 percent of all the people who use the Federal public land areas—the forests, the parks and everything else—use the wilderness system.

Before the administrative action was taken last year, those people already had available for their use 8 percent of all of the land of the public domain, set aside in wilderness areas. So the 1 percent of the people who use our public lands, before the administrative action was taken last year, had the use of 8 percent of the land. They had 8 times as much of the use of the land, in proportion, as did the people who used the national parks, the national monuments, and things such as that, in the ordinary sense in which we use them.

What happened last year was that there were approximately 1¼ million acres added—whatever the figure was; at least a million acres—in the Selway-Bitterroot Area of Idaho. That raised the proportion. Now the 1 percent of the people who use our public lands have 12 percent of the public lands set aside for their use—12 percent is set aside for their exclusive use.

I am somewhat of a realist. I can appreciate the great cultural values some of these people feel these lands might have. When they have 12 times as much land set aside for their use as the ordinary individual does, I think they are getting somewhere near their equal share of the public land use.

There is a more impelling reason why we should not go beyond this at the present time. If Senators will read the bill, they will find that no one could go into these areas except man on his two legs or on horses. There are to be no roads. No motorboats will be allowed, except where they have been customarily used, and they will be regulated out as fast as they can be. There will be no machinery of any kind in these areas. There will be nothing allowed in the areas except man on his two legs and on horses.

What will this mean in practical terms and effects? I do not care what the supporters of the bill have said to the contrary, the facts are it is not within the financial realm of the average man who takes his family on a vacation to rent an outfit with a guide and horses, as well as pack horses and the necessary equipment, to go into a wilderness area. I do not care what anybody says to the contrary, we shall be establishing here, mainly, a wilderness system for people of more affluent means, denying the area and its enjoyment for the most part to people of ordinary means.

But there is another reason for opposition. No roads are to be provided. I do not have the figures with me, but we all know that there is a growing number of people who are retired, who have reached the ages of 60 and 65. They have retired, and now, perhaps for the first time in their lives, they have sufficient time to utilize these facilities, to have some of the pleasures of life, after having worked for so long.

There is not one person in a thousand of that age who has the physical stamina to put a pack on his back or to ride a horse into a wilderness area 25 miles in order to enjoy the use of that area, even if he had the money to hire a horse and guides. Frankly, most of them have no business in those areas without guides, having lived a more sedentary existence all their lives. They have no justification physically for walking or riding into those areas.

So what have we done here? We have already locked up 12 percent of our public lands, and the most beautiful areas in the United States. They are not locking up any old swamp or merely mediocre views, or anything like that, for the 1 percent of the population; they are locking up 12 percent of the most beautiful, wild, primitive country we have between the Atlantic and the Pacific.

Now, I think there is a case to be made for pure justice and pure equity. Consider that our people from 60 to 65 years of age cannot have access to a road where they can view those parts of the country, because no roads are permitted in them. On the other hand, how well are we going to treat the 1 percent of our population, this handful of people who are reaching out for more and more of this land? They are not satisfied with the 8 million acres that they have now. Under this bill 65 million acres of land are subject to reclassification as wilderness area, and this is what they are reaching out to grab.

As a matter of compromise, I am perfectly willing, personally, to go along with the 8.2 million acres they now have. But it seems to me we are going as far as we should go.

This brings me to the amendment which I have offered, and which I intend to offer again tomorrow morning, to provide that, just like the park system, no more lands shall be included in the wilderness system unless Congress has acted affirmatively.

I think my colleague from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] very beautifully and brilliantly illustrated this point just a few minutes ago. Fortunately, we have not given authority to the Secretary of the Interior to throw any lands he wants to into this system. Congress has retained jurisdiction for that purpose.

On February 20 of this year, the following Senators all joined me in offering an amendment to Senate bill 4: Messrs. BARTLETT, BENNETT, CANNON, DOMINICK, FONG, GOLDWATER, HAYDEN, JORDAN of Idaho, LAUSCHE, MECHEM, MUNDT, RANDOLPH, SIMPSON, and THURMOND.

This amendment is not now in print, having been submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and that it may also be printed for the use of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

(f) Any recommendation of the President made in accordance with the provisions of this section shall take effect upon the day following the adjournment sine die of the first complete session of the Congress following the date or dates on which such recommendation was received by the United States Senate and the House of Representatives; but only if prior to such adjournment Congress approves a concurrent resolution declaring itself in favor of such recommendation: *Provided*, That, in the case of a recommendation covering two or more separate areas, such resolution may be limited to one or more of the areas covered or parts thereof.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I shall discuss this amendment more fully tomorrow.

In order to understand this problem and all its ramifications, there are certain things that need to be known. First of all, let us face it squarely—this is not a conservation bill. I repeat, this is not a conservation bill. The word "conservation" is mentioned in the bill only once.

As a man who has lived all his life in the West, I think I understand conservation about as well as anyone. I have been a fan of conservation measures, and I may say even a rabid supporter.

In my opinion, the bill as it is now constituted is not going to conserve anything. It is going to lock up areas for the use of a few. But the conservation aspects of the bill are completely lacking.

I should like to underscore again the fact that this is not a conservation measure. If a bill locking up areas which may not receive the benefits of conservation is called a conservation measure, then we have reversed the meaning of conservation in this country. The word "conservation" is mentioned in the bill only once. I do not see mentioned anywhere in the bill the fact that conservation is one of the purposes hoped to be accomplished.

In order that the record may be completely clear, there are in the national forest, wild, wilderness, and canoe areas, 8,220,403 acres.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Can the Senator tell me how many acres there are in my State of Arizona?

Mr. ALLOTT. The figures I have before me show 422,990.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. In the National Park System there are 22,560,000 acres.

In the lands not now permanently withdrawn from resource use, there are in the national forest primitive areas 6,098,532 acres.

There are 28,554,014 acres in the National Wildlife Refuges and game areas.

That makes a total of 65,432,949 acres that are susceptible of inclusion within the wilderness areas.

I ask unanimous consent that I may include in the RECORD at this point a table

showing Federal ownership or management of land in 11 Western States. The table shows, I may say for the benefit of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who is on the floor, that 71.3 percent of the State of Arizona is owned by the Federal Government.

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

TABLE 1.—*Federal ownership or management of land in 11 Western States*

	Total land area (thousand acres)	Federally owned land [1] (thousand acres)	Percent of total land area	Managed by Federal Government Indian tribal lands (thousand acres)	Percent of total land area	Federally owned or managed lands (thousand acres)	Percent of total land area
Arizona	72,688	32,396	44.6	19,383	26.7	51,779	71.3
California	100,314	45,071	44.9	496	.5	45,567	45.4
Colorado	66,510	24,156	36.3	746	1.1	24,902	37.4
Idaho	52,972	34,050	64.3	409	.8	34,459	65.1
Montana	93,362	27,815	29.8	1,557	1.7	29,372	31.5
Nevada	70,265	60,726	86.4	1,062	1.5	61,788	87.9
New Mexico	77,767	27,300	35.1	5,815	7.5	33,115	42.6
Oregon	61,642	31,580	51.2	1,208	2.0	32,788	53.2
Utah	52,701	36,466	69.2	2,253	4.3	38,719	73.5
Washington	42,743	12,666	29.6	1,813	4.2	14,479	33.8
Wyoming	62,404	30,219	48.4	1,753	2.8	31,972	51.2
Total	753,368	362,445	48.1	36,495	4.8	398,940	52.9

[1] Excludes trust properties, Indian tribal lands.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1960.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I might point out that in my State of Arizona, when we add the State-owned land to the Federal-owned land, the total is 88 percent. In other words, the fastest growing State in the Nation must get along, taxwise, by taxing 12 percent of the available land.

I suggest that in the days when my State had fewer than a million people, and the density was two or three persons to the square mile, we could live under those conditions. However, what the Federal Government is doing by forcing more and more land in the West under Federal control is to hasten the day when the Western States will not be able to tax themselves adequately to run their own governments. Of course, when this happens, the only place that we will be able to turn to will be the Federal Government. That is something that we westerners do not like to do.

It is unfortunate that when the Original Thirteen States formed our Union they, too, were not subjected to some kind of giving away of their land in order to become members of the Union.

Frankly, I believe that if we westerners had known before what we know now, many of our communities would not be States of the Union, but would still be territories. I say that because, frankly, we were better off as far as the ability to live our own lives was concerned.

In my State we have 16 national monuments, 2 national parks, and 2 national recreation areas. I forget how many wildlife areas we have. Still the effort is to put more and more land under the control of the Federal Government, instead of continuing with the rather time-honored and time-proven concept of multiple use of the lands in the West.

I suggest that our eastern friends, who are so eager to have the West become a giant national park, might try to imagine their own State problems if they were to have in their own States their own lands subjected to ownership by the Federal Government.

I might say, in passing, because I see on the floor my good friend from Idaho, sitting in the majority leader's chair, that, as he well knows, one of my favorite fishing spots in the whole Nation is in the Middle Fork of the Salmon River in Idaho. I remember when that was truly a wilderness area, when it was hard to get in, and when it meant perhaps a 2½-day pack trip to get to the Middle Fork of the Salmon River. It was opened up. I do not know if it is a wilderness area, as such. However, it is some kind of wildlife area.

To me that was one of the most beautiful streams in the world. Although it has retained its beauty, the area has been opened up to people who have no appreciation for this kind of scenery. The last time I was there I saw empty beer cans and empty whisky bottles, and fish still lying around the campsites, and the campsites uncleaned. Instead of preserving these areas as wilderness areas, the tendency is to have them more and more opened up. The public will demand that they be opened up. As a result they will lose their scenic value. I am in hearty accord with the preservation of areas for people who really like to get into the wilderness, or get out into the open, as we say, and use it. However, I am not in favor of opening it up to the abuse of people who want to say they have been there and in the process leave their trade mark.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield, so that I may respond to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CHURCH. The area to which the Senator from Arizona refers is, of course, an Idaho primitive area. I know the Senator loves the area very much. He has taken some wonderful photographs of the area on the occasion of his trips into it in the past. I say to him that one of the purposes of the proposed legislation is to prevent a further opening up of the area, which is what has occurred in past years, so that the scenic and wilderness values, which are the predominant values, can be preserved, and so that the wildlife and the watershed can be preserved as well. In this sense, the bill is not only a wise conservation measure, but also a measure to prevent the continuation of the very process the Senator has lamented.

I might just say in passing, in all good humor, that I have listened with interest to the remarks of the Senator with respect to the burdens of statehood. I would say that it is open to him to sponsor legislation to restore Arizona to territorial status. If a persuasive case can be made, I believe Congress would listen with fascination to the advocacy of such a proposal by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I might say that I doubt Congress would seriously consider, or that even the New Frontier would seriously consider, such a proposal, because we pay about $300 million a year into the National Treasury. I do not believe they are about to let go of a fat plum like that.

My reference was to the days when we became territories and then later States, when we did not have big populations, and when Federal ownership of lands, even in Idaho and in Montana, was of no great consequence. We never gave it any thought at all. Today, in a State like my own, which is the sixth largest State from a geographical standpoint in the United States, we find ourselves with these national parks and national monuments and national recreation areas located in our State, and approximately 19 Indian reservations, taking up about 88 percent of the State. We do not like to lose any more of the 12 percent of the land, because we are up against the wall now.

There is another point that I should like to raise and with respect to it ask a question of my good friend from Idaho, if the Senator from Colorado will yield for that purpose.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. First I should like to respond to the Senator from Arizona by saying that the pending bill does not involve the acquisition of so much as a single acre of additional Federal land; all of the land involved is already owned by the Federal Government; so it will not impose any heavier burden upon the Western States, where, I agree, Federal ownership is very large. The bill does not enlarge that holding whatever.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to be reassured on that point by the Senator. This is the point that bothers me. I know what the intention of the writers of the bill is. I can say that I am in accord with it, but I am troubled by this point. The Senator says that the Idaho Wilderness Area, if it becomes a part of the public land, will be preserved in its present form and condition.

I have asked this question of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, with respect to a large section of land near Henry Mountain, in southern Utah, in the Wild Horse Area, about which Zane Grey wrote, and with respect to Navaho Mountain, where I run a trading post, an area consisting of about 15 million acres, which he wants to make into a so-called wilderness area. What is going to happen when the eastern tourist or the western tourist cannot get in there? What if he cannot get in there because he does not like to ride a horse and he does not like to walk, perhaps because he has not heard of the 50-mile program, but, instead, likes to drive his car on a paved road and find good accommodations when he gets there? My question is, Can the Interior Department and can the organization set up to administer the bill and can Congress withstand pressures to provide the funds to open these places? That is what bothers me.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I should like to respond to the question of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Idaho to permit him to respond; then I should like to resume my discourse.

Mr. CHURCH. The very pressures which the Senator from Arizona fears are pressures which are genuinely feared by the supporters of the proposed legislation. We feel that an enactment of this kind will provide better guarantees that wilderness areas can be preserved in their primitive state than will the absence of such legislation. Without such legislation, it is much more likely that the pressures will not be withstood and that the small portions of the wilderness which still remain to us will vanish. This is one of the chief reasons why I support the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to respond, since the Senator from Arizona has raised this question. I am looking at a map which is included in the hearings on S. 174, the wilderness bill, held in 1961. I am looking at page 284, which has facing it a map of Colorado and a map of Arizona, showing areas which are susceptible of inclusion in the wilderness system.

Everyone who desires to have some kind of beauty retained in our mountains must ask himself a question. For example, if one looks at the wilderness areas in Colorado, he observes that it is very hard to establish a camp on the side of one of our mountains which rise to 14,000 feet. Ultimately, in the wilderness areas of the West, one is reduced to a relatively few locations where camps can be established.

The next question one must ask himself is this: After 30, 40, or 50 parties have camped in those few areas which are suitable for camping, and considering the tin cans and other refuse, including the residue left by horses, how much suitable area will be left untrammeled by man and his four-footed friends? The answer is: Not too much So the proposal to include more and more land in the bill is unrealistic.

The Senator from Arizona mentioned the multiple-use concept of land. I wish to discuss that point. Since the passage by Congress of the multiple-use law, this would be really the first time that that law would be completely abrogated. Congress included in the multiple-use law the use of areas for a wilderness system. I think this is one of the proper uses. But we simply cannot afford, as I pointed out to the Senate 2 years ago, to put all our land—some of it our best land—into wilderness and lock it up so that it can never be touched again.

Mr. John Wolfe, a prominent Colorado geologist, made an impressive statement before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this year. He pointed out that the great portion of the mineral wealth of Colorado lies beneath the wilderness areas which would be set aside by the bill. The same is true of other States. When we begin to talk about conservation and the use of land, I think we are entitled to talk about multiple use. When 12 percent of all the public lands of this country are already locked up for a single use—as wilderness areas—merely to enable people to breathe fresh air, I think we have reached a place beyond which we should not go until Congress has had an opportunity to consider the proposal and gage it affirmatively. The multiple-use theory with respect to land has been accepted by Congress and has been adopted by Congress. I think it should be retained by Congress.

When we hear what is proposed to be done with the land, I think it should be pointed out that in the 11 States of the West—Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming—the value of the farm, mine, and forest products is $6,369 million. The value of the mineral production is $3.8 billion; the value of forest products is $3.3 billion.

As in the State of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], Federal land ownership is substantial in Colorado, roughly, 35 percent. That means that we who live there must bear a greater proportion of the expense of our State than we would if we had the opportunity to convert Federal lands to private ownership; but we do not have that opportunity.

At the time a similar bill was considered by the Senate 2 years ago, the proponents did not pay any attention whatever to impending report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. The reason was that the report had not been completed at that time. But the proponents were perfectly willing, anyway, to establish wilderness areas, even though some $2 million had been spent on the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and the study which it had made. Congress nevertheless proceeded to consider wilderness legislation.

Now the report of that Commission is before us. What did that "blue chip" Commission, of which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] was a member, say about wilderness areas. Speaking of primitive areas, the report said:

> Areas in this class are inspirational, esthetic, scientific, and cultural assets of the highest value. They, and they alone, satisfy the longing to leave behind for a time all contact with civilization. Fortunately, they are a resource of which the country still has an abundant supply and which it can afford to preserve from other uses for the benefit of future generations. At the same time, it must be recognized that there are some areas which meet the physical requirements of this class but which for economic and social reasons are more valuable for other purposes.
>
> The recommendation is that primitive areas should be carefully selected and should be managed for the sole and unequivocal purpose of maintaining their primitive characteristics.

What the Commission said was that some of the lands may be valuable for other purposes than as wilderness areas. With that statement I agree.

Mr. President, turning now to the bill, it contains several items which I think should be considered very carefully.

On page 17 we find the following provision in regard to grazing:

> The grazing of livestock * * * shall be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions and regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary having jurisdiction over such area.

Mr. President, in the committee I tried unsuccessfully to have the word "restrictions" stricken, because I believe that word has a connotation in the bill which is not justified. So, Mr. President, tomorrow I shall try again to have that word stricken.

The word "restrictions" is also used in connection with motorboats, on page 16. I think there is no question that it is the intention of both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to restrict the use of motorboats. However, with respect to this matter I notice the provision that—

> The President may * * * authorize prospecting (including but not limited to exploration for oil and gas), mining (including but not limited to the production of oil and gas)—

And so forth, and so on.

The point is that "restrictions" and "regulations" either mean the same thing or else "restrictions" further qualifies "regulations." I believe it rather significant that the portion which refers to the President's action provides for "regulations," but the bill provides that there will be "restrictions" in regard to the use of motorboats. If anything is to be done with respect to grazing in the wilderness system, I believe such a provision should be included under "regulations," not "restrictions." In my opinion and, I believe, in the opinion of most persons, the word "restrictions" carries with it the right arbitrarily to establish a guideline which must be followed, whereas the word "regulations" implies a limitation under a definite set of guidelines which will remain constant and will not be subject to the whim or fancy of the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment relating to these words. I ask that the amendment be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in the next few minutes I propose to discuss briefly several amendments which I shall send to the desk and ask to have printed.

I turn now to another amendment relating to page 17 of the bill. This part of the bill has caused us a great deal of concern and trouble. I refer to the provision of the bill that:

(2) Within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, (A) the President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable,—

And so forth.

My amendment would substitute the words "appropriate Secretary" for "the President." I believe it perfectly obvious to anyone—and tomorrow I shall discuss this matter at greater length—that no one would have access to the President, for the purpose of securing authority to explore for minerals or "the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance," and so forth. Of course I believe those who drafted the bill desire to place that power in the hands of the President, because no one would have access to him. However, if we wish this provision to be meaningful, and if we really mean what we provide in the bill when we include the provision that this can be done whenever the public interest demands it, let us put the authority in the Secretary, and permit him to take action.

So, Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk, and ask that it be printed and lie on the desk until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I also call attention to the review provided by the bill. On page 10 of the bill we find the following provision:

Provided, further, That where a resolution of opposition to any such recommendation has been introduced, a hearing thereon shall be held within thirty days by the committee to which such resolution has been referred.

The difficulty arises from the fact that 30 days is too long a period of time. The Reorganization Act of 1949—and the procedures under the bill are subject to that act—contains a provision that immediately after 10 days following the filing of any resolution and its referral to a committee, any Member of the House or any Member of the Senate may move to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution. But if such a motion were made on the 11th day, for example, the committee would not be required to hold a hearing for 20 days after that, but still be in compliance with this provision of the bill.

So this amendment is a simple one which provides that the word "thirty" be changed to the word "five", so that the committee will have to hold a hearing within the limitation time provided under the Administrative Procedures Act, and so that the Member of the House or the Member of the Senate who makes the motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution will have in his hand, when he comes to the Senate or to the House, as the case may be, a hearing upon the resolution, and will have an opportunity to question and to cross-question witnesses and to provide a record and to have the record available for debate.

Mr. President, I ask that this amendment be printed and lie on the table until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Would the amendment be an amendment to a provision of the Reorganization Act or the provision on page 10, line 14, which reads "shall be held within thirty days"—so that it would read "five days"?

Mr. ALLOTT. It is an amendment to line 14. "Thirty" would read "five".

Mr. METCALF. There would be no change in the other provisions of the Reorganization Act?

Mr. ALLOTT. No, the amendment would not affect the Reorganization Act, as such, or the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. METCALF. I merely wished to be clear as to the effect of the proposed amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. The amendment would only change the time of hearing from 30 days to 5 days, so that anyone who would desire to avail himself of the so-called advantages of the bill would really have some advantage he could take.

Mr. President, tomorrow I shall offer another amendment which would deal with page 3, line 23. I shall not discuss the amendment in detail today. The gist of it is that primitive areas would not be placed within the wilderness system following enactment of the bill, but, they would be assured their preservation in their present category and their protection until such time as they could be classified by the appropriate Secretary and recommendations made as to their exclusion from or inclusion in the wilderness system.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and lie on the desk. I am sure that members of the committee fully understand the purpose of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, line 23, strike out all through line 3 on page 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) (1) The wilderness system shall include all areas within the national forests classified on the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, or canoe: *Provided,* That the areas within the national forests classified as primitive may be included in the wilderness system as hereinafter provided. Following enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within ten years, review in accordance with paragraph C, section 251.20, of the Code of Federal Regulations, title 36, effective January 1, 1959, the suitability of each primitive area in the national forests for preservation as wilderness and shall report his findings to the President. While being reviewed and until action is taken as provided by this subsection, primitive areas shall be administered so as to preserve their present status and condition. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the inclusion within the wilderness system, or exclusion therefrom, of each area on which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definition of boundaries: *Provided,* That the President may, as a part of his recommendations, alter the boundaries existing on the date of this Act for any primitive area to be included in the wilderness system, recommending the exclusion and return to national forest land status of any portions not predominantly of wilderness value, or recommending the addition of any contiguous area of national forest lands predominantly of wilderness value; *Provided further,* That following such exclusions and additions any primitive area recommended to be included in the wilderness system shall not exceed the area classified as primitive on the date of this Act. The recommendation of the President with respect to the inclusion in the wilderness system, or the exclusion therefrom of a primitive area, or portions thereof, shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided,* That if Congress rejects a recommendation of the President and no revised recommendation is made to Congress with respect to that primitive area within two years, the land shall cease to be a primitive area and shall be administered as other national forest lands: *And provided further,* That primitive areas with respect to which recommendations are submitted to Congress on the eighth, ninth, and tenth years of the review period herein provided shall retain their status as primitive areas until the expiration, in respect to each area, of a full session of Congress, two years for resubmission of revised recommendations to Congress by the President, and, if so resubmitted, until the expiration of a full session of Congress thereafter. Recommendations on all primitive areas not previously submitted to the Congress shall be made during the tenth year of the review period. Any primitive area, or portion thereof, on which a recommendation for inclusion in the wilderness system has not become effective within fourteen years following the enactment of this Act shall cease to be a primitive area and shall be administered as other national forest land."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on page 17 of the bill is a section which, as I have stated, has caused us much trouble. There is a provision that purports to refer to mining, which I wish to discuss. I have already pointed out that

it is next to impossible—if not impossible—for anyone to get the President's ear for the purpose of determining whether or not a certain area should be explored and mined for oil, gas, or other minerals. The amendment which I propose would affect the mining provision which is now in the bill, which is utterly meaningless, and which would never have any effect.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed, that it lie on the table until tomorrow, and that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 17, line 1, strike out all through "(B)" on line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Within national forests and public domain areas included in the wilderness system: (A) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, until midnight, December 31, 1977, laws of the United States pertaining to mineral leasing and mining shall, to the same extent as applicable prior to the effective date of this Act, extend to all lands affected by this Act; subject, however, to such reasonable regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary having jurisdiction over the area consistent with the use of the land for mineral development and exploration drilling. Subject to valid rights then existing, effective January 1, 1978, the minerals in lands designated by this Act as wilderness areas are withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the mining laws and from leasing under the mining laws and from leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act and all amendments thereto. *Provided*, That after December 31, 1977, the appropriate Secretary may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including but not limited to the exploration and production of oil and gas).

"(B) The appropriate Secretary may within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable authorize the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water-conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof, upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial; and (C)".

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have one final amendment which I shall offer tomorrow. I am making my remarks so that Senators may be aware of the nature and the purposes of my amendments. The amendment, relating to page 21, line 9 of the bill, would strike out the section of the bill concerning a land use commission, a provision which was inserted in the bill to affect one State. I believe there is no justification for treating any one State any differently from another. In this instance the Secretary of Agriculture himself recommended that we exclude that provision from the bill.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it lie on the table. I ask unanimous consent that it may also be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 21, line 9, strike out all through line 4, page 22.

Mr. ALLOTT. In conclusion, we should have a wilderness system. We should have a wilderness bill. I desire to be protected from the precipitous actions of our Secretaries of Agriculture and our Secretaries of the Interior. We have found that they are capable of precipitous action. We found that they were capable of such action when they included the Selway-Bitterroot area last year.

It is my hope that we could have a wilderness bill which would protect all Americans—not merely those who desire wilderness, but also those who are interested in true conservation, those who are interested in the development of the West, and those who wish to see restored to Congress control of that portion of our congressional duties which we have relinquished. As the distinguished Senator from Idaho has said, it is true that, under the bill, we would have more control than we have had. But we would not have the control that we should have. What is needed is the right and the power to exert control over lands that are going into wilderness areas in the same way that we do lands that go into the national park system. Otherwise we will actually have abrogated much of our responsibility and our power, and we will be afflicted with more woes than Job ever was.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. METCALF. So that the discussion will be in today's RECORD and available for Senators to read, I desire to take some time to discuss the power which the Senator from Colorado suggests we should recapture. As was very brilliantly outlined by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who is handling the bill, we are only dealing with Federal land that has a certain specific use. We are recapturing some of the power that we delegated 30 to 50 years ago.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is that not the statement I just made?

Mr. METCALF. Yes.

I wish now to talk about the other Federal land, about which the Senator from Arizona was concerned, land with which all of us in the Western States are concerned. That is all the other Federal land that is not incorporated in a primitive area, in a national park, in a wilderness area, in a fish and wildlife or in a canoe area. As to those vast Federal lands, the bill would give authority to Congress that the Senator is seeking.

The bill provides that no new wilderness area shall be created out of areas that are not now under wilderness use or under use similar to wilderness use without an affirmative and specific act of Congress.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator's statement is in the form of a question, I shall be happy to answer. The Senator is completely correct. But the fact is that it is a statement without meaning. None of the areas of which he has spoken will ever be included in the wilderness areas because they would not be useful for that purpose. It is not that kind of area and not that kind of land.

As far as I know, at the present time the Department of Agriculture has already classified as primitive areas and as wilderness areas almost every strip of land in this country which could possibly be classified as such.

The Senator from Colorado was a faithful attendant at the hearings. The Senator will recall that several witnesses suggested that, contrary to our prediction a few years ago, the amount of land in wilderness and primitive areas in the national parks, and so forth, has grown in the last few years. Right now some of the people who were proponents of the measure are suggesting that other wilderness areas and other primitive areas in other parks shall be created. Under present law, as the Senator from Idaho has said, such areas could be created by a stroke of the pen. If the land is national forest land, the area could be created out of the national forests by a decision of the Secretary of Agriculture. But if the bill should pass, we would have to have an affirmative act to create a wilderness area just as we create a national park or authorize a Bureau of Reclamation project.

I merely wish to say to the Senator that if, under section (h), page 11, of the bill, he is perfectly happy to have other areas reviewed affirmatively, I can see no real basis for differentiation as to why we should have a different system for the areas that have been qualified as wilderness areas.

Mr. METCALF. Merely because——

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to remind the Senator that I have the floor. I yielded to him. I at least want to keep enough control so that I can answer in full before I yield to him again.

The fact is that the Senator was talking about areas which are outside of the primitive, wild, park, game refuge, and so forth, areas, and the Senator says, "This is all right." There is no justification for making a distinction as between the two. I made this statement before the Senator took his feet: I agree that by the bill, if it should become law—and the Lord forbid that it ever should become law—we would be recapturing a portion of the powers which we delegated away a long time ago. The point is that we would not be recapturing enough. We would not recapture enough so that the Congress would consider every acre which was to go into a wilderness system on exactly the same basis it considers every acre which is to go into the park system.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator.

I did not mean for the discussion to be a series of questions. I merely wished to discuss with the Senator a phase which the senior Senator from Colorado

and the junior Senator from Colorado had omitted.

I refer to the effect of the bill on other areas of the public domain which are not included in these various categories.

I should like to cite, for information, the ORRRC report, which the Senator from Colorado cited. On page 132 of the report there is the quotation:

Portions of national forests, parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, game ranges, and the unreserved public domain meet the basic criteria of primitive areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report, from which I have quoted, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

Portions of national forests, parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, game ranges, and the unreserved public domain meet the basic criteria of primitive areas. The natural environment has been undisturbed by commercial utilization, and they are without roads. Some of these areas are managed for the purposes of wilderness preservation under broad statutory authority. Certain class V areas of more than 100,000 acres in national forests have already been set aside by the Secretary of Agriculture as wilderness areas. Others between 5,000 and 100,000 acres have been set aside by the Chief of the Forest Service as wild areas.

There is widespread feeling, which the Commission shares, that the Congress should take action to assure the permanent reservation of these and similar suitable areas in national forests, national parks, wildlife refuges, and other lands in Federal ownership. The objective in the management of all class V areas, irrespective of size or ownership, is the same—to preserve primitive conditions. The purpose of legislation to designate outstanding areas in this class in Federal ownership as wilderness areas is to give the increased assurance of attaining this objective that action by the Congress will provide.

Mr. METCALF. I now skip some of the excerpt, to the point:

There is widespread feeling, which the Commission shares, that the Congress should take action to assure the permanent reservation of these and similar suitable areas in national forests, national parks, wildlife refuges, and other lands in Federal ownership.

I am suggesting that by the passage of the bill, with respect to other lands in Federal ownership and the unreserved public domain, we would be recapturing for the Congress an affirmative declaration of congressional action to create a wilderness out of those lands, which is sought by the two Senators from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then the Senator is recommending, as I understand, that other lands should go into the system, other than those contemplated by the pending bill?

Mr. METCALF. I am not recommending. The ORRRC report so recommends.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thought the Senator was citing it with approval.

Mr. METCALF. I was citing it in response to the suggestion made by the Senator from Colorado that there were no lands other than the primitive areas, and so forth, which were capable of wilderness use. I was suggesting that there are people, including the authors of the ORRRC report, who say that there are other lands in the public domain and national forests which meet the criteria for wilderness, and who wish to incorporate them into a wilderness system.

Mr. ALLOTT. I know that the Senator argues his point with great sincerity and with great belief in what he says. I should like to invite attention to the same section of the report to which the Senator has referred. On page 131 of the ORRRC report, it is stated:

Recommendation 8-6: Congress should enact legislation providing for the establishment and management of certain primitive areas (class V) as "wilderness areas."

There was nothing in the report about classifying all primitive areas as wilderness areas. That is what we would be doing, under the form of the bill as it is now being considered. We would include all primitive areas to start with in the wilderness system.

Mr. METCALF. The very next paragraph, which I have had printed in the RECORD along with my remarks, lists the national forests, national parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, game ranges, and the unreserved public domain, as meeting the basic criteria of primitive areas, as being lands which should go into the wilderness system.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have one question for the Senator. It is more a rhetorical question than an actual one.

If the affirmative action of the Congress is the proper way to bring in the other areas, why is it not a proper way to apply to the present bill?

Mr. METCALF. As the Senator from Idaho so eloquently pointed out, these areas are now and have been for more than 30 years primitive, for wilderness use. We would only continue the basic use which has existed for more than 30 years. We would not be using any of these acres of land for anything else; whether national parks, primitive areas, or designated as wilderness.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should have to disagree with the Senator, because if the primitive areas come into the wilderness system under the terms of the bill, even though there may be mining and some forestry in some of the primitive areas now, there would not be any in the future.

Mr. METCALF. For 30 years these lands have been administered substantially as wilderness areas.

Mr. ALLOTT. There has been mining and some forestry. So if we should bring the lands into the wilderness system under the terms of the bill, all that would stop immediately.

Mr. METCALF. The very purpose of the review is to protect the interests which have been created. The people involved have had an opportunity during all of these past years to go in and prospect the lands. They have not lumbered in these areas. They have not built roads into these areas. By and large, substantially they have been administered in the same manner as wilderness areas or national parks for 30 years.

What we are seeking, under techniques which have been established for many years in the Congress, under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, is to quickly take care of those lands that have a basic wilderness use, and then to provide that in respect to any future creation of a wilderness area Congress will, as the Senator from Colorado desires, affirmatively authorize such creation and establish the boundaries in the same way as a law is passed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I merely say to the distinguished Senator that I know the way he feels. I can hardly sympathize with his point of view, because in my opinion there is no justification for arguing that the Congress should affirmatively review areas outside of the specified ones which might possibly be included in the future. I do not think any of these lands would come in, because mostly they are not of a quality which would classify them as wilderness areas. But there is no basis in fact for a distinction as to justifying one method for these lands and another method for the lands which are included under the terms of the bill at this time.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for yielding to me.

Mr. ALLOTT. I was happy to do so.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. DOMINICK. I was intensely interested in what my colleague said, for I consider it to be an extremely fine analysis of the bill and the problems inherent in its consideration.

There is one question which I think might pinpoint the discussion the Senator was having.

It is my understanding that we in the Congress must take affirmative action to include within the wilderness system all lands now not classified in specific uses. Second, we must take affirmative action to take from forest lands particular portions and put them in national parks. Third, we must take specific action to authorize reclamation projects, part of which may be within the public lands—a great deal of which in fact are within the public lands system.

Can my colleague see any justification for making the sole exception to the generally conceded procedure the lands which are classified in this bill as primitive lands?

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall have to answer my distinguished colleague in the negative. I am at a loss as to any legal reason or other method of logic which would say that we should change the method for bringing in the primitive areas, to make it different from all the instances my colleague has cited. The logic of such a conclusion escapes me.

Mr. DOMINICK. Does the distinguished Senator have any specific example he might give in which the type of procedure contemplated under the pending bill is applied to any other substantive legislation?

Mr. ALLOTT. Of course, the Senator is aware that it is applied to recommendations of the President for reorganization of Government and it has been used in that respect, but I do not know, offhand, of another one that occurs.

Mr. DOMINICK. Are not those recommendations solely concerned with the executive department?

Mr. ALLOTT. They are solely concerned with the executive department.

Mr. DOMINICK. Would the Senator think that was substantially different from what the responsibility of Congress is with respect to our national resources and our public lands?

Mr. ALLOTT. It occurs to me the responsibility is entirely different. The act to which I previously referred, under which the President makes recommendations to reorganize the executive departments, grew out of the Hoover report. They said, "We want to go ahead with the reorganization of our Government. We want to give the President the chance to do it, but we want Congress to have a chance to review it." So the President was given the right to reorganize the executive branches of Government, with the Congress having the right of review.

That is not the same as the case before us. Here we are dealing with the fundamental responsibility of the assets of the United States. They do not belong to my colleague or to me; they belong to all the people. We are dealing with those assets now. We are disposing of them.

I discussed this matter at great length on the floor of the Senate 2 years ago. In the original action in giving this power to the Secretary of Agriculture, or even admitting that he had it, Congress was negligent in its duties. It is my hope that we will take back that power, or retain it, because these are assets which I think we should consider only affirmatively.

The argument is made that we cannot get action on these proposals. The other party is in control of the Congress. It has an almost two-to-one majority in the House, and a better than two-to-one advantage in the Senate. I cannot believe that it cannot bring before Congress any bill it wants to. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs considers any bill they wish to bring up. I have not known of any bill that has not been brought before the committee that the majority party wanted to bring to the floor. That is no argument, in my mind. The other party has an effective majority. It can bring any of these bills to the floor if it wants to.

Mr. DOMINICK. I think we have brought out the point at issue, very frankly.

Mr. CHURCH obtained the floor.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Am I correctly informed that the Senator from Colorado has submitted an amendment to strike out the final provision in the bill which takes care of the special situation in Alaska?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator realize that the conditions in Alaska are quite different from those in any other State? It happens that Alaska has gone further in setting aside areas that would be eligible for wilderness than has any other State in the Union. In Alaska is set aside in national parks two-fifths of the total national parks areas of the entire Nation. In wildlife ranges and refuges we have in Alaska virtually twice the total land set aside in the other 49 States. In national forests we now have larger areas than any other State of the Union. So Alaska has not only done its part in providing areas potentially available for designation as wilderness, but far more. I am fearful that this trend may go ahead still further unless there are some safeguards. Section 9, dealing with land use commissions, seeks to provide them. It seems to me that that section, which merely provides that a study be made before action is taken, is a reasonable and a modest one. It would merely provide information to guide the appropriate Secretary before he makes his recommendations to the President before action is taken. It provides only a minimum safeguard for the vast area of Alaska, in which so much more land is already in Federal ownership than in any other State.

I should dislike seeing that provision withdrawn. I hope the Senator will not press his amendment at this time.

I wonder why he feels the provision for Alaska should be deleted?

Mr. ALLOTT. I will answer the Senator in two ways. As he knows, since the territory of Alaska became a State I have, in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, been most of the time with the Senator from Alaska—in the main, if not almost entirely. The Senator from Colorado has been sympathetic to legislation which pertained to Alaska, and which perhaps gave Alaska an advantage that was not available to the other States.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator for whatever he has done, and I hope he will maintain the same attitude in the future.

Mr. ALLOTT. While this section was in the bill of 2 years ago, and I recall when the Senator offered it, I feel it gives the Commission too much power. I feel it should not be applied to one State any more than to other States.

I read now from page 30 of the committee report, which is a letter from the Department of Agriculture:

> As worded, the provisions of section 9 for a Presidential Land Use Commission would apply only to the State of Alaska. We recognize that Federal ownership of about 99 percent of the land area of the State of Alaska presents a situation peculiar to that State, and have no particular objection to such a Commission in relation to Alaska. However, the scope of the duties of the Commission would go to all federally owned land in the State and not just to lands in wilderness-type areas.
>
> We therefore question whether provision for such a Commission should be included in legislation which otherwise deals only with wilderness-type areas. We therefore suggest that all of section 9 on pages 19 and 20 be deleted and the succeeding sections be renumbered accordingly.

I answer the distinguished Senator in two ways: First of all, the Land Use Commission section takes in too much territory. I do not think it should be applied solely to Alaska. Second, I am simply following the recommendation of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GRUENING. I appreciate the point of view of the Senator. I point out that one of the reasons why this is a special provision for Alaska—and I can understand the feeling on the part of my colleague that all States should be treated alike—is that, it should be recalled, Alaska entered the Union so much later than the other States, and was subject, during its long stepchildhood, to a rampant and militant bureaucracy which often imposed its will arbitrarily and over the protests of Alaskans. At the same time Alaska was discriminated against and excluded from much beneficial legislation enacted for the other States. Alaska should be given a chance to undo some of the damage done to it when it was not a State. Section 9 simply provides for an advisory Commission. It does not compel anything. It alters nothing. The power of Congress is not diminished.

If the Senator from Colorado will not withdraw his amendment to delete this section, I hope it will not prevail. I understand his feeling that States should be treated alike, but, after all, there is a vast difference, not merely in the historical background, but in the great size of Alaska and the tremendous withdrawals that have taken place for various purposes potentially related to wilderness. No State had so little land of its own at the time it came into statehood; 99 percent or more was in the Federal domain, and even after the provisions of the Statehood Act go into effect, will be entitled to only 27 percent of its area, and by no means the best land.

If the provisions of section 9 are not allowed to remain in the bill without revision, and the provision on advice is not maintained, I am fearful of what may happen.

A few years ago a bill was introduced by the previous Secretary of the Interior to withdraw 9 million acres of arctic wilderness in the northeast corner of the State. Extensive hearings were held, and this proposal was rejected by the Congress. Nevertheless, the Secretary of the Interior withdrew that amount.

Immediately, of course, efforts were made by the Interior Department to get appropriations to manage this remote wilderness, which my colleague and I opposed, because if it was to be left wilderness it should be left alone. This is why Alaskans may well be fearful unless we have this moderate safeguarding amendment, for study before recommendations for more wilderness withdrawals are made.

As I say, the Commission which would be appointed by the President would be merely advisory, and would merely consult with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, and

would have no other authority. I am hopeful that the amendment will remain in the bill. I am sure that it will not do the damage that my friend from Colorado anticipates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in support of the pending bill. I am proud to be counted as a supporter of the wilderness bill. It is a measure which received tremendous support in newspaper after newspaper across the length and breadth of our land. The editorial policy of the overwhelming number of newspapers in the Nation supports the wilderness bill.

During the 85th and 86th Congresses, I was privileged to be the principal sponsor of the proposed legislation. In the 87th and 88th Congresses, this task has been assumed by the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], together with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], myself, and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. All the cosponsors are listed on the bill.

In 1961 the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] guided the wilderness bill, then known as S. 174, to an overwhelming victory by a vote of 78 to 8. This substantial margin testified to two primary facts; one, it demonstrated the legislative adroitness and skill of the Senator from Idaho; two, it indicated the fundamental soundness of the legislation.

It should be remembered that this type of legislation has been processed over the years in the appropriate committees of Congress. The refinements which are contained in the pending bill are the result of the most careful scrutiny that any proposed legislative program has ever received.

I believe we have before us an extremely worthwhile bill. As I indicated in my statement before the Committee on Interior and Insular affairs, this solid vote of confidence, the vote of 78 to 8, did not occur by accident or error. It reflected the reasonable, temperate, and moderate procedures contained in the proposed legislation, to preserve certain areas of the Nation within a national wilderness preservation system.

It should be quite obvious to every American citizen that if future generations are ever to have the privilege of seeing the native beauty of wilderness areas, or areas that have been untouched by commercialism, this legislation which is before us must be adopted.

During the 8 years in which the proposed legislation has been before Congress, many important modifications have been effected in the specific procedures for identifying and protecting certain areas of wilderness. For example, the proposal to establish a permanent national wilderness preservation council has been eliminated. The original definition of a wilderness area has been modified considerably. The regulations for the protection of wilderness areas have been revised and liberalized. Each of these changes was made because the proponents of the legislation were determined to seek a bill that recognized the need for wilderness preservation but which did not unduly hamper present land-use programs or legitimate economic, commercial, or commodity uses.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to speak at length about the undeniable benefits that wilderness resources will impart to future generations of Americans. As our civilization becomes progressively more mechanized, automated, and dehumanized, the value of preserving the primeval character of certain designated areas will increase manifold.

This will represent a legacy of incomparable value to generations hundreds of years hence, because it will be a gift beyond human creation.

As a matter of fact, I am not at all sure that the preservation of these wilderness areas may not make a great contribution to our individual and national mental health. I believe that as we preserve these areas, we may very well economize in the building of institutions for taking care of people who are the victims of the terrific tensions of the modern day world.

In the State of Minnesota, we are proud to have such a national forest, which is a wilderness area. It is one of the most beautiful areas in the world. It is untouched by commercialism. It is a constant source of enjoyment and recreation for thousands of families. It has become a source of great recreational opportunity for the families of our Nation. Thousands of families have an opportunity to enjoy the blessings that only God Himself can give to people in this beauty of the native area.

These lands that we speak of are not beyond human protection and preservation. The national wilderness preservation system containing national forest areas, national park system areas, and national wildlife and game range areas, will insure that these federally owned lands will be administered in such a way as to leave them unimpaired. I am confident that an overwhelming majority of Senators will recognize the historic nature of our opportunity to establish this legacy.

I really cannot believe that anyone would oppose it, that anyone would momentarily put private property ahead of the long-range interest of the people.

I wish to congratulate the principal sponsors of the proposed legislation, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. They have provided us with determined, courageous, and bipartisan leadership. Similarly, the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has done a magnificent job in managing the proposed legislation in the Interior Committee and on the Senate floor.

I am confident that the efforts of these devoted public servants will be richly rewarded as countless generations of future Americans reap the benefits of their wisdom, their foresight, and their determination.

In fact, Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the proposed legislation and as one who initiated it some years ago, and took a great deal of criticism, much of which was very vicious and at times most disturbing and distracting, I wish to say that I am more proud of my name being listed as a cosponsor of this bill than of almost any other bill that I supported in Congress. I can think of no greater service that a man can perform at this stage for future generations in terms of our domestic legislation program, than the bill that is before us. Nothing is more important than for us to stake out, so to speak, and to protect these areas of America that are known as wilderness areas, to make sure that generations yet to come will be able to enjoy the blessings of our time and the heritage of this great Nation.

Again I commend the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator very much, but I believe he has been overly modest with respect to his own role in connection with the proposed legislation. He is the father, the initiator, the pioneer, who first submitted wilderness legislation, some 6 years ago, in March of 1957, and it has been a hard, long, legislative road since.

Ten hearings have been held on the proposed legislation, four in Washington and six in the field. Two thousand, eight hundred and twenty-five pages of testimony have been taken. Such has been the interest in the proposed legislation and in the struggle to adopt it. In connection with the long, hard fight, the man who got it all started is the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. We are all greatly indebted to him for his efforts in behalf of the millions of Americans who will receive a lasting profit and benefit from his efforts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. It is something to get something started, but another to bring it to a successful conclusion.

I am not trying to be overly generous when I say that the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Montana, and the few other Senators who have carried on this fight, particularly in committee, are deserving of our thanks and gratitude. I can assure the Senator that this legislation is looked upon by people throughout the Nation as one of the finest bits of the legislative program that we have before us. I salute them for what they are doing.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support for the pending measure, the National Wilderness Preservation Act. We who live along the Atlantic seaboard might at the first blush seem to have only an indirect interest in the proposed legislation. Yet the preservation of our wilderness territory, mostly in the Mountain States of the Far West and Alaska, while it may seem a long way from Pennsylvania, is nevertheless definitely in the national interest.

I have supported such proposed legislation every time it came before the Senate since I was first elected to this body. I support it again. Actually, I wish it were stronger. In my view, we could have gone further than the pending measure does to preserve our wilderness lands. Nevertheless, I realize the necessity for compromise. I know we are engaging in the art of the possible. At least, the bill makes a substantial

start toward setting aside for posterity and for those who love the wilderness to camp and fish, and to some extent hunt in it, the opportunity to do so.

I particularly commend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for his leadership in this regard. It is a leadership which is not without risk, for I know that there are within his State strong interests who oppose the proposed legislation, interests which, in my opinion, do not represent the better view on this controversial subject. The Senator from Idaho, who I am happy to say was returned to this body last fall by a very substantial majority, was brave indeed in fighting those strong vested interests in his own State.

It is nice to know that, every now and then, in elections to this body, right, in the long run, on the whole, does to some extent tend to prevail. I compliment the Senator from Idaho for his taking the national interest on many problems which, ostensibly, might seem to be of very little interest to his State. Need I add that I include the mass transit bill in this regard? There are those who sometimes think Senators engage in log rolling; that "If you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours," and thereby proposed legislation is passed which otherwise could not be passed.

I have no hesitation in saying that it is my clear opinion that the wilderness bill is in the national interest, without regard to any other proposal coming before Congress, just as the mass transit bill was in the national interest, without regard to any other proposed legislation which might come before Congress. I have no guilty conscience—in fact, I sleep well at night—in supporting the wilderness bill—which, as I say, is of little immediate interest to the people of Pennsylvania—just as I supported the mass transportation bill, which is of imperative importance to the people of our State; and I am indeed happy to know of the prospects for the prompt passage of the bill by the Senate. I hope and pray that the other body will be equally alert and equally intelligent in following the national interest.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this is not the first time that I have been a coauthor of the wilderness bill, nor will it be the first time that the Senate will pass it—as the Senate will do this week.

In the first part of the bill we find the following:

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress recognizes that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions except those that are designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition. It is accordingly declared to be the policy of the Congress of the United States to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Wilderness Preservation System to be composed of federally owned areas in the United States and its possessions to be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character, and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness.

Mr. President, the first question for me and for the other Members of the Congress to ask themselves is whether the bill is in the public interest. There will be no quarrel with any Senator concerning his answer to that question. I think the question should be answered unanimously in the affirmative.

The next question is whether the bill accurately and reasonably carries out the provisions of this legislative intent. On that subject there is in this Chamber a divergence of views. For my part, I answer that question also in the affirmative. I believe that the interests of all people of our country are advanced by the provisions of the bill. Other Senators have spoken earlier today in regard to those provisions; and I shall not take the time of the Senate or encumber the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by submitting extended remarks on the bill.

I make this point, Mr. President: As has been stated heretofore, under present law, the Secretary of Agriculture has complete, untrammeled authority to classify as wilderness any of the public domain now under his jurisdiction, if he so desires. With respect to his authority as well as the authority now existing in the Department of the Interior, the bill provides for a procedure by which lands in the public domain not now classified as wilderness shall parcel by parcel and piece by piece be examined and explored; and provision is made for a hearing at which interested American citizens—including local Government officials—will be able to support or oppose any proposed classification as wilderness of any parts of the public domain.

If, for example, the Department were to overrule the objectors, and were to determine that, in its judgment, any given parcel should be classified as wilderness, provision is made for an appeal to the President. There, again, this measure provides for the filing of objections. Let us assume that the White House concurred in the determination made by the Department. The bill provides that either of the two Houses of Congress can reject, repudiate, and overrule the decisions made in the executive branch. What is wrong with that, Mr. President? Who honestly and logically can argue against that approach and the due process followed at various stages under that approach?

Today, Congress has no control or check on the exercise of discretion in the executive branch. This bill provides that Congress shall have such control or check. However, far more important is the fact that if the bill is enacted into law, the American people of your generation, Mr. President, and mine and the American people of succeeding generations will have an opportunity in their lifetime to see the pristine beauty with which the Creator endowed the North American land mass, for this measure will preserve for the Americans of today and for those who come tomorrow the beauty of our country in its primitive state.

Mr. President, I wish to make another point for the benefit of the people of California. My State is a semiarid State; and a U.S. Senator from California is not worth his salt if he ever forgets the necessity to supply more water to the people who now live in California and to those who are coming there each year at the rate of over a half a million or more. We had before us the question of whether the Federal Power Commission should continue its jurisdiction with respect to matters of water and power, or whether we should prevent it from operating in areas designated as wilderness. There was a dispute about that. The Interior Department recommended that Congress eliminate all the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission as provided by this measure. To the credit of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, it rejected that recommendation; and it has written clearly into the bill a provision that with respect to problems of water under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, the present law with respect to that jurisdiction shall remain in effect.

Mr. President, those are the brief comments which I wished to make here today. In past Congresses and in the discussions which have occurred in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have spoken at great length on this subject. I want the RECORD to show my statement that the bill is in the public interest.

This measure is not one of partisan or political concern, Mr. President. U.S. Senators from both parties stand on this floor and speak in favor of the bill. Other U.S. Senators from both parties stand on this floor and speak in opposition to the bill.

A year ago the bill was passed overwhelmingly by the Senate. I trust that this year, once again, the bill will be passed by the Senate; and I hope that in this Congress—different from the last session—the Members of the House of Representatives likewise will have an opportunity to vote their judgment as to whether the bill should become law.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I might express my appreciation to the able Senator from California?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I desire to express my appreciation to the Senator for the very fine support which he has given the bill over the years. He has been one of the stalwart champions of wilderness legislation. In giving the bill that kind of support, he has demonstrated his farsightedness in that field as he has demonstrated statesmanship on other questions that pertain to the wise conservation of the Nation's resources.

The people of California can be very proud of him in the role he has played in connection with the proposed legislation and, as a Democrat who stands on this side of the aisle, I wish to extend my personal appreciation to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to give my friend and colleague my unbound thanks for his generous comment. I am

grateful to him. I sincerely believe that he, I, and others who feel as we do can supply a leadership that will result in the enactment of the bill into law.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will indulge me one more minute, I should like to place into the RECORD some statistics that I think are called for in view of the discussion that has heretofore taken place today on the pending measure.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am sorry that the senior Senator from Colorado is not present. I believe he would not take offense if I placed the figures in the RECORD, for he will have an opportunity to review them when the RECORD is published today and to comment on them tomorrow, should he see fit to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that the figures to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

	Acres
Total land area of the United States	2,313,733,120
Total Federal lands	767,766,435
Total land in national forests	181,600,000
Total national forest land subject to S. 4	14,138,000

Mr. CHURCH. In the course of his remarks, the senior Senator from Colorado mentioned that the bill would authorize the establishment of a wilderness system which would comprise some 12 percent of the public domain. He observed that only 1 percent of our people actually use the wilderness. On that basis he concluded that we would be giving a disproportionate amount of public lands over to a very small number of people to utilize and to enjoy.

Mr. President, I question those figures in two respects. First, members of the committee staff advise me that the correct figure is not 12 percent of the forest lands but somewhere between 7 and 8 percent of the forest lands.

Furthermore, the land about which we are talking is a part of one great country. If we are going to compare the numbers of people who enjoy the wilderness with the amount of land that we would set aside, then the comparison must be based upon the land set aside as it relates to all of the area of our country.

Today we have 2,313,733,000 acres of land in the United States of America. After the review provisions which are established in the bill have been completed and the wilderness system that would be authorized by the proposed legislation has been established, it is estimated that it would run to between 35 and 40 million acres, which is approximately 1½ percent of the total area of the United States. So that if the figures have any meaning at all, I suggest that a very definite balance has been struck between the area set aside and the numbers of our people who, over the years, will enjoy it. I placed my figures in the RECORD because I think they put the subject in proper perspective, particularly in view of remarks made earlier by the senior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I am now prepared to yield the floor. I wish to say to my good friend from Pennsylvania that I appreciate the fact he has been so generous in allowing me and other Senators to speak. It is typical of him to stand aside and let others take the floor. I commend him for it. I hope he has no further difficulty in getting his own remarks into the RECORD before he adjourns the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his kind and generous remarks. My good friend from California, who is terse, desires that I yield to him briefly. I am only happy to do so.

CHOOSING CONTRACTORS TO DO FEDERAL WORK

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank my good friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania. I shall not add to his difficulties.

Mr. President, a few days ago the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] introduced a measure providing that Americans should be given more facts with respect to how contractors are chosen by the Federal Government in matters of defense and of space agency procurement contracts. When he introduced that proposed legislation, the able Senator said:

> A full disclosure of all relevant facts would benefit everybody. An informed public opinion would exert irresistible weight in support of decisions which are soundly based and against those which are not. It would reduce to a minimum improper pressure on Government officials. It would restore public confidence in the integrity of Government.

Mr. President, I completely agree with what the able Senator from New Jersey had in mind in introducing his proposed legislation and with the comments he has made concerning it.

So do distinguished newspapers and able columnists. I ask unanimous consent that the excellent editorial published in the Washington Post on Friday, March 1, and comments made by two distinguished American columnists, Mr. Marquis Childs and Mr. Roscoe Drummond, dealing with the subject all be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 1963]

CONGRESS AND CONTRACTS

The practice of letting favored Congressmen announce the award of Government contracts in their districts may have some partisan advantages, but the cost is high in terms of the longrun public confidence. Of course Senators and Members of the House are delighted to make known that so many millions of dollars will be spent in their States or districts because their constituents will assume that the announcer has wielded a potent influence in the matter. The difficulty with the practice is that such an inference is often false and that if it were true it would suggest a scandal.

The official policy of the Defense Department is the antithesis of favoritism. It provides: "Our first and paramount objective is to acquire weapons and materiel which fully meet our qualitative, quantitative and delivery requirements—at the lowest overall cost. Whenever our specifications are sufficiently precise, we must obtain competition through formal advertised bidding procedures as required by law." But when the Department announces the awarding of contracts through Democratic Congressmen and denies a comparable privilege to Republican Congressmen, it seems to fly into the face of its own policy.

The effect on Congressmen is likely to be especially unfortunate. Certainly it tends to intensify the pressures on the Department from legislators who want a larger share of the huge defense budget spent in their districts. The net effect is to encourage legislators to think of defense expenditures, not in terms of the maximum national security, but in terms of swinging lucrative contracts to their hometowns.

Instead of cultivating the impression of a cozy liaison between the Defense Department and Members of Congress in the letting of contracts, Congress ought to be strengthening the safeguards against special influence and favoritism. Senator CASE, of New Jersey, has proposed a bill requiring that all ex parte communications in regard to defense or space contracts by persons other than the bidder be recorded for public inspection. He would also require, in the case of negotiated contracts, the disclosure of the basis on which the contract was made, except for classified information, and set up a House-Senate watchdog committee to review such contracts.

This is the direction in which Congress ought to be moving. With billions of dollars flowing from the Treasury to defense and space contractors, it is of the utmost importance to avoid favoritism and even the appearance of using defense projects as political bait.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1963]

ARMS RACE SEEN INFECTING POLITICS

(By Marquis Childs)

The noisy quarrel, which is essentially between two giant contractors and their congressional backers. Over the TFX plane contract points up the ever-growing entanglement of huge defense spending with the politics of who gets what.

The Senate subcommittee investigating the $6.5 billion contract has taken after Secretary of Defense McNamara on the ground that he gave the contract to General Dynamics even though Boeing entered a lower bid. McNamara's answer is that economies to be achieved through developing a single plane for both the Air Force and the Navy determined the award. A resolute man, he shows no signs of reversing his decision.

The Defense Department has responded by saying, in effect, that you can hardly expect an unbiased finding when Senators with a direct stake in the outcome sit on the investigating committee. The accusing finger is pointed at Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, for whom the Boeing plant in Seattle and its payroll must be a major consideration.

But it is possible that JACKSON, with his wide and continuing interest in national security, would welcome a way out of the pressures that inevitably bear down on a Senator with important defense industry in his State. If he can deliver for a particular industry back home he may at the same time be doing a disservice to the Nation.

That is why the Senate, instead of indulging in the quarrel currently going on, would do well to give serious consideration to the proposals of Senator CLIFFORD CASE, Republican, of New Jersey. CASE put in bills the other day calling for complete public disclosure of all communications whether written or oral and from Members of Congress and anyone in the executive branch seeking to influence the awarding of a contract. He would also require full and prompt disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract is granted.

Of the $60 billion a year in defense and space contracts an estimated 65 percent are negotiated without competitive bidding. This is a wide-open invitation to pull and push. While by most accounts McNamara has done a remarkable job of standing up to these pressures, it is too great a burden to put on one man.

CASE, in introducing his proposals, cited examples of the "I can do more for you" theme that is more and more resorted to. He quoted speeches by President Kennedy in last year's election in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, claiming a marked increase in Government contracts for those States under his administration, with the President urging election of Democratic Governors to continue this collaboration.

The Defense Department has fallen into the habit of allowing Senators and Representatives to announce important defense contracts in their States and districts. That tends to create the impression they are responsible for obtaining this prize. In most instances the impression is false but there is rivalry for the local headlines that come out of such an announcement.

Senator CASE has a third proposal. That is to establish a joint Senate-House committee to review defense and space contracts, with special attention to negotiated contracts. It would be made up of a Democrat and a Republican each named from the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, Senate and House Government Operations, and Senate and House Space Committees.

It would bear a family resemblance to the Committee on the Conduct of the War which Harry S. Truman so ably directed in World War II.

That any of the CASE proposals will be adopted seems unlikely even though five other Senators have joined in sponsoring the bills. The joint committee on contracts cuts across too many privileges and perquisites which present committee chairmen cling to.

With each succeeding election, so long as defense budgets run at $55 or $60 billion, the game of contract promise and grab will become more deeply entrenched in the political system. As this system prevails any meaningful disarmament is bound to become more difficult. Each Member of Congress will have a stake in keeping the home plant going. This has already been demonstrated in areas where aircraft contracts have been cut back as missiles have begun to dominate.

In his farewell address President Eisenhower spoke solemn words of warning about the growing influence of what he called the military-industrial complex. Today it might better be called the military-industrial-political complex.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 26, 1963]

DEFENSE CONTRACTS—CONGRESS SHOULD CHECK

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Despite the respect and confidence which the top civilian leadership of the Pentagon has well earned, especially Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and Deputy Secretary Roswell Gilpatric, I submit that instead of there being too much congressional checking of defense there isn't enough.

Take the TFX plane contract which the Senate Committee on Government Operations is now investigating. This was awarded to General Dynamics although three different military panels had recommended that it go to Boeing.

There is no evidence that Secretary McNamara yielded to partisan pressures. It is clear that he had a rational basis for the decision he made. But here, at one stroke, is $6,500 million going to one corporation to build a supersonic Navy-Air Force fighter plane which the military would prefer to have built somewhat differently. The issue is primarily one of economy—the McNamara-approved single two-service plane, which could be used both from the ground and from carriers, versus two somewhat different and thus more expensive planes sought by the Navy and Air Force.

Even if you have read everything that has been said on this matter, I do not see how you or I can adequately judge the conflicting contentions. Mr. McNamara made an honest and defensible decision, but no outsider who isn't devoting almost continuous scrutiny to the evidence can have any basis for being sure it was the best or wisest decision.

This is why responsible, expertly staffed congressional investigation is desirable and can be a boon to the Defense Department itself.

There is not enough of this kind of investigation. It is sporadic. It needs to be continuous. With approximately $60 billion going into defense and space contracts, we need more doublechecking, not less. About 65 percent of these are negotiated contracts let—for quite sound reasons—without competitive bidding.

The amount of money going into defense and space continues to mount. The defense budget has been increased 25 percent in the last 2½ years. The rate of growth in defense spending may taper off in a year or two, but the space budget will increase substantially.

With this kind of money involved, even the best Pentagon decisionmaking needs steady scrutiny by people outside the Defense Department. It will be a protection to the Defense Department. Even if the McClellan committee decides that the McNamara-Gilpatric team was in all ways prudent and courageous and sound in the TFX contract, let's not stop there. Congress ought not to limit its investigations to ex parte complaints.

This is why the recent proposals of Senator CLIFFORD CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, are all headed in the right direction. Their effect would be to give some additional bone and muscle to congressional scrutiny. To this end CASE proposes:

1. A permanent joint Senate-House committee to give continuous attention to defense and space contracts. It would be fully bipartisan, with one Democrat and one Republican named from the present committees which have specialized knowledge—House and Senate Appropriations, Government Operations, and Space.

2. Complete public disclosure of all communications seeking to influence the letting of defense contracts—oral or written by anybody, Congressmen, ex-Congressmen-turned-lobbyists, presidential aids.

3. And, in the end, a full public exposition by the Defense Department setting out the basis for the award of a contract.

These are needed and sound steps. They would strengthen congressional scrutiny. They would make it continuous rather than sporadic. They would reduce the massive outside pressures, which can be countered when they are open but are hard to resist when they are under the table. My information is that most, if not all, the civilian heads of the Pentagon would welcome all of these measures. They should.

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I intend to speak on the need for congressional reorganization. In a few minutes the Senate will adjourn for the purpose of going to the opening of the professional baseball season. I shall go, too. I am looking forward to a good game.

However, it is rather amusing that we abandon our usual custom of coming in at noon, and come in at what to most Senators is really the ungodly hour of 9 o'clock this morning so that we could get at least a little business done, and then all go to the ball game.

That is all right with me. Last week we had an informal recess from a little after 10 o'clock in the morning until after 2 o'clock so that certain Senators could greet the cherry blossom queens from their States. That is fine. I am for cherry blossoms; I am for queens. They were beautiful girls. They deserved all their honors. It was a shame that the cherry blossoms blew off before most of the queens had an opportunity to be crowned.

Mr. President, I do think that in between our cherry blossom recesses and our baseball fun we ought to give a little bit of thought as to whether the Senate of the United States is really doing the job it ought to be doing.

It will be no news to my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to learn that in my opinion it is not.

In the Washington Post of April 5 appeared a very good column written by my friend Roscoe Drummond entitled "Congress—Why It Falters."

Mr. Drummond, a very acute observer of the congressional scene, asks the question as to what is the crucial issue before the 88th Congress. He concludes that the issue of highest priority on the agenda is the reorganization of Congress itself. I agree.

Mr. Drummond believes that the most urgent need is to improve the future of Congress and, indeed, to make sure that it has a future. I agree. While in my opinion the executive arm of our Government has been doing an outstanding job and did an excellent job even during the years of the Eisenhower administration, and while the judicial branch of our Government in my opinion has been farsighted, forward-looking, intelligent and sound, the legislative branch has been under increasing criticism. In my opinion that criticism is largely justified.

Mr. Drummond comments that Congress has already lost its capacity to transact the public business carefully, responsibly, and efficiently.

He points out that it has lost this capacity by attempting to deal with space-age problems with iron age tools. The cliche which I prefer is "with horse and buggy tools," but perhaps "iron age tools" is a more accurate term, historically.

Mr. Drummond comments on the vast amount of time and public attention, both in the committee and on the Senate floor, which has been taken by the TFX controversy. He suggests that everybody would agree that $6.5 billion should not be spent casually. He points out that it was not, that it is not going to be, that the investigations in the Defense Department have been painstaking and meticulous, that there has been a good deal of controversy, and that the controversy has been resolved by the individual who under the law is supposed to resolve it, the Secretary of Defense.

Nevertheless, one of our able congressional committees has thought it worthwhile to go into an extensive re-

view of that decision. I do not say the committee had no right to do so. Clearly it did.

Mr. Drummond says the committee did, too, but he points out that last October, after Congress had been in session for 173 days, in the last 4 harried days before adjournment we rushed through five appropriation bills totaling $15,850 million, or one-sixth of a $93 billion budget. He suggests that $15 billion should not be appropriated casually. He comments, "It was." I agree with him.

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

Mr. CLARK. I should prefer to finish my remarks, but I will yield to the Senator for a question. I do not want to get into a colloquy with the Senator at this time. I should be glad to do that when I finish.

Mr. PROUTY. I will wait for the Senator to finish.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is suggested by Mr. Drummond that the time may come when Congress will look into the mirror and do something about its own failure to transact the public business carefully, responsibly, and efficiently. He quotes with approval comments made early in this session by the National Committee for an Effective Congress, to the effect that last year Congress found it almost impossible to finish its business.

The Senate did not even organize this year until the end of February.

This committee—an able committee with which all Senators are familiar—suggests that "Congress is not handling its workload because it has not organized its time, its talents, and its resources to meet the space-age tasks which today's world imposes upon it."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column written by Mr. Drummond may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

CONGRESS—WHY IT FALTERS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

What is the crucial issue before the 88th Congress? Is it the tax bill or medicare or aid to education?

All of these are important, but I am convinced that the issue of highest priority on the agenda of this Congress is the reorganization of Congress itself.

Many things need to be done to improve the future of the country, but the most urgent need is to improve the future of Congress—to make sure it has a future.

The fact is that Congress has already lost its capacity to transact the public business carefully, responsibly, and efficiently. It has lost it by attempting to deal with space age problems with iron age tools.

Look at one example:

The Senate's Government Operations Committee is worried and is therefore vigorously investigating whether the Department of Defense may have made a mistake in selecting the TFX fighter plane and awarding the $6.5-billion contract to General Dynamics.

The military put in months investigating how this plane should be built. After the facts were laid out, the civilian heads reviewed them exhaustively for many weeks. Six and a half billion dollars shouldn't be spent casually. It wasn't.

Last October, after Congress had been in session 173 days, in the last four frantic harried days before the session expired, it rushed through five appropriations bills totaling $15,850,000,000—one sixth of a $93-billion budget. Fifteen billion dollars shouldn't be appropriated casually. It was.

I am not saying that Congress should not investigate the TFX contract for fear it was casually decided. I am simply asking when Congress is going to look into the mirror and do something about its own failure to transact the public business carefully, responsibly, and efficiently.

Year after year, as cited above, it appropriates huge sums with the back of its wrist as it rushes home to tell the voters what a good job it is doing.

Congress appropriates everything piecemeal. It never examines the budget in toto. Different committees look at different parts. Congress never looks at the whole.

After authorizing the expenditure of billions of dollars each year, Congress fails to give itself adequate staff to review the misuses of Federal funds reported to it by its own agency, the General Accounting Office.

This is not the only evidence of congressional disorganization. The National Committee for an Effective Congress makes this early-session report:

"Last year Congress found it almost impossible to finish its business. This year Congress found it almost impossible to get started. The Senate did not even organize its committees until the end of February.

"This year the session was accompanied by a rising public chorus questioning the structure and function of Congress, but the suggestion echoes within Congress itself that reforms are in order.

"Congress is not handling its workload."

Congress is not handling its workload because it has not organized its time, its talents, and its resources to meet the spage age tasks which today's world imposes upon it.

Fortunately there are some influential Senators and Congressmen who are acutely aware that Congress must modernize its machinery for transacting the public business. There is formidable resistance from those Members who would rather have a weak and ineffectual Congress than give up special privilege and personal power.

Time is running out because this session of Congress is further behind than the last.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. I will not engage in any colloquy, I assure my friend from Pennsylvania.

I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that Mr. Drummond also pointed out that one of the great difficulties encountered, particularly by the minority, in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, is that we do not have adequate committee staff members.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator from Vermont. I do not think the minority does have a sufficient number. I should like to help the Senator get them.

Mr. PROUTY. As the Senator well knows, I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Education and chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. CLARK. Hardly the chairman, but at least the ranking minority member.

Mr. PROUTY. The ranking minority member. I thank the Senator for correcting me. I hope someday to be chairman.

Mr. CLARK. I hope the Senator will not be, but I love him very much.

Mr. PROUTY. In any event, I do not have a single staff member on whom I can rely assigned to me on either of those subcommittees. The Senator can undertand very well, considering the problems with which we are confronted, that it is impossible for any of us on the minority side to do adequate justice to legislation presented before us.

I hope very much that the Senator will exercise his influence with the minority leader, so that the Republicans may have adequate staff members.

Mr. CLARK. With the majority leader.

Mr. PROUTY. With the majority leader.

Mr. CLARK. I have great sympathy for the Senator's position. I was about to invite attention to one of the subjects which is on the table, S. Res. 81, submitted by the Senator from Vermont, to provide for a more equitable distribution of staff members of committees. I am a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, though, to be sure, one of the most junior members. I shall be glad to use my influence to see that a prompt hearing is given to the Senator on that resolution. I urge him to get in touch with other members of the committee for that purpose.

Mr. PROUTY. I appreciate the Senator's help very much.

THE SENATE CALENDAR

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, among the other matters listed on our calendar under "Subjects on the Table" are Senate Resolutions 9, 10, and 80, offered early in the session, to amend the cloture rule of the Senate.

It has seemed to me for some time that the Senate, which has been, as I shall show later, in very brief sessions during the past 3 months—many times it has met only twice a week, frequently has come in late and adjourned early—might well devote its attention to that part of the reorganization of the Congress which is set forth in the cloture resolutions, but the leadership thought otherwise. I am in no position, as merely one Senator, to bring the resolutions again before the Senate for consideration. I express the hope that before the 88th Congress adjourns those resolutions will be brought before the Senate and brought to a final vote on their merits. This I believe could be done, if the leadership on both sides of the aisle were really in favor of majority rule.

Fifty-six Senators in this body, including the present distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the only other Senator on the floor as I speak, the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], favor that action.

I think it is high time that majority rule did take over in the Senate, and the Senate should be able to act when its majority not only is ready for action, but also has indicated how it would act.

(At this point Mr. BURDICK assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I turn to a discussion of today's calendar; the calendar for Monday, April 8, 1963. I note that in addition to the "Subjects on the Table," which I have briefly discussed, there are only four pieces of proposed legislation on the calendar for action, under the heading of "General Orders Under Rule VIII."

Two of them—a bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, and a bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps and to authorize local area youth employment programs—will be acted on before our Easter recess, which officially will begin toward the end of this week, and which I hope because I intend to take full advantage of it—will unofficially continue until Monday, April 22, statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is extraordinary, Mr. President, that on this 8th day of April, after 3¼ months of laboring, we have been able to produce so small a litter of mice as this legislation to which I have referred, but "That's all there is, there isn't any more."

Why is that? Why has there been such a small output? The Senate has passed only two major bills—the mass transit bill, which after extensive debate was passed, on April 4; and the 4-year extension of the draft, which might well also have resulted in substantial and meaningful debate for a good many days, because, goodness knows, the Draft Act is in great need of being gone over, revised, and put through a fine-tooth comb. But that bill passed in 10 minutes.

The Banking and Currency Committee, from which the mass transit bill was reported, did not even meet until February 26, although there was no reason in the world, under rule XXV, why the Banking and Currency Committee could not have met as early as Wednesday, January 9, or some 7 weeks—at least 6 weeks—before it did meet.

In all the Senate has acted on 34 routine money resolutions, which took about 2 days. We have passed only 12 public bills, mostly of a minor or noncontroversial nature.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of those 12 bills together with an analysis of time consumed by the Senate since the start of the session, may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Analysis of record—Jan. 9 through Feb. 25

Date	Senate	Time in session
Wednesday, Jan. 9	12:00–12:57	0:57
Thursday, Jan. 10	12:00– 1:04	1:04
Friday, Jan. 11	(1)	
Monday, Jan. 14	12:00– 3:21	3:21
Tuesday, Jan. 15	12:00– 5:48	5:48
Wednesday, Jan. 16	12:00– 5–55	5:55
Thursday, Jan. 17	12:00– 5:25	5:25
Friday, Jan. 18	12–00– 3:51	3:51
Monday, Jan. 21	12:00– 5:51	5:51
Tuesday, Jan. 22	12:00– 5:55	5:55
Wednesday, Jan. 23	12:00– 4:56	4:56
Thursday, Jan. 24	12:00– 5:40	5:40
Friday, Jan. 25	12:00– 5:14	5:14
Monday, Jan. 28	10:00– 6:07	8:07
Tuesday, Jan. 29	10:00– 6:04	8:04
Wednesday, Jan. 30	11:00– 1:34	2:34
Thursday, Jan. 31	12:00– 5:40	5:40
16 sessions		[2] 78:22
Friday, Feb. 1	(1)	
Monday, Feb. 4	10:00– 5:10	7:10
Tuesday, Feb. 5	10:00– 5:11	7:11
Wednesday, Feb. 6	10:00– 5:02	7:02
Thursday, Feb. 7 [3]	10:00–11:27	1:27
Friday, Feb. 8	(1)	
Monday, Feb. 11	12:00– 3:30	3:30
Tuesday, Feb. 12	(1)	
Wednesday, Feb. 13	(1)	
Thursday, Feb. 14	12–00– 3:18	3:18
Friday, Feb. 15	(1)	
Monday, Feb. 18	12:00– 1:56	1:56
Tuesday, Feb. 19	12:00– 5:45	5:45
Wednesday, Feb. 20	12:00– 5:54	5:54
Thursday, Feb. 21	12:00– 5:26	5:26
Friday, Feb. 22	12:00– 1:10	1:00
Monday, Feb. 25	12:00– 4:29	4:29
12 sessions		[2] 55:58

[1] Not in session.
[2] Average length of session less than 5 hours.
[3] Date of cloture vote.

Analysis of record Feb. 26 through Apr. 5

Date	Senate	Time in session	Legislative action
Tuesday, Feb. 26			Not in session.
Wednesday, Feb. 27			Do.
Thursday, Feb. 28	12:00–3:36	3:36	
Friday, Mar. 1	12:00–5:17	5:17	
Monday, Mar. 4	12:00–4:16	4:16	Passed S. 13 (Arkansas land transfer), S. 345 (Hawaii housing)
Tuesday, Mar. 5			Not in session.
Wednesday, Mar. 6			Do.
Thursday, Mar. 7	12:00–7:08	7:08	
Friday, Mar. 8	12:00–3:00	3:00	Passed S. 816 (establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology.
Monday, Mar. 11	12:00–2:27	2:27	Passed S. 20 (outdoor recreation, plus 34 money resolutions).
Tuesday, Mar. 12			Not in session.
Wednesday, Mar. 13			Do.
Thursday, Mar. 14	12:00–7:54	7:54	
Friday, Mar. 15	11:00–3:46	4:46	Passed H.R. 2438 (draft extension).
8 sessions		39:14	
Monday, Mar. 18			Not in session.
Tuesday, Mar. 19	12:00–3:50	3:50	Passed S. 1089 (cadmium), H.R. 212 (veterans), H.R. 2085 (taxation), H.R. 1597 (tax).
Wednesday, Mar. 20			Not in session.
Thursday, Mar. 21	12:00–5:05	5:55	
Friday, Mar. 22			Do.
Monday, Mar. 25	12:50–3:02	3:02	
Tuesday, Mar. 26			Do.
Wednesday, Mar. 27			Do.
Thursday, Mar. 28	12:00–5:30	5:30	190 hours, 21 minutes.
Friday, Mar. 29			Not in session.
Monday, Apr. 1	12:00–6:02	6:02	Passed S. 1035 (dual rate contracts).
Tuesday, Apr. 2	11:00–6:08	7:08	Passed H.R. 4374 (Winston Churchill).
Wednesday, Apr. 3	10:00–6:15	8:15	
Thursday, Apr. 4	11:00–4:34	5:34	Passed S. 6 (mass transit).
Friday, Apr. 5			Not in session.
44 sessions		222:50	12 bills and 35 resolutions.

Mr. CLARK. It has been said that the only reason why we do not act any more quickly than we do is because the committees are busily at work on the President's program and on important legislation which Members desire to bring before this body on the floor which is not in the President's program.

I point out, however, that 47 committees or subcommittees of the Senate have held 233 meetings. There have been 63 possible weekday meeting days. On nine of them no meeting of any sort was called. This is an average of less than 4 meetings a day for those 47 committees or subcommittees.

I note in passing that the Finance Committee has met only six times, and not at all on that bill to which, in my opinion, and in the opinion of many other Senators, they should be devoting their attention, which is the President's tax revision and tax reform bill.

Let it be noted that there is nothing in the Constitution that would keep the Finance Committee from doing exactly what the Appropriations Committee has been doing, namely, holding preliminary sessions. Just as the Appropriations Committee does, the Finance Committee could hold preliminary sessions on tax revision and tax reform, in order that when legislation comes over from the House the Senate will be able to act promptly on the legislation. I commend the Appropriations Committees for this action. I deplore the failure of the Finance Committee to follow the same course of action.

Let no one think that the Constitution prevents a committee that deals with revenue raising from holding preliminary sessions in order to hear administration witnesses and other experts before the House sends the bill over to the Senate. There is no constitutional prohibition against hearings. Indeed a year ago hearings took place in the Finance Committee on the so-called Du Pont bill long before the House had acted on the proposed legislation.

In my judgment, this is probably one of the best ways in which the time of the 100 Members of this body could be saved. If the Finance Committee would only move forward with their hearings, it could report the bill out of the committee, and the Senate could act on it within 30 days of the time it gets the tax bill from the House.

In my opinion, if we are still in session by Labor Day, if we stay here long after Labor Day, the primary reason will be that the Finance Committee did not choose to meet and to conduct preliminary hearings on the administration's tax bill.

The Senate has held 44 different sessions, totaling 222 hours, in this session of the Congress, an average of 5 hours per session.

The Senate was not in session on 19, or 30 percent, of the 63 weekdays on which it could have met.

To be sure, as was pointed out, there has been very little business for floor action, but there has been ample need for committee action. I suggest committee action has been inadequate.

Let us take a look at the action which has been taken on the President's pro-

gram. Thirty-four administration legislative requests have come to the Senate and have been referred to Senate committees for action. As of the 21st of March, which is the last date for which the Democratic policy committee has a memorandum available for Democratic Senators, no action whatever had been taken on 23 of those legislative recommendations of the President. That is over two-thirds of all his requests. This includes no action in committee as well as no action on the floor.

I conclude that Congress is off to an unjustifiably slow start. The committees should have been organized during the first few days of the session, instead of on February 25. There was no legitimate excuse for not doing this. Let no one say that it was the fight over the rules change which made it impossible, because those who were in favor of the rule change were willing for the committees to meet. It was those who were against the rules changes who refused to permit committees to meet, and thus unjustifiably delayed the work of the Senate.

From January 9 to February 7, when the rules debate terminated, there were only 7 days when the Senate met before noon. There was nothing to prevent morning committee meetings on these days.

My next point is that fewer, longer daily sessions with more days set aside fully for committee work in the first months of the opening session of the Congress could save at least 1 month of time and move up adjournment by that much.

There is not one Senator who does not want to get out of the session by the middle of summer. There is no reason why the Senate could not get out of the session by the middle of the summer, having done all the work we wanted to do, except for the fact that we are so tied up in our redtape, so tied up in horse-and-buggy practices, so tied up by procedures which prevent the Senate from using modern methods of business, that, like Ferdinand the Bull, we sit under the tree and smell the flowers while the rest of the world goes by.

There is another aspect of the problem which I want to discuss, and that is the inordinate amount of time the committees take out of the busy lives of executives of our Government. I wrote to each of the Cabinet officers in the President's Cabinet some weeks ago, asking him to compile for me the amount of time which the chief Cabinet officers had been forced to expend in testifying before congressional committees during sessions of the 87th Congress in 1961 and 1962.

I do not say that it is not frequently necessary for members of the executive branch to come before the committees of Congress and testify. It is. But I do say if we had joint sessions of relevant Senatorial and House committees, the enlightenment which the witness would furnish to committee members would be the same as it would be otherwise, and the amount of time they would have to spend testifying would be cut in half—perhaps not quite in half, because there would be more committee members to ask questions but decreased substantially. And I suggest there is not much excuse for the time spent, as it now frequently is, in coming before two or three or more committees exercising jurisdiction over the same subject matter, when their testimony and time in contribution to the national interest could be very much curtailed.

Cabinet officers from the Treasury, Defense, Agriculture, Justice, Commerce, Interior, Labor, State, Post Office, and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments during the 87th Congress appeared 592 times before congressional committees. This consumed a total of 1,394½ hours of their time.

I ask unanimous consent that the schedule which I have caused to be prepared, showing the amount of time spent by these Cabinet officers in appearing before congressional committees, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

1961 and 1962

Department	Appropriation bills				Other bills				Briefings				Special			Total	
	House		Senate		House		Senate		House		Senate		Times	Hours	Committee	Times	Hours
	Times	Hours	Times	Hours	Times	Hours	Times	Hours	Times	Hours	Times	Hours					
Treasury: Secretary	6	8½	4	6½	37	91	15	45	3	7	4	9½	4	10	Joint Economic Committee.	74	179½
													1	2	Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.		
Defense: Secretary	13	50¼	7	22	16	51	15	78½								51	201¾
Agriculture: Secretary	(?)9	18	(?)2	4	(?)32	65	(?)19	38	(?)8	15						70	140
Justice: Secretary	2	2	1	½	9	12¾										12	24
Commerce: Secretary	2	4	3	7	37	73	10	17					1	2		53	103
Interior: Secretary	3	6	3	6	17	25½	23	36	[1] 2			[1] 4½				49	78
Labor: Secretary	4	14	5	14	25	50	17	34					51	110	Ways and Means	102	222
State: Secretary	7	15	4	8	10	20	9	18	10	20	84	101	1	2	Joint Atomic Energy	125	184
Post Office: Postmaster General.	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)		31	113
Health, Education, and Welfare: Secretary.					13	39	8	21								21	60
Total																588	1,305¼

[1] House and Senate.

[2] No specific figures.

Mr. CLARK. So, Mr. President, I hope in due course the Senate will pay heed to the suggestions of Roscoe Drummond and James Reston, to which I have referred many times before, and to the many other commentators and practically every political scientist in the United States of America who has considered this subject, and many of our own Members, and get on with the work of congressional reorganization, for that indeed is the crucial task of this Congress; and I hope it will be done before it is too late.

DISARMAMENT

Mr. CLARK. Now I turn briefly to another subject, which has to do with the subject of disarmament.

I note that on April 3 of this year the able junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a lecture which had been delivered by Mr. David E. Lilienthal entitled "The Mythology of Nuclear Disarmament." The text of the lecture appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages 5583–5584.

I have the highest admiration for Mr. Lilienthal. In fact, I believe that he is one of the great living Americans. The work he has done in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority has earned for him a deserved permanent place in American history. The magnificent impromptu comments he made on what the United States meant to him, before a congressional committee, which was badgering him, some few years ago, has justly gone down in the annals of permanent eloquent prose as an outstanding appreciation of our country.

Yet, in my judgment, Mr. Lilienthal is just plain wrong in the position he takes toward disarmament and world peace.

His main theme is that it is both futile and dangerous to concentrate on disarmament while the real causes of war tensions remain.

Mr. President, as long as man is as imperfect as he is today, as long as he reacts like a human being, just so long are there going to be world tensions. As long as we have national States, there will always be tensions, and there will always be problems. If we want to get rid of the delicate balance of terror in which we live, until all international tensions have relaxed we are going to

wait until the end of the world. That end could come sooner than we think, if we do not do something about armaments.

So I say in that regard, with deep regret, Mr. Lilienthal is just plain wrong in this basic assumption.

He also states that nuclear war is not inevitable; that the way to peace lies through the "slow sure growth of community among men."

Of course that is true. Nuclear war is not inevitable, but it is pretty close to it today, unless we start taking some positive steps to eliminate the delicate balance of terror and to reduce the heavy burden of armaments which lies heavy on the shoulders not only of the American people but also on the shoulders of the Russian people, and in addition, on the shoulders of many other taxpayers in countries across the face of the world.

Mr. Lilienthal makes four criticisms of the pending disarmament negotiations.

First, he says that these negotiations tend to increase ill will and mutual suspicion and produce a dangerous cycle of high hopes and disenchantment. Geneva, he says, is a minus for peace.

Mr. President, this I categorically deny. I was present as a congressional observer for 2 weeks at the Geneva Disarmament Conference last fall. I observed the Russian delegates and the American delegates, and the delegates of nations alined with the West and those who are alined with the Communist world.

I can state categorically that nowhere did I see any ill will created by these interchanges on the part of the delegates. The delegates all behaved as civilized mature human beings with mutual respect for each other.

To be sure, there was disagreement between what the Russians felt should be done and what the Americans felt should be done; but I do not believe that these interchanges create ill will. I believe they have contributed to the eventual hammering out agreements, in connection with which both parties negotiate from respected strength.

Then Mr. Lilienthal says that the absence of China and France from the bargaining vitiates efforts along this line.

This is not true. If we can come to agreement with the Soviet Union, I am confident it will be possible to bring both France and China into line. While I believe it is difficult to negotiate without France and China, this is a rather insignificant difficulty in the face of what can be done if the two greatest powers in the world can get together.

The third point Mr. Lilienthal makes is that disarmament negotiations distract and dilute our enemies from the multiple, diverse ways in which we can build a community of interest which is the only real hope for world peace.

This, again, I categorically deny. There are all kinds of ways to build a community of interest. Disarmament negotiations are probably the most effective. There is no reason why these negotiations should not continue to a successful conclusion, at the same time that every other effort goes forward in the building of a community of interest, which I join Mr. Lilienthal in believing is the most important single way of bringing about real peace.

Mr. Lilienthal's fourth and last point is that disarmament negotiations are either unrealistic, because military force is growing as they go on, or cynical, because they are being used for propaganda and a cause of disillusionment.

Again I categorically deny this. The differences between the Soviet Union and ourselves both with respect to the test ban and with respect to general and complete disarmament, which is the fixed national policy of President Kennedy, as well as of the Soviet Union, have been shrinking constantly over the last few years. The differences between us is now relatively slight. I am optimistic and I am hopeful that the negotiations will continue to a satisfactory result within the foreseeable future.

In summary, Mr. Lilienthal believes that war cannot be abolished by trying to abolish the weapons of war, so long as the basic causes of war remain; and that by concentrating on the attempts to abolish the weapons, we divert our efforts from the task of eliminating the basic causes.

This, I suggest, is superficial and only half the coin. We have to do both.

I deeply regret that so able, and, indeed, so great an American should thus place himself in support of those in this country who have a cynical point of view with respect to the issue which confronts the world and how to eliminate the delicate balance of terror.

A far sounder approach to this problem has been made by one who is perhaps as equally great an American, the Honorable James J. Wadsworth, the former chief of our disarmament delegation at Geneva, and the former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, and presently president of the Peace Research Institute in Washington, D.C. He is a man who is respected by practically every American. In a brilliant article entitled "Let's Be Adult," published in the December 29, 1962, issue of the Saturday Review, Mr. Wadsworth says that he was brought up, as were many of us, and as indeed we all were, as a great supporter of military preparedness. But he states, further:

> To me, peace is just the only thing that makes sense. I believe in peace precisely because I am a devoted American who would volunteer to fight for his country if she were at war.

However, he states that he hopes that honorable alternatives can be found to keep war from our shores and from the whole world.

Mr. President, I share these hopes.

Mr. Wadsworth continues:

> The tensions of the cold war have created a strongly belligerent posture among many Americans.

Surely no one who has listened to speeches made on this floor by some of our colleagues can come to any other conclusion. Some of this is understandable, Mr. Wadsworth says, but some of it is largely a matter of public confusion over the news.

In this I concur.

Mr. Wadsworth continues by saying that it is a sad commentary on our capacity for adult thought that in the last analysis so many of us still appear to prefer the rumble of the mindless physical conflict for the settlement of argument. We must decide whether we are strong enough to ignore the occasional accusation of "chicken," as one small boy defies another.

> If we have confidence that our way of doing things is better than that of our competitors, then we don't have to prove it by force. What we desperately need to do, then, is to develop the force of example which proclaims our inward force of character.

Mr. Wadsworth goes on to point out:

> Our military-minded friends will retort that force of character cannot protect the country against a "mad dog" neighbor country, if the latter decides to attack. Probably true. But the point is that some people are more anxious to go out and shoot what they think is a mad dog than to make sure that it is really mad.

Again, I agree. Then Mr. Wadsworth says:

> It might therefore prove helpful to everyone if we reminded ourselves—

And I again agree—

> if we reminded ourselves, regularly and out loud, that the primary cause is the quest of peace and that the secondary part is the surmounting of the difficulties blocking that quest. Singlemindedness is a trait which can range from admirable devotion to stupid stubbornness, but unless we are single-minded about peace we might just as well forget it.

Mr. Wadsworth concludes—and I shall not detain the Senate with a longer summary of what he has to say:

> Let me be quite clear: no one disapproves more than I do—

And I agree—

> of being pushed around. I have the same wholly human reactions to indignity and injustice as most men. I do not advocate "turning the other cheek" as the preferred path to peace.

I interpolate: I am wholly opposed to unilateral disarmament.

> Rather, I insist that we can block or parry the first blow, thus making the "turning" unnecessary. But, though I understand human reaction, I cannot condone either the belligerence of the Communist line or the counterbelligerance which that line creates in the United States of America. Both reactions are simply not adult, in the light of the holocaust to which they can lead.
>
> So we must give more thought and attention—

And I concur—

> to what I call the "Three A's": the Attitude which can help create the Atmosphere in which we can take the Action which will lead us and our adversaries away from the brink of disaster together. Neither of us really wants to jump off: this would mean destruction for us both. Why not, then, put as much thought and energy into creating and developing such a course of action as we do in creating and developing ever newer and more devastating weapons? Which course is more likely to be our salvation in the long run? Which makes more sense? Let's try being adult for a change.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wadsworth's article may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LET'S BE ADULT

(By James J. Wadsworth)

In common with most boys of my generation, I was brought up a devoted military-preparedness advocate. I majored in military science (ROTC) at college, then enlisted in the National Guard, took my commission in the cavalry, and served with the guard for 11 years. When war threatened in 1941 I tried to get my commission out of mothballs, but, failing my physical, took a job in an aircraft company where I fought the war, meanwhile acting as inspector general of a New York State guard regiment headquartered in Buffalo.

All in all, I was and still am about as poor a candidate for what is called pacifism as can be imagined. By that I mean that peace, to me, is not something one espouses for religious, moral, or ethical reasons, or even political reasons. To me, peace is just the only thing that makes sense. I believe in peace precisely because I am a devoted American who would volunteer to fight for his country if she were at war; but I am also one who fervently hopes that honorable alternatives can be found to keep war from our shores and from the whole world.

It strikes me that as a first step toward finding such alternatives we Americans should take a more objective view of our "peace versus war" posture. Let's explore that idea for the moment, in terms of a common denominator. We are all familiar with the way children fight with each other: Somehow the whole outlook of the child seems to revolve around the question of who started the fight and who, therefore, is solely to blame. Such wrangling is part of what I call the playground procedure. Don't you think that the adults in high office should by now have improved a bit on the routine?

Of course, we know they haven't. Take the ever-current argument about nuclear tests. It offers plenty of material for discussion, but since September 1961, the free world has confined itself, in the main, to reiterating the accusation that the Russians "broke the moratorium" that had "been in effect nearly 3 years." People seem to forget, however, that there had never been an agreed moratorium, and that on December 29, 1959, President Eisenhower proclaimed that as far as the United States was concerned, there was no moratorium and that we felt ourselves free to test at any time. People also forget that, since then, the United States has turned down no less than three suggestions on the part of the Soviets and the nonalined states that a moratorium be entered into. Now, I have no quarrel with that policy at this time—an unpoliced moratorium can be a dangerous thing. I merely feel that when we insist on saying the Soviets broke a moratorium we refused to recognize as existing, we are behaving in an unadult way.

Perhaps, too, we should have listened with more care to the statements of Soviet representatives during the late summer and fall of 1958, and ever since. Many times, both at Geneva and elsewhere, we were told plainly that the Soviet Union considered it her right to conduct as many tests as had the United States and the United Kingdom put together. The main reason for Soviet resumption a year ago was indeed for the purpose of catching up, both in technology and in number of shots. I don't condone it: I think it was a bad business, but at least we were warned, even if the warning itself was not very adult.

It is interesting to note that the Soviet series conducted in 1962 seems to have occasioned only mild disturbance within the administration, and interesting too that the decision to resume U.S. tests in March of 1962 was made in the full expectation that another Russian series would follow. There was considerable speculation that after both series have been completed the Soviets would be more amenable to a test ban treaty. But mark this well: there are few persons in official Washington today who are ready to say that the latest Soviet series will not trigger of still another U.S. series. And, if the United States does fire another series, what then? If the Soviets follow the Playground Procedure, we know the answer.

The tensions of the cold war have created a strongly belligerent posture among many Americans. Some of this is understandable, some of it unjustified by the facts, and some largely a matter of public confusion over the news. I find it all over the country, however, coming from all sorts of people. They say they are tired of being pushed around and lied about and lied to; that it is time we stood up on our hind legs and did some pushing ourselves. If you ask them whether they want an all-out nuclear war, they say "No," but they don't fear it as much as they used to because they have become accustomed to the talk about it—perhaps "numbed" would be a better word. But they call for a military invasion of Cuba in almost the same breath as they reject war.

Perhaps the most dangerous factor in this attitude is that people who have it don't see any inconsistency in it. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why one of the great Communist inconsistencies of all time seems to have made little impression on the U.S. public, or the press, or even the Government. This inconsistency lies in the fact that the Soviet Union incessantly calls for general and complete disarmament, and just as incessantly proclaims its support both now and in the future for "wars of liberation." How one can advocate war and disarmament in the same breath I have never been able to discover, but our most belligerent Americans fall into the same trap.

Look at the situation in Berlin from the standpoint of the Playground Procedure. The facts are grim: they include not only the infamous wall, but the existence of massive Soviet and East German military strength right across the street. Even so, would Khrushchev readily go to war over Berlin—I mean, all-out war, which could not be avoided in such a tinder box? Yet until Cuba, Khrushchev kept pacing that chip on his shoulder with bombastic and provocatory statements, and Secretary McNamara kept threatening to knock it off by proclaiming that we have loaded nuclear weapons in our airplanes, ready at the end of the runways to take off if the President gives the word.

Haven't we seen this before? Haven't we heard it over and over again in the backyards, playgrounds, and parks of our communities? The buildup for the original charge, usually to such a point where the accused has to embrace a position of aggression never contemplated; the resentment and counterbelligerence of the accused at being unfairly pushed around; the inexorable increase of pressure, tension, and bellicosity to avoid the stigma of being "chicken," with sensation seekers yapping "let's you and him fight"—this is the cold war in our world today. It is a sad commentary on our capacity for adult thought that in the last analysis so many of us still appear to prefer the rumble—the mindless physical conflict—for the settlement of arguments.

Consider for a moment the concept underlying the "rumble" mentality—that if you are big and strong enough, no one will attack you. As it happens the writer of this article, who is 6 feet 4 inches tall and weighs 240 pounds, can controvert this notion. For, the fact is that there will always be those who are out to prove something (heaven knows what) by attacking the big guy. The fact that he is big is no more a deterrent against attack than the penalty of the law, even of capital punishment, is enough of a deterrent against crime. Yet it is worth remembering that the big fellow himself can often control the situation by the exercise of adult thinking.

To scorn a trial by battle is very difficult. Our ingrown ideals of courage forbid us to refuse such a trial. Yet if to be strong automatically makes us a target for some (as indeed it does), then we must decide whether we are strong enough to ignore the occasional accusation of "chicken." If we have confidence that our way of doing things is better than that of our competitors, then we don't have to prove it by force. What we desperately need to do, then, is to develop a force of example which proclaims our inward force of character.

Our military-minded friends will retort that force of character cannot protect a country against a "mad dog" neighbor country, if the latter decides to attack. Probably true. But the point is that some people are more anxious to go out and shoot what they think is a mad dog than to make sure that it is really mad. They don't want to inquire whether some other action might not be more effective. There are even those who instead of killing the dog prefer to throw stones at it, or even to tie tin cans to its tail, which is what international diplomacy calls provocative acts. Either way, such people are not even trying to live up to their self-proclaimed label of "peace-loving."

Both the great power blocs say: "We want to survive in peace." Significantly, in the United States, that simple phrase is almost inevitably followed by the word "but": "But we cannot allow communism to take over the world"; "but the Communists understand only the language of strength"; "but the Berlin wall represents a challenge we can't afford to sweep under the rug." Whether these statements are right, wrong, or half-true, the important word in them is the "but," for it means that the simple phrase that precedes it (e.g., "We want peace") is secondary in our minds. It means that we really do not want peace under existing conditions, and that preliminary fighting may still be necessary. We have used the same "but" for the last 15 years to becloud our position in the disarmament debates and other negotiations involving the world's nations; and though it is only a tiny word, it has seemed to our antagonists and even some of our friends to qualify our acceptance of disarmament as a principle.

It might therefore prove helpful to everyone if we reminded ourselves, regularly and out loud, that the primary cause is the quest of peace and that the secondary part is the surmounting of the difficulties blocking that quest. Singlemindedness is a trait which can range from admirable devotion to stupid stubbornness, but unless we are singleminded about peace we might just as well forget it.

Today our leadership is still indulging in the same qualifying method of enunciating policy. The other day I heard a TV news commentator describe the U.S. posture in these terms: "The administration is determined to add to our military strength to seek disarmament." What kind of double talk is that, and what does it really mean? Our President and our top military men tell us there is no security in piling new armaments on top of old ones, but we seem determined to do it, come what may. Why do some Americans in high office display such an appalling disregard of the world? It is customary, of course, to explain away the arms escalation by saying it is merely a reflex response to what others are doing. If we were the definite underdog in this weapons business, if we needed desperately to catch up with a much more powerful adversary, I could perhaps understand this argument. But this is not the case. We do not occupy a position of weakness at all.

We have enough weapons to destroy all our potential enemies many times over.

Why then the emphasis on increasing our military potential? Is it to frighten the Soviet Union into disarmament? That simply does not make sense. If there is one truth that has been proved out in the past, it is that a strong and proud Nation will go to almost any lengths to keep from being surpassed militarily—to catch up if they are behind, and to keep ahead if they are ahead. Frighten the Soviet Union into disarmament? You might just as well try to frighten the United States into Communism.

My quarrel with my government, as well as with the governments of friend and foe alike, is, therefore, that they have not convinced even themselves that a world without war is worth a supreme effort. No Nation has ever tried an all-out, concerted, organized offensive against war as the method of settling international disputes. Many have joined together in treaties, agreements, leagues, and associations such as the United Nations, but each of them has always felt it necessary to reserve the right, out loud, to take unilateral military action should they deem it necessary.

Up until the era of the nuclear weapon this preoccupation with force-as-policy was neither surprising nor particularly vulnerable to criticism. Most wars arose from the desire for power or aggrandizement or the annexation of valuable territory. It seemed worth the time and expense of most nations either to plan for or to guard against aggression for such purposes. But it is no longer as simple as that, nor are the consequences of a shooting war in the same league today with those of times past. Therefore, if we are interested in survival, and most human beings are, we are forced in our own self-interest to find honorable alternatives to shooting.

It is all very well to swagger and strut and warn of our power and defy the antagonist to knock off the chip. Play-acting of this sort may still carry considerable weight in the playground, but not in 20th-century diplomacy, because the nuclear weapon has in fact become the great equalizer between the warring camps. A new way of impressing the adversary must therefore be found which will have the effect of removing the wholly uncalled-for pressures that characterize the cold war impasse.

No one has all the answers, but they exist somewhere, and they will be found. On the level of brute, man-to-man contention, we humans have often come to the realization that fighting is not as important as learning to get along; we have come to understand that the energy, substance, and blood wasted in fighting can be put to far better use in peaceful, cooperative pursuits. In such situations, neither man need be afraid of the other's strength. Each man may well figure he has a good chance of winning any set-to, regardless of his antagonist's brawn. Yet both men can find in judging each other's potential that there is room for respect, even without total agreement, and can find that this respect leads gradually to cooperation and perhaps even to friendship. Is such an evolving friendship impossible between nations? It has, after all, not proved impossible between neighbors, between communities, between cities and States.

But such respect and cooperation do need a new atmosphere, a new environment in which to thrive. And the more we yip and yap about how we should not only flex but use our muscles, the further we remove ourselves and our friends from that environment. Let me be quite clear: no one disapproves more than I do of being pushed around. I have the same wholly human reactions to indignity and injustice as most men. I do not advocate "turning the other cheek" as the preferred path to peace; rather, I insist that we can block or parry the first blow, thus making the turning unnecessary. But, though I understand human reaction, I cannot condone either the belligerence of the Communist line or the counterbelligerence which that line creates. Both reactions, are simply not adult, in the light of the holocaust to which they can lead.

So we must give more thought and attention to what I call the "Three A's": the attitude which can help create the atmosphere in which we can take the action which will lead us and our adversaries away from the brink together. Neither of us really wants to jump off: this would mean destruction for us both. Why not, then, put as much thought and energy into creating and developing such a course of action as we do in creating and developing ever newer and more devastating weapons? Which course is more likely to be our salvation in the long run? Which makes more sense? Let's try being adult.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the New York Times this morning published a splendid letter, also written by Mr. James J. Wadsworth, on the subject of the test ban, in which he denies that the Hosmer committee of the House, a partisan Republican committee, speaks for all House Republicans. He points out that the Republican leadership in the other body "has left the impression that the GOP as a whole opposes the administration's current test ban policy."

Mr. Wadsworth states categorically that this is not true. I am glad to note this comment by a very able, effective member of the Republican Party. He discusses rather critically the report of the Hosmer committee, pointing out that they made their first report when they had heard only one side of the story, and that after the second side, the administration side, was in, they gave it very little publicity. Mr. Wadsworth concludes his letter by saying:

If this administration is guilty of anything—

And he does not say that it is—

It is the failure to educate the public to the comparative risks of continued testing versus a treaty.

I commend Mr. Wadsworth for his very able statement of support for the test ban position of the President of the United States and his advisers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wadsworth's letter may be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

TEST-BAN REPORT ATTACKED—WADSWORTH DENIES PANEL SPEAKS FOR ALL HOUSE REPUBLICANS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Critics of the protracted efforts to achieve a nuclear test-ban treaty with the Russians have been most outspoken since the chances of agreement seemed to improve in the wake of the Cuban crisis. These critics are to be found in both parties, as are the consistent advocates of a workable treaty. Unfortunately, however, the Republican leadership in the House has left the impression that the GOP as a whole opposes the administration's current test-ban policy.

This impression has been left by Representative CRAIG HOSMER's Republican House panel on nuclear testing, whose reports are signed by the entire GOP leadership. The panel's first report, presumably based on the views of experts whose antitest-ban views were already well known, was released to the press before scientists with a different approach could be heard.

Not surprisingly, the first report concluded that "the present basis for negotiations on detection machinery fails to offer realistic probability of detecting violations." Yet it was not until almost a month later that Government witnesses spelled out the areas of recent progress in underground test detection before the hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Anyone seriously interested in the facts could hardly be in a position to judge the detection machinery without hearing from the men most closely associated with making it work.

UNDERGROUND EXPLOSIONS

Now the hearings are over and Mr. HOSMER's panel has issued another report. This time the panel has seized upon one bit of testimony, carefully ignored other statements, and has come to the conclusion that the American-British detection system cannot detect small underground nuclear tests over an area of 2.5 million square miles in the U.S.S.R.

The Hosmer panel's calculations are based on the assumption that secret Soviet tests would be conducted in dry alluvium, a soft earth. But the panel ignored the testimony of Dr. Franklin Long of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, who indicated that there are only two small areas of alluvium in the U.S.S.R. One is on the Iranian and Afghan borders, the other about 400 miles from Iran. Both are within detection range of stations outside of the U.S.S.R.

As a Republican and as the former chief negotiator for the Eisenhower administration, which initiated the nuclear test-ban talks, I find the operation of the Hosmer panel one of the most unfortunate domestic developments since I served in Geneva. It is biased in its presentation of the argument and misleading in its pretense of speaking for all House Republicans. I feel sure that the panel does not reflect the views of all Republicans in the House and certainly in the Senate, which must ultimately ratify any treaty which is signed.

BASIS FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Some congressional and press attacks on continued efforts to reach agreement imply that the top officials of the administration and their negotiators are "giving away" our national security, piece by piece. Level-headed Americans know that successful negotiations must be based on a structure of mutual advantages for both sides. A workable nuclear test ban—and further steps toward mutual disarmament—would improve the security of both major powers as well as all other nations.

If this administration is guilty of anything, it is the failure to educate the public to the comparative risks of continued testing versus a treaty. President Kennedy made a cogent point during his press conference of March 21 when he spoke of the probability that many more nations would have the nuclear weapon by the mid-seventies. I hope he will continue to voice this warning until it is well understood. When the public is made aware of the choice we face, it can intelligently weigh the risks of new paths of international security.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I conclude as follows: Let us stop playing games with disarmament, as though we were little boys. Let us put away our tin soldiers. Let us disavow the "war whoopers," as Walter Lippmann calls them. Let us forget all this nonsense

about "eyeball to eyeball" and "Who is going to blink first?" In short, let us grow up. This is serious business. We are not on a juvenile Western television circuit, where the goodies are our boys shooting up the baddies, and the baddies, named Vladimir, are all trying to shoot us up.

We are living in a stark, harsh world of the mid-sixties. We cannot retreat into euphoria. Nor can we recapture the mood of the First Crusade. Let us not get into a holy war on 700 years of controversy between Mohammedan and Christian led to no intelligent conclusion. Let us not get into a long, bitter shooting war with those with whom we disagree, with the same unfortunate result as a thousand years ago.

Let me suggest that we are not playing a high school football game with the Russians. Let us support the hardboiled realists of our administration, and indeed of President Eisenhower's before them, who say there is no alternative to peace, who say that war is unthinkable. Let us get on with the long, hard, tough negotiation from strength, which, in the long run, is the only road to a lasting peace, which, in my opinion, will inevitably lead to the President's objective; namely, general and complete disarmament under enforcible world law.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate and commend the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania upon the speech he has just made. I am conscious of the fact that David Lilienthal was a great public service commissioner in Wisconsin before he became the head of TVA.

I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania that Mr. Lilienthal is a man of wisdom, restraint, and responsibility. Nevertheless, I think the answer which the Senator from Pennsylvania has given to the Lilienthal thesis, which is, that we should not engage in disarmament discussions and should not sign a disarmament treaty because such a treaty is superficial and does not go to the basic causes of war, is completely correct. I support the Senator from Pennsylvania wholeheartedly. We must work on both ends of the problem. We must work on the basic causes of war—poverty, illiteracy, mistrust—as well as work night and day to do what we can to limit the forces of destruction, which of themselves certainly can cause war.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his support of my position in this regard, and I welcome it. I assure him that he and I do not stand entirely alone.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, earlier today I placed in the RECORD a column by Max Freedman, in which he protested that the excellent speeches made by the majority whip in favor of a treaty for the control of nuclear weapons testing have not been given the kind of national attention and publicity which they should have received. The Senator from Pennsylvania also has been making speeches in the Senate on this subject, and his speeches have not received the attention which they deserve.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator from Wisconsin recall that a number of us came to the Chamber when the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was making his speech on the floor several weeks ago? I think six or seven of us engaged in a colloquy with him at that time. I receive plenty of publicity; I am not looking for more; but I think it is a great shame that the Senator from Minnesota should have received, so far as I know, only one little stick of type in the Washington Post; I saw no other comment on his speech in any other newspapers. To my way of thinking, his speech was one of the great speeches delivered at this session of Congress.

Mr. HART. I, too, should like to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for again pricking the conscience of the Senate concerning the overshadowing question which confronts America today and will confront it in the years ahead.

It is remarkable that we can discuss at great length a great variety of things, ranging from A to Z, and yet we seem consciously to ignore the fact that all that litany from A to Z will evaporate if we do not face up to this problem.

Again I salute the Senator from Pennsylvania for insisting that we obtain a sense of priority.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his comments. May the three of us—the only Senators on the floor—and also the present Presiding Officer, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], express the hope that this point of view will be adequately reported in the press and on the television and the radio.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION RECORD ON LANDIS' RECOMMENDATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in December 1960, shortly after President Kennedy was elected, and before he took office, Dean Landis, of the Harvard Law School, was appointed to make a study of the quasi-judicial agencies of the Federal Government. He made a very intelligent, thoughtful, and critical appraisal of them. He also made a series of recommendations as to how they might improve their operations.

I may point out that, in the judgment of many persons, these quasi-judicial agencies have a more profound influence on the American people and on their way of life than does almost any other area of Government operation. These quasi-judicial agencies include the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and many others. They affect the content of much of what we see on the television and much of what we hear on the radio; and they also have a definite effect on the rates we pay for gas and fuel oil, on the cost of transport, and on the health of all these industries.

On January 11, I wrote to each of the agencies, and asked what progress they had made on the Landis recommendations. Previously, I have placed in the RECORD the replies which came from other agencies. Today, I should like to call attention, very briefly, to a reply I received from Mr. Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. He acknowledged the criticisms made by Mr. Landis and conceded their validity when he said:

> The present members of the Federal Power Commission have been fully aware of the serious questions raised by Mr. Landis' December 1960 Report on Regulatory Agencies, particularly those associated with the Commission's past inaction and past failure to protect the consumer interest.
>
> We have taken numerous steps to achieve the goals set forth in Mr. Landis' report even though our experience has indicated that all of his detailed suggestions were not in the public interest.

Mr. Landis called the Federal Power Commission a classic example of the breakdown of the administrative process. He pointed out that laws passed by Congress and decisions made by the Supreme Court have been flouted and ignored by the FPC.

The letter from Mr. Swidler is a significant justification of the record of his agency in meeting the Landis criticisms. I do not fully share Mr. Swidler's opinion; and at a later time I intend to evaluate and appraise further the progress made by the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter of March 1, from Mr. Swidler, Chairman of the Commission; and also a release by the Federal Power Commission, dated January 30, reporting on recent activities of the Commission; and a further release, dated February 13, by the FPC; and several statistical tables which set forth the progress made by the Commission.

There being no objection, the letter, releases, and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1963.

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

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I regret the delay in responding to your letter of January 11, but as was explained to your staff the press of official business made it impossible to prepare in a shorter period of time the detailed response which your inquiry deserves.

The present members of the Federal Power Commission have been fully aware of the serious questions raised by Mr. Landis' December 1960 Report on Regulatory Agencies, particularly those associated with the Commission's past inaction and past failure to protect the consumer interest.

We have taken numerous steps to achieve the goals set forth in Mr. Landis' report even though our experience has indicated that all of his detailed suggestions were not in the public interest. As you know, when the present members of the Commission took office we were faced with backlogs in the natural gas field and a withering away of responsibilities in the electric power field which had accumulated over a period of years. We have made major advances in the past year in clearing away the backlog of natural gas cases and bringing stability to gas prices, and in revitalizing our activities in carrying out our statutory responsibilities under the Federal Power Act. These

advances have been accomplished through organization changes, new procedures, clear policies, and a greater sense of urgency by the Commission as well as its staff.

I am enclosing a recent press release describing our progress in the four major natural gas regulatory areas. This report contains complete statistics on our natural gas caseload.

As you know, many of the recommendations contained in Mr. Landis' report called for the President to submit to the Congress reorganization plans for the various regulatory agencies, including the Federal Power Commission. Since the initiation of these proposals rests with the President, I shall not comment on them.

Mr. Landis devoted a considerable portion of his report to the suggestion that the FPC should utilize section 7(f) of the Natural Gas Act to eliminate the processing of thousands of independent producer and pipeline certificate applications. Section 7(f) permits a natural gas company to enlarge or extend its facilities to supply increased market demands within its service area without further FPC authorization.

In considering the application of this provision to pipeline companies, the Commission last year dismissed a series of long-pending applications seeking such determinations, holding that the service area provision is not an exception that can be applied without reservations. We concluded that the determination can be applied to a company such as the Washington Gas Light Co., which is in probably a unique position, engaged solely in local distribution of gas even though its system crosses State lines in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. On the other hand, we denied a request by Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co., which is typical of the interstate pipeline systems, finding that it was seeking a service area determination which would allow it unlimited rights to construct facilities within a contiguous geographical area that includes a large portion of one State and small areas of two others. Such an exemption would be an abdication by the Commission of the full jurisdiction that Congress intended that the Federal Power Commission exercise over interstate transporters of gas. Copies of the Washington Gas Light and Arkansas Louisiana orders are enclosed.

We have achieved the purposes of the section 7(f) by proscribing regulations which permit pipelines through budget-type authorizations to construct additional facilities to existing customers is specified relatively small amounts without further approval of the Commission.

Mr. Landis specifically suggested that small natural gas producers should be exempted from regulation.

The suggestion that the Commission should exempt all producers below a certain size has been thoroughly explored and we have had to reject this course for reasons both practical and legal. First, the Natural Gas Act does not permit us to exercise such a discretion. The statute requires the Commission to regulate natural gas companies, and no leeway is provided which would permit us to treat certain classes of companies, such as small independent producers, any differently than other types of companies. Secondly, even if the statute did permit such exemptions, there are other problems, including the likelihood of triggering escalation clauses in major contracts, if the small producers are freed to operate outside of our price ceilings.

The Commission has taken many steps to reduce the burden of regulation for small producers and make independent producer regulation effective. The most important actions are the area rate proceedings which obviate the necessity for case-by-case determinations for the thousands of independent producers and enable us to fix just and reasonable rates for an entire producing area in one proceeding. We have also developed simplified forms for small producers to use in making filings with the FPC, which reduce the burden on the producer as well as simplifying the processing within the Commission.

Other recommendations made by Mr. Landis, including those relating to planning, budget management, and the development of new policies and procedures designed to improve administration and expedite the substantive work of the Commission have been considered and acted upon during the past 18 months with good results.

Applications for certificates of public convenience and necessity require notice of application and hearing and are acted upon at the earliest date possible consistent with statutory requirements and other matters pending. An abridged procedure is employed when no opposition is filed to a certificate application and the Commission staff recommends that the certificate be granted by the Commission as in the public interest. This procedure permits a large number of cases to be decided in a single order and facilitates prompt disposition of pipeline certificate applications. The Commission has intensified its efforts to use the abridged hearing procedure whenever feasible. Thus, 1980 pipeline and independent producer certificates representing 83.6 percent of all certificates granted during fiscal year 1962 were processed in this manner.

Present Commission experience concerning cases initiated since July 1, 1961, shows that the time required for disposing of all types of cases has been greatly reduced as compared with the record in the past. For example, 13 were decided in an average of 179 days after filing or suspension, compared to an average of 815 days for 67 cases decided by the prior Commission in fiscal years 1960 and 1961. Although the 13 cases are only a small sample, their processing time is indicative of the progress being made to shorten the proceedings.

On July 1, 1961 there were 116 pipeline rate cases pending. These involved accumulated revenues collected by the companies, subject to possible refund to the consumer, totaling over a billion dollars. By January 1, 1963, the backlog had been reduced to 48 cases with possible refunds amounting to $471 million. During this 18-month period, 85 cases were disposed of and refunds totaling $350 million were ordered by the Commission. Thirty-nine of the 85 cases were disposed of in the last 6 months and refunds ordered in this period totaled more than $252 million. Rate reductions ordered in these same cases totaled $62 million annually. Eighty-four of the 85 cases were inherited from the former Commission and the great majority were decided through the settlement process.

The disposition of our backlog of independent producer rate cases cannot be expected until we can conclude the first two area rate cases now underway. The hearing in the lead case is now well along. These proceedings have been devised to dispose of hundreds of cases in a single decision. Over 900 of the 2,940 cases pending December 31, 1962, have been consolidated into the two area proceedings. The Commission staff is presently developing plans for area rate proceedings to fix just and reasonable rates for the remaining major gas producing areas in the country.

We have identified the workload and established controls to insure that all types of cases move in an orderly and timely manner from one processing stage to the next. We have established time standards throughout the formal hearing process and are making every effort to meet or excel the standards.

To enable us to process our cases more expeditiously, we have also:

(a) Required natural gas companies to submit their case-in-chief and all supporting data verified by an independent certified public accountant at the time a rate increase is filed, thus eliminating the need for extended field investigations as a part of rate cases.

(b) Made more extensive use of prehearing conferences to clarify issues and, where possible, eliminate immaterial or peripheral issues.

(c) Established guidelines limiting the type of evidence necessary to determine initial prices of natural gas in independent producer certificate cases.

(d) Initiated action to require electric utilities, when filing schedules of rates subject to our jurisdiction, to support these filings with cost information.

In line with another recommendation in the Landis report, the position of Assistant to the Chairman has been established to assist in carrying out the important duties of the Chairman's office. The assistant acts as the adviser and personal representative of the Chairman, who under Reorganization Plan No. 9 is responsible for the executive and administrative functions of the Commission. Other members of the Commission now also have personal assistants to help them handle the heavy workload of the Commission.

Mr. Landis recommended that individual commissioners should be responsible for enunciating the grounds on which conclusions are reached in decisions. On May 1, 1961, the Commission announced that its opinions generally would be issued in the name of the individual commissioner preparing the opinion. This policy has resulted in expediting the disposition of cases and improved the quality of our opinions by providing close Commission supervision.

In response to your final question, the Commission's total appropriation for the current fiscal year (1963) is $10,700,000, which compares with $6,932,500 in fiscal 1959.

I have concentrated largely on our progress in natural gas regulation, since the main weight of the Landis report and the heavy backlogs were in this area. The Commission during the last year and a half has taken strong action to revitalize its activities in electric power regulaton to correct the results of past inaction and past disregard of consumer interests. I am enclosing a list of recent accomplishments of the Commission, describing progress in all of our major areas of responsibility.

If you need any further information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman.

RECENT ACTIVITIES OF THE FPC

NATURAL GAS

1. In the past 18 months the Commission has disposed of two-thirds of the billion-dollar backlog of pipeline rate cases it inherited and has ordered interstate pipelines to refund $350 million and reduce their rates for the future by over $62 million annually.

2. The rapid increase in the wellhead price of gas sold in interstate commerce has been halted. The average price has been virtually stabilized in the past year.

3. The Commission has wholeheartedly carried out its responsibility for regulating

sales of gas in interstate commerce by independent producers. We have ordered producers to refund over $30 million.

4. The Commission has underway a comprehensive study in cooperation with the State commissions to determine the extent to which natural gas rate refunds reductions are being passed on to the ultimate consumer.

5. The Commission has pushed forward with area rate proceedings to fix just and reasonable rates for producers and the hearing in the lead case involving hundreds of producers in the Permian Basin of Texas and New Mexico is well along toward completion.

6. The interim area ceilings for sales of new gas in the important producing areas of southern Louisiana and Texas Railroad District 4 were reduced by 2 cents per thousand cubic feet.

7. The Bureau of Natural Gas was reorganized to pinpoint responsibility and assure that cases were speeded to a prompt conclusion.

8. The Commission adopted a rule requiring pipelines to file complete backup information with rate increase requests, thus eliminating field investigations and enabling the Commission to set cases for hearing at once and dispose of them promptly.

9. The Commission adopted a rule which outlaws new contracts for the sale of gas by producers that contain indefinite escalation clauses, such as the so-called favored-nations clauses, which have caused much of the inflation in the price of gas in the past.

10. The Commission adopted a rule prohibiting ex parte communications dealing with the merits of contested cases.

11. The Commission has taken many steps to ease the burden of regulation on the small independent producer.

a. We have devised a one-page form in which they can file for increases which are not in excess of our ceilings.

b. Our area rate policy, in which the rates for all the producers in an area are determined in a single proceeding, relieves the small independent producer of the burdens of individual rate proceedings.

12. A field office has been established in Houston, Tex., to insure closer supervision of personnel working in the field and serve as a clearinghouse for the problems of the producers in the area.

13. We have established an Office of Economics to assist the Commission in planning the future course of regulation of the natural gas industry because economic problems go to the core of regulatory policy.

14. The Commission has established guidelines which limit the evidence in producer certificate cases and will enable the Commission to hold the line on the price for new gas and at the same time dispose of certificate applications expeditiously.

15. In opinion No. 369 issued November 30, 1962, the Commission rejected a price increase by H. L. Hunt and others that would have created a new, higher price plateau for natural gas in southern Louisiana and Mississippi. The decision was the present Commission's first decision in a litigated gas producer rate case and demonstrated our determination to hold the line against unjustified increases in natural gas prices.

16. In opinion No. 348 issued October 23, 1961, the Commission held that it had jurisdiction over the sale of all of the gas moving in interstate commerce, even though some of the gas was consumed in the producing State. The Commission thus prevented possible increased costs to interstate customers by the use of contractual arrangements purporting to segregate certain volumes of gas from the interstate stream and thus to avoid FPC jurisdiction over the price paid to the producers.

17. In opinion No. 351 issued January 22, 1962, the Commission decided the famous CATCO case on remand from the Supreme Court. The decision reduced the initial price for this large sale of gas in southern Louisiana from 21.4 cents per Mcf down to 18.5 cents and ordered refunds of the higher amounts previously collected.

18. In opinion No. 366 issued October 19, 1962, the Commission decided the rate of return issue in four rate cases involving El Paso Natural Gas Co. pending before the Commission since 1955. The case was set for hearing in July 1961 and the interim order procedure, which the Supreme Court recently approved and described as "not only entirely appropriate but in the best traditions of effective administrative practice," was used by the Commission to expedite the decision. The Commission ordered refunds which will total over $68 million, exclusive of interest, on the rate of return issue alone and ordered rate reductions of 15.8 million annually which were made effective before the end of 1962 over the protest of El Paso. The reduced rates were therefore in effect in time to lower the 1963 price of intrastate gas in California which is controlled by the January 1 price fixed by the FPC for interstate sales.

ELECTRIC POWER

1. The Commission is conducting a national power survey to encourage the voluntary interconnection and coordination of the Nation's power systems on a regional and interregional basis. The Commission's objectives are to promote the maximum use of the latest technology in the electric power field to provide lower rates to consumers. The survey has already stimulated many new interconnections between companies. The advisory committees we have formed have provided a forum for all segments of the industry—public, private, and cooperative—to meet and discuss their expansion plans in light of the national interest in providing low cost electricity in all parts of the country.

2. When the present members of the Commission took office the Commission's electric rate regulation functions were practically nonexistent. There were only four professional people engaged in electric rate work. The Commission took immediate action to exercise its responsibility to regulate the wholesale rates of electric utilities in interstate commerce which is one of the primary consumer protection functions of the Federal Power Act.

3. The Commission transferred the electric rate staff from the Bureau of Natural Gas where it was buried and made it a prominent part of a new division in the Bureau of Power. We have built up the electric rate staff within the limits of existing manpower and we are seeking funds to enlarge the staff to the minimum required to carry out effective rate regulation.

4. Many utilities did not even have their wholesale rates in interstate commerce on file with the Federal Power Commission. We are requiring that these rate filings be made and where necessary have issued a show-cause order to require the filings. Over 1,000 electric rate filings were made with the Federal Power Commission in the last 6 months of 1962.

5. The FPC has issued a proposed rule that will require electric companies to support their rate filings with cost information to facilitate meaningful Commission review.

6. The Commission is preparing a list of all the public utilities subject to the Commission's jurisdiction which we will publish shortly.

7. The Commission has announced a proposed rule requiring strict and detailed accounting for political expenditures by power companies. (The rule applies also to natural gas companies.)

8. The Commission has taken action to carry out its responsibility for collecting the money owed the U.S. Treasury from downstream hydroelectric projects that benefit from upstream Federal developments.

(a) A provision is being inserted in all new licenses which will require annual payments for headwater benefits based upon a formula.

(b) We have announced a rule which will accomplish the same purpose for existing projects.

In this fiscal year we are collecting $1,750,000 in headwater benefits for the Federal Treasury which is three times as much money as has been collected in the entire history of the FPC. We estimate that in the next year we will collect $4 million.

9. The Commission in Opinion No. 356 on April 19, 1962, ruled that a pumped storage hydroelectric project was subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. The Commission emphasized that the Federal Power Act conferred broad authority on the Commission to insure the most comprehensive use of the Nation's water resources.

10. The Commission in opinion No. 357 on April 25, 1962, spelled out a new policy in issuing licenses for non-Federal hydro projects built prior to 1935 and still operating without a license. The FPC concluded that these projects should not be given the benefit of the maximum 50-year licenses allowed under the Federal Power Act but should be licensed for a shorter term. We are making a concerted effort to bring these projects under license.

11. We have accelerated the pace of our hydroelectric licensing work. In the last 6 months of 1962 licenses were issued for projects whose construction will add $260 million to stimulate the Nation's economy.

12. We have proposed a rule requiring all licensees to submit a comprehensive plan for public recreation with their license applications to assure that the general public obtains the full benefits of the recreation potential of hydroelectric projects built under FPC license.

[From Federal Power Commission Release No. 12,497; G-6907]

FPC CHAIRMAN SWIDLER REPORTS PROGRESS IN ALL NATURAL GAS REGULATORY AREAS DURING 1962

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 13, 1963.—The Federal Power Commission cut its pipeline rate case backlog by well over half during 1962, reducing the number of cases on hand from 90 to 41 and the annual dollar amount of proposed increases from $388.2 million to about $151 million, Chairman Joseph C. Swidler reported today.

The FPC during 1962 also made substantial progress in its other three natural gas regulatory areas, Chairman Swidler said. He reported—

A reduction of $16,098,417 in the backlog of proposed annual rate increases by independent producers of natural gas.

A decrease from about $1.1 billion to $914 million in the amount of proposed construction in pending pipeline certificate applications.

A reduction from 3,209 to 2,814 in the number of producer certificate applications pending.

The $1,099,090,000 accumulation of excess rates collected subject to refund 6 months ago by natural gas pipelines was reduced to approximately $470,779,443 at the end of 1962.

During the quarter ended December 31, Chairman Swidler said, the FPC disposed of

23 pipeline rate increase cases involving $96,070,000 annually. At the same time it ordered refunds estimated at $184,946,172, plus interest.

More than two-thirds of the $151,009,400 in pipeline rate increases pending at year's end was involved in five cases. One of these is before the Commission, two are awaiting initial decision by FPC examiners, and two are undergoing staff investigation.

The annual dollar amount involved in proposed rate increases by independent natural gas producers dropped for both the year and for the last quarter of 1962. The Commission had on hand proposed increases totaling $167,525,597 at the beginning of the year, and this was reduced to $158,159,192 by September 30, and to $151,427,180 at year's end. However, the number of cases on hand rose approximately 5 percent from 2,756 at the beginning of the year to 2,881 on September 30 and 2,905 on December 31.

Chairman Swidler also reported an across-the-board reduction in the amount of proposed construction in pending pipeline certificate applications for both the quarter and the year.

Pending applications, measured by the estimated construction costs, were reduced from $1.1 billion to about $914 million for the year; the miles of pipeline in pending applications was reduced from 8,782 to 8,582; and measured by compressor horsepower the reduction was from 772,783 to 612,960. The number of cases on hand, however, rose from 206 to 224 during the year. Corresponding reductions for the quarter were $1,036,230,973 to $913,783,652 (construction costs); 9,414 to 8,582 (miles of pipe); and 767,942 to 612,960 (compressor horsepower).

Hearings have been completed on nearly half of the $913,783,652 backlog of proposed new construction on hand December 31, and approximately $120 million was being held up awaiting further information or action by the applicants or the disposition of other cases.

More than $351 million of the pending pipeline construction applications, or more than one-third, is proposed in the five largest cases. Four of these applications are through the hearing stage, and the fifth is ready for hearing. Temporary authorization has been granted for construction of $138,227,922 of the new construction proposed in pending applications.

The number of pending applications by independent producers seeking authorization to sell gas in interstate commerce was reduced from 3,209 at the beginning of the year to 2,814 on December 31, 1962. The FPC during the year disposed of 2,039 such applications. Temporary authorizations had been issued in 1,892 of the 2,814 cases still pending at year's end. Of the remaining 922 applications, 300 involve service for which temporary certificates have not been requested or which are new filings still being processed. For the last quarter, however, there was an increase in the number pending from 2,557 to 2,814.

The attached tables show statistics as of the end of the last quarter, with comparisons with the preceding quarter and the quarter ended a year earlier. The statistics are divided into four tables—pipeline certificate cases, pipeline rate cases, producer certificate cases, and producer rate cases. The tables include summary remarks concerning the more significant aspects of the statistics.

The publication of these statistics completes the first full year of coverage through the quarterly reports, initiated by Chairman Swidler at the beginning of 1962.

TABLE I.—*Pipeline company certificate filings and actions (construction and operation only)*

	Number of applications, quarter ending—			Miles of pipeline, quarter ending—			Compressor horsepower, quarter ending—			Estimated cost		
	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961
Pending start of quarter	194	200	195	9,414	10,202	7,432	767,942	785,197	590,298	$1,036,230,973	$1,101,470,293	$934,623,381
Applications filed during quarter	71	49	53	916	616	1,830	73,590	55,410	192,050	121,123,452	86,333,844	242,418,571
Certificates issued during quarter	38	51	39	1,562	1,403	476	228,572	72,665	9,565	230,865,173	151,522,153	71,866,821
Otherwise disposed of during quarter	3	4	3	186	1	4				12,705,600	51,011	30,544
Pending end of quarter	[1] [2] 224	194	206	[3] 8,582	9,414	8,782	[3] 612,960	767,942	772,783	[3] 913,783,652	[4] 1,036,230,973	1,104,144,587

[1] Increase during quarter.
[2] Includes 82 applications on which temporary certificates involving $138,227,922 in estimated construction cost have been issued.
[3] Reduction during quarter.
[4] Adjusted to include amendments and supplements to applications and modifications of certificates.

Analysis of cases pending

	Dec. 31, 1962	Dec. 31, 1961
Additional information requested	$11,548,000	$61,955,000
Undergoing staff analysis	69,714,047	171,622,030
Ready for hearing	125,225,404	188,266,145
Hearing in progress	178,208,630	387,598,061
Before examiner for decision	197,110,200	84,253,994
Before Commission	212,365,567	27,458,000
Pending action by applicant or in other cases	107,302,320	164,702,662
Total major projects pending ($700,000 or more construction cost)	901,474,168	1,085,855,892
Minor projects pending	12,309,484	19,288,695
Total, all projects pending	913,783,652	1,105,144,587

5 largest certificate applications pending Dec. 31, 1962

Name of company	Docket No.	Estimated construction cost	Status
Colorado Interstate Gas Co.	G-16904	$99,745,673	Before Commission.
Columbia-Gulf Transmission Co.	CP-62-89	72,225,300	Before examiner for decision.
Oklahoma-Illinois Gas Pipeline Co.	CP-62-260	64,130,000	Ready for hearing.
El Paso Natural Gas Co.	G-16235	58,685,000	Before Commission.
Tennessee Gas Transmission Co.	CP-60-94	56,624,000	Before examiner for decision.

TABLE II.—*Pipeline company rate filings and actions*

	Number of dockets, quarter ending—			Annual amount, quarter ending—		
	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961
Filings under suspension, start of quarter	64	76	101	$247,042,400	$277,189,100	$394,764,500
Increases suspended during quarter		2		37,000	8,582,900	
Increases allowed without suspension during quarter		3			826,500	600
Disposition of suspension proceedings during quarter [1]	23	14	11	96,070,000	38,729,600	6,573,600
Increases allowed after hearing and decision	5			9,849,000		
Increases disallowed or withdrawn after hearing and decision				8,054,000		
Increases allowed by settlement proceedings	18	14	11	56,726,900	13,026,500	3,275,000
Increases disallowed or withdrawn by settlement proceedings				21,440,100	25,703,100	3,298,600
Filings under suspension, end of quarter	[2] [3] 41	64	90	[3] [4] 151,009,400	247,042,400	388,190,900

[1] Cases disposed of during the last quarter provided for refunds estimated to total $184,946,172, plus interest.
[2] Includes 8 cases still pending which have been disposed of except for subsidiary issues.
[3] Reduction during quarter.
[4] The accumulated amount of revenues collected subject to possible refund was $470,779,443 on Dec. 31, 1962, compared with $1,099,090,000 on July 1, 1962.

5 largest pipeline rate suspensions as of Dec. 31, 1962

Name of company	Docket No.	Annual amount suspended	Status
El Paso Natural Gas Co.	G-12948 et al.	$62,526,000	Awaiting examiner's decision.
United Fuel Gas Co.	G-20270	14,614,500	Do.
Southern Natural Gas Co.	G-18512	10,135,400	Undergoing staff investigation.
Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co.	RP60-9	8,507,900	Before Commission.
Northern Natural Gas Co.	G-15335	8,137,000	Undergoing staff investigation.

TABLE III.—*Independent producer gas certificate filings and actions (service and abandonment)*

	Number through quarter ending—		
	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961
Pending start of quarter	2,557	2,520	2,973
Applications filed during quarter	402	404	453
Certificates issued during quarter	[1] 80	311	142
Otherwise disposed of during quarter	65	56	75
Pending end of quarter	[2] [3] 2,814	2,557	3,209

[1] None of these certificates were conditioned to require reductions in the initial sales price of the gas.
[2] Temporary authorizations have been issued in 1,892 of these cases. Of the remaining 922 pending applications, 300 involve service for which temporary authorization cannot be issued. The remaining 622 cases include those for which temporary authorizations have not been requested or which are new filings still being processed.
[3] Increase during quarter.

TABLE IV.—*Independent producer rate filings and actions*

	Number of dockets,[1] quarter ending—			Annual amount, quarter ending—		
	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961	December 1962	September 1962	December 1961
Filings under suspension, start of quarter	2,881	2,902	2,563	$158,159,192	$164,870,541	$165,787,033
Increases suspended during quarter	191	96	203	3,682,301	5,115,468	2,406,941
Disposition of supension proceedings during quarter	167	117	10	10,414,313	11,826,817	668,377
Increases allowed after hearing and decision	6					
Increases disallowed or withdrawn after hearing and decision				85,465		
Increases allowed by settlement proceedings	161	117	10	5,502,432	3,181,997	491,654
Increases disallowed or withdrawn by settlement proceedings				4,826,416	8,644,820	176,723
Filings under suspension, end of quarter	[2] [3] 2,905	2,881	2,756	[4] 151,427,180	158,159,192	167,525,597

[1] A docket may include 1 or more filings.
[2] Includes 901 dockets in area rate proceedings now in progress.
[3] Increase during quarter.
[4] Reduction during quarter.

NOTE.—A substantial portion of the suspended independent producer rate filings are held pending determination of the proper area price in a formal proceeding. The Commission is currently devoting the efforts of a considerable portion of its staff, in expediting : area hearings, docket No. AR 61-1 and AR 61-2, and significant decrease in number of suspensions on hand is not anticipated pending conclusion of such hearing.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that, in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow at 10 o'clock a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 9, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 8, 1963:

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. John Edward Kelly, O20156, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Louis Alfred Walsh Jr., O19567, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Elmer John Gibson, O19822, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Edwin Hess Burba, O31518, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alexander Day Surles Jr., O20622, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Benjamin Henry Pochyla, O30103, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Joe Stallings Lawrie, O20914, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Roberts Calhoun, O19256, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Walter August Jensen, O19006, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. George Thomas Powers 3d, O19137, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Jackson Graham, O20553, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Howard Wilson Penney, O22917, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Peter Clarke Hyzer, O20589, U.S. Army.

Col. Walter Evans Brinker, O21776, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard Thomas Cassidy, O23213, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Emil Paul Eschenburg, O23469, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Norton, O23858, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Leland George Cagwin, O23200, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Albin Felix Irzyk, O24158, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Walter Philip Leber, O25130, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Charles Gribble, Jr., O23695, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Harry Jarvis Engel, O39840, Judge Advocate General Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Richard Pressly Scott, O23787, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Clinton Taber, O25270, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Pershing Brown, O23544, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Keith Lincoln Ware, O33181, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Lafayette Mabry, Jr., O34047, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Woodrow Wilson Vaughan, O23004, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Ralph Longwell Poster, O22669, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Parker Warner, O32462, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Raymond Leroy Shoemaker, Jr., O22978, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Clarence William Clapsaddle, Jr., O22972, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Willard Pearson, O44466, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Eugene DePuy, O34710, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edward Paul Smith, O22063, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Joseph Alexander McChristian, O21966, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Fred Wilbur Collins, O33425, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Herron Nichols Maples, O45920, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Bruce Smith, O46241, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Howard Bayer, O23551, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George I. Forsythe, O24510, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard Joe Seitz, O33979, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Arthur Lorenzo West, Jr., O25269, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel U.S. Army).

Col. Ellis Warner Williamson, O34484, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Edmonston Coffin, O25234, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army.

Col. Dayton Willis Eddy, O24565, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Gray O'Connor, O21088, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas Mull Crawford, O21983, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas Augustine Kenan, O22670, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Elias Carter Townsend, O31680, U.S. Army.

Col. Henry Augustine Miley, Jr., O22993, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Joseph Miller Heiser, Jr., O43773, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Austin James Montgomery, O51942, U.S. Army.

Col. Raymond Chandler Conroy O33276, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Bryan Coleman Thomas Fenton, O20088, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Conn Lewis Mulburn, Jr., O20405, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Joe Morris Blumberg, O29332, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

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

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. James Karrick Woolnough, O18709, U.S. Army.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

Having been designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, the following-named officer, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Charles H. Hayes, U.S. Marine Corps.

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. William A. Brockett, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Adm. Robert L. Dennison, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade indicated, on the retired list, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having been designated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, the following-named officers for appointment to the grades indicated while so serving:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. David L. McDonald, U.S. Navy.

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. William E. Gentner, Jr., U.S. Navy.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Raymond G. Andrews to be first lieutenant, and ending Gabriel J. Zinni to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 15, 1963;

The nominations beginning Ned E. Ackner to be colonel, and ending Hugh M. Zumbro to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 28, 1963; and

Eckwood H. Solomon, Jr., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288, which nomination was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 15, 1963.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning Adolphus R. Allison, Jr., to be lieutenant commander, and ending Clarence Van Eaton to be lieutenant (junior grade), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 28, 1963.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Maine Chicken Barbecue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when all of our States seek greater employment opportunities for their citizens, it has become most important to increase consumer demand in this country and abroad for the countless goods and products produced in the United States.

It seems timely for me to acquaint my colleagues with a most successful sales promotion event in Washington, D.C., which should prove beneficial to several State of Maine food products. I refer specifically to a Maine chicken barbecue sponsored by the Maine State Society on April 3 at the Kenwood Golf and Country Club. Featured on the menu was Maine chicken barbecued on the grounds by experts, Maine potatoes and peas, and topped off by Maine blueberry pie.

This barbecue would have been judged a success by any standards. Three hundred and fifty loyal State of Maine people, temporarily displaced from the Pine Tree State and living in Washington, D.C., turned out to dine on Maine delicacies, listen to the Honorable Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, and meet Maine's lovely cherry blossom princess and "Miss Maine Vacationland," Miss Sarah Allen.

The more intangible benefit from this affair came from acquainting a host of people, including food brokers and food retailers in the Washington area with a few food items produced in Maine, of which we are justly proud.

Executives from all the major chainstores attended as well as representatives from several embassies of countries that import Maine agricultural produce.

This most successful affair was the brainchild of the imaginative president of the Maine State Society, Hon. James V. Day, better known in Washington as a member of the Federal Maritime Commission. Cooperating to the fullest extent were the Maine State Department of Agriculture and the Maine Poultry Growers Association.

The resulting good will and extensive publicity could very well open new markets for Maine produce; I commend Commissioner Day and other officers of the Maine State Society.

I have been assured that the famous Maine State Society annual lobster dinner will be put on again this summer, with extra trimmings.

The day of the Yankee peddler may be gone, but there are still ways to get people everywhere to recognize superior products. The formula is still the same, a little initiative and a lot of hard work.

A National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the whopping $98.8-billion budget—the biggest ever submitted by any administration in war or peace—many of the needs of the American people are being pushed aside.

While the need for more and better schools for our children is vital, we find that education must wait because we are short on funds.

While the need for medical care for the aged is urgent, we find that we cannot provide a health care program unless we raise taxes, social security taxes.

While there exists an ever-increasing need for more housing for the elderly, we find that there are insufficient moneys to properly house our senior citizens.

While there is a need for more adequate benefits for our disabled veterans, we find that our budget cannot stand this additional expenditure.

While there is a desperate need for tax relief for the overburdened wage earners, we find that a tax cut can only be given at the expense of creating a bigger deficit and a larger national debt.

Mr. Speaker, I can go on and on but the answers are always the same, we cannot afford these needed services. Now, if there were no other avenue open to us, I would agree. But, we can find the money to accomplish many of these objectives if only we used a bit of horsesense.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is a national lottery. By promoting a national lottery, we could raise easily, painlessly and voluntarily over $10 billion a year in new revenue.

Instead of letting all the money that is spent on betting—$50 billion a year—disappear into the hands of the underworld, we can tap this tremendous source of revenue for our own welfare and the public's good.

In a national lottery, Mr. Speaker, we can find not only the answer but the money to take care of many of these needs of our American citizens.

Mrs. Blanche W. Noyes Is Among Six Named To Receive 1963 Federal Woman's Award — Outstanding Achievements Credited to Honorees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, an article by Reporter Sue Cronk in the April 7 issue of the Washington Post discusses the naming of six outstanding women employed by the Government as recipients of the 1963 Federal Woman's Award.

Established in 1960, this award recognizes women in the Federal employ who have contributed to the quality and efficiency of the career service, influenced major programs, and demonstrated personal qualities of leadership, judgment, integrity, and dedication. Heading the panel who selected the six 1963 recipients was News Commentator David Brinkley. Other judges were TV Personality Betty Furness; Katharine E. McBride, president of Bryn Mawr College; and H. Ladd Plumley, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

It is a pleasure to note that one of the ladies accorded this high honor is Mrs. Blanche W. Noyes, former Bendix Trophy winner and an air-marking specialist for the Centers and Towers Project Branch, Installation and Materiel Service, Federal Aviation Agency. A cherished friend, Mrs. Noyes is an experienced and capable aviatrix who has logged some 13,000 certified air hours. I have been privileged to fly with her as a passenger on many occasions, and have often joined her as a participant in ceremonies and programs sponsored by segments of the aviation industry in West Virginia.

Mrs. Noyes has been a leader of thought in the field of aviation. The Post article states that—

> She has been directly and personally responsible for the Government's air-marking program. She has written and revised the technical handbook used by those who design and build air markers, and she has designed the U.S. standard heliport marker and the ground signals used by pilots awaiting rescue, in addition to helping many foreign countries set up their marking programs.

We are grateful to Blanche Noyes for these significant contributions which reflect her unswerving devotion to the public interest.

The 1963 Federal Woman's Award was also presented to the following:

Dr. Eleanor L. Makel, assistant to the director of the medicine and surgery branch, St. Elizabeths Hospital; Miss Bessie Margolin, assistant solicitor in the Department of Labor; Mrs. Katherine Mather, chief of the petrography section, Special Investigations Branch, Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Department of the Army; Miss Verna C. Mohagen, director of personnel management, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Miss Eleanor C. Pressly, head of the vehicles section, Spacecraft Integration and Sounding Rocket Division, Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. President, I am confident that each Member of Congress will wish to join me in conveying these dedicated and distinguished ladies our heartfelt congratulations and gratitude for tasks well done.

ASCS Committeemen Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a special group of farmers in our Nation. They are the farmer ASCS committeemen who administer most of the action programs of the Department of Agriculture. The time is appropriate because 1963 is the 25th anniversary of the legislation establishing the present farmer committee system. The 75th Congress passed legislation which the President signed into law—Public Law 430—on February 16, 1938. It was, in part, an amendment to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act which directed the Secretary of Agriculture to establish local and State committees. While similar committees functioned from the time the Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed in 1933, these others were operating under directives issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than by provision of law.

Under this law the Secretary was directed to establish local administrative areas which cannot cross county lines, with the provision that the participating farmers within such local areas were to elect three farmers to administer the program and represent them. This, then, amounts to an honor for these three elected farmers, but it also becomes a duty. It is an honor because it shows the esteem in which these men are held in their communities. It is a duty because many demands are made on their time, often when they can ill afford to take the time from operating their individual business, to attend meetings or perform other duties including explaining new programs to farmers and enrolling them in these programs.

We all know that over the years these committees have become increasingly interested and effective in the presentation of the programs to the farmers, as is so well evidenced by the following data on farmer participation in the agricultural conservation program during the past 5 years.

Year	Farms participating	Acres on participating farms	Cropland on participating farms
1958	1,114,459	400,763,000	157,230,000
1959	1,005,738	387,534,000	148,644,000
1960	1,055,872	391,421,000	152,199,000
1961	1,216,962	433,573,000	182,224,000
1962 [1]	1,270,000	440,000,000	185,000,000

[1] Estimated.

Actually, the total number of farmers who have participated in the ACP during this 5-year period is much nearer the 2 million figure, because there is a constant turnover of participants which, in 1962, was approximately 200,000, or 4 times the total increase over the preceding year. Because of the importance of the functions these committeemen perform in the limited time they are given the opportunity to work, it appears that more extensive use should be made of their talents whenever possible, as these men are the backbone of the program. This in no way detracts from the efficient and hard-working staffs maintained in their offices. They work as a team for the benefit of all farmers. One point which is frequently overlooked in the consideration of this program is the fact that it embraces all farmland. From time to time, special programs to treat production and conservation problems on certain types of land are considered and then enacted, but not all land is eligible. Some of these special programs include (a) the conservation reserve of the soil bank program, (b) the Great Plains program, (c) feed grains program, and so forth. Since under the ACP any farmland is eligible—it is this total of all land which we must depend upon for the Nation's food supply in the future—we must do everything possible to see that it is preserved rather than wasted away. Hence, it becomes increasingly important that these men—the community, county, and State ASCS committees—be given the necessary tools, including the opportunity to familiarize all farmers in

their locale with the need for the preservation of the soil for future generations, and the necessary finances to enroll all farmers in the program.

For my part, I believe they have done a giantlike job to date with the tools provided for them to work with. They have earned all the acclamation accorded them by their fellow farmers. They deserve to be lauded for their years of dedication to duty. ASCS committeemen, we salute you.

A Shortage of Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 domestic problem in the United States today is the high rate of unemployment. One of the main causes of this serious problem is the fact that many of our unemployed lack the basic skills needed to fill existing job vacancies. We are suffering not so much from a shortage of jobs as from a shortage of manpower trained to fill those jobs.

During a recent interview for U.S. News & World Report, Labor Secretary Wirtz said that there are numerous opportunities, especially for young people, "in skilled jobs and in professional jobs such as teaching, medicine, nursing and engineering," as well as in many service occupations.

In order to reduce the steadily rising level of unemployment, we must equip our labor force through training and retraining to fill the skill demands of the jobs that are going begging. Because of the importance of Secretary Wirtz' remarks on this subject, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from his interview in the April 1 issue of U.S. News & World Report be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

EXCERPT FROM "WHY YOUNG PEOPLE FACE A SHORTAGE OF JOBS"—AN INTERVIEW WITH LABOR SECRETARY WIRTZ

Question. Are there jobs now for all those with skills?

Answer. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act we are training people at the rate of 50,000 to 60,000 a year, and so far we have been able to find work for most of those who finish the training program. If the economy can move up at the rate of 4 percent a year—the present goal—there would soon be full demand for our manpower supply. We are actually coming close to a shortage of skilled manpower in a number of occupations already.

Question. A shortage of workers? In what kinds of jobs?

Answer. This is already true in a good many types of engineering jobs, in teaching jobs, in many professional jobs and in skilled jobs in some trades.

Question. Aren't these jobs for college-trained people?

Answer. Not necessarily. Take the construction industry: Unless we train at a much faster rate than now through the apprenticeship program, there will be a real shortage of skilled workers in the construction industry.

Question. Who controls the apprenticeship program?

Answer. In general, the industry and the unions. There are problems in connection with apprenticeship training which have to be faced squarely.

Question. Has there been an arbitrary limitation of the number who can get apprenticeship training?

Answer. Yes, there has been some of that.

Question. Restraint on Negro training in particular?

Answer. In some unions there has been and still is racial discrimination in apprenticeship programs which cannot be justified or tolerated.

Question. Mr. Secretary, in what fields are jobs for younger people now available?

Answer. In general, the answer is in skilled jobs and in professional jobs such as teaching, medicine, nursing, and engineering. There is a shortage, too, of people just below the professional level, such as assistants to engineers and scientists, and so on.

Question. What about secretarial jobs?

Answer. In a good many cities job opportunities are available in service occupations, ranging all the way from secretarial work to domestic help, both male and female. In most cities it's hard for housewives to get the domestic help they need.

Question. But domestic work is not highly skilled. Why is it so hard to get domestic help at a time when there are so many people unemployed?

Answer. There are two problems here. One: It's a harder administrative job to bring thousands of workers together with thousands of housewives than it is to staff a single factory that employs several thousand workers. Often a housewife just wants somebody for part-time work.

There is also this problem: In this country there is a tradition of looking down on domestic service. To many workers even the most menial job on an assembly line is more attractive, has more status appeal, than a job taking care of somebody's house or yard, or working in a restaurant.

GOP Solons Fettered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, studies have been made to determine the status of the minority as far as staff work in House committees is concerned. This study has shown a decided lack in the quantity of staffing which is available to the minority. On April 7, 1963, my colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona, the Honorable BARRY GOLDWATER wrote a column entitled "GOP Solons Fettered" which sets forth the complete case for adequate minority staffing in a succinct, well-ordered manner.

The article follows:

[From the New York Journal-American, Apr. 7, 1963]

WHAT I BELIEVE: GOP SOLONS FETTERED

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

Why doesn't the Republican minority in Congress exercise more weight in Government policymaking?

There are many reasons, such as the size of the majority, the role played by powerful Democratic committee chairman and the influence exerted by a Democratic President.

But another reason, one which doesn't get nearly enough attention, is the fact of inadequate minority staffs in the House and Senate.

Just as generals must, so Senators and Representatives depend heavily upon staffs to do the real digging and much of the work, pulling together the background on which a policy decision can be made. What witnesses will a committee hear? What is the status of similar legislation? What are the needs for proposed legislation, and so on? All this is the work of committee staffs.

Today, of course, the majority party, which is the Democratic Party, expects a substantial share of the staff to be appointed by them and to be working for them.

On committee after committee, however, the minority party has not been able to appoint any staff members at all. On most, there is at least a disparity of staff appointments far beyond the disparity in party representation.

Insufficient minority staffing makes legislation more dependent than ever upon the statistics, the witnesses, the proposals of the Democratic administration as transmitted through the majority. I would make this point just as emphatically if the situation were reversed and proper committee staffing was denied to the Democrats.

The need is for proper policies, properly researched, properly arrived at and understood above and beyond the desires of the particular administration running the executive branch.

This cannot be done without spadework on behalf of the minority position on the myriad questions coming before the House and Senate. Legislating is amazingly complex, reaching into every possible phase of American life. Some subjects could occupy the entire time of intelligent legislators to the exclusion of everything else.

What it boils down to, is help for busy Senators and Congressmen. Unless provided on a larger scale for minority Members of Congress, the case for the opposition in American political life will continue to suffer.

Unfortunately, too much importance is given to advancing the administration's program today. Just because a President sends a message to Congress and follows it up with specific legislation doesn't automatically assure that this is the best thing that could be enacted for the people.

Very often, just the opposite is the case. Sometimes it is the people's definite advantage to have Presidential requests opposed and defeated by their representatives in Congress. And because of this, the minority effort is extremely important. It definitely should be supported by the best staff work available.

A Timely Fable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, a modern fable with a strong point to make appeared on March 31. The newsletter of our able colleague from Texas, Hon. JIM WRIGHT, offers a subtle, but most effective, explanation of one of the most controversial transactions of modern times.

I heartily commend this document to my colleagues as enjoyable, enlightening, and eloquent literature.

The article follows:

A TIMELY FABLE

Once upon a time, in a fair and bountiful land where many animals lived, there stood a curious five-sided house. It nestled alongside a broad river in a big and majestic city.

In this house lived a mule, a goat, and a falcon. To them the other animals of the land had entrusted the job of protecting their country from an angry red bear which snorted the kind of fire from which the sun is made and, on occasion, thumped his shoe upon the table.

The mule, the goat, and the falcon all were anxious to protect the land, but among themselves they were very quarrelsome. Each had his own idea on how to defeat the red bear in case he should attack.

"I shall meet him on the land, and with my great mobility and firepower, I shall kick him to death," brayed the mule, flecking a bit of lint from his forest green suit.

"Tut, tut, there will be no need of that" sneered the goat, who was resplendent in his dark blue suit with gold stripes. "My specialty is the sea, and if the bear ever threatens our shores, I shall butt him right out of the water."

"Nonsense," jeered the falcon, proudly displaying the silver wings on his light blue suit. "If the bear should attack, I shall fly to his homeland, peck out his eyes and destroy his ability to fight."

So it went for many years, with the three animals incessantly bickering among themselves.

Nowhere did these arguments cause more concern than on a gentle hill which lay just across the river. Here lived a great herd of donkeys and elephants. Even though they themselves were not immune from petty jealousies, they realized there was a desperate need to eliminate the tumult within the great five-sided house. After the donkeys had done much braying and the elephants had done much trumpeting, they decided that another animal should be chosen to take complete charge of the occupants of the five-sided house.

Now it happened that in a large white house not far from the hill there lived an eagle. It was decided to let the eagle choose the animal to be in charge of the five-sided house, provided, of course, that the donkeys and the elephants approved of the eagle's choice.

Many years passed, and several different eagles moved in and out of the large white house. Each eagle chose an animal to live in the five-sided house. Alas, however, the mule, the goat, and the falcon never really stopped their bickering. They seemed to resent every animal that was put in charge of them, and each continued to go pretty much his own way.

Finally one day a new eagle moved into the large white house. This eagle had some very definite ideas about the animal that should be put in charge of the five-sided house. He wanted a wise, but young, owl.

It so happened that just such an owl lived in a busy city to the west. This owl made a living by providing engines to be used in crossing narrow inlets on the shore of a large lake, the Fjord Motor Co., some animals called it.

The owl consented to take charge of the five-sided house, and the animals on the hill generally approved.

"He's very wise," nodded the donkeys.

"And he can bring to the house the valuable cost-cutting lessons he learned in private enterprise," trumpeted the elephants.

Soon after moving into the five-sided house the owl discovered that the goat and the falcon were planning to buy new swords. Separate kinds, of course.

"Why can't you both buy the same type of sword and save money?" the owl asked.

"That's quite impossible," said the goat with a patronizing smile. "Yes, quite," agreed the falcon. When the owl asked why, the goat tried to explain.

"You see, my sword is to be used at sea," he said. "I have always bought a sword shaped sort of like a 'T'."

"And my sword," put in the falcon, "is to be used for the air and must have something of an 'F' shape."

The wise young owl pulled a slide rule out from under his wing and appeared quite thoughtful. "Perhaps an 'X' shaped sword might serve you both," he observed. "We could call it the TFX, and it would save a billion dollars."

Panic gripped the goat and the falcon.

"It won't work," cried one.

"It's never been done before," shrieked the other.

The owl consulted his slide rule again. "Nevertheless I think we should try it. Even though the TFX might not exactly suit your individual preferences, I will promise you that it will provide a far better sword than either of you now has."

Crestfallen and bitter, the goat and the falcon left the owl.

"Whatever shall we do?" cried the goat.

"We shall march straight to the Hill and complain to our powerful friends," said the falcon. "One of the donkeys is a particularly close friend of mine."

The goat appeared puzzled. "But aren't the elephants and the donkeys on the Hill also very close friends of the owl?" he asked.

"They have been," the falcon gloated. "But they may change their minds if we tell them that the owl is robbing us of an effective means of protecting the country, and that it would be cheaper and better to build two different swords."

"But is that true?" demanded the goat.

"Sure it is," smirked the falcon, winking and nudging the goat in the ribs. "Sure it is."

Moral: As long as we're going to have an owl, we ought to believe in him because he seems to be the only one who gives a hoot.

Accelerated Public Works Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Members of the House of Representatives will consider the 1963 supplemental appropriation bill.

In my opinion, based upon personal experience, it is essential that Congress appropriate the full $500 million requested by the President of the United States in order to continue the vital accelerated public works program, as authorized during the 87th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, immediately following the 1962 general election my office arranged and participated in a public meeting in each of the seven counties of the Fifth Congressional District to explain the Accelerated Public Works Act. Because of the extremely high percentage of existing unemployment, I knew the accelerated public works program would provide the only method available for our citizens to help themselves. This act made possible urgently needed temporary employment and at the same time made it possible for our local officials to improve local living conditions.

Our citizens have done all within their resources to create new and permanent private employment. Our unemployed, who are denied gainful employment through no fault of their own, are anxious to have an opportunity to work and support their families.

Because of continued increased unemployment, our community, city, and county officials have been forced to reduce essential services due to the fact they have no way to obtain local funds because of their decreased income. However, they have carefully considered the accelerated public works program and following detailed studies they have submitted applications for quite a few fully justified public projects. In each case our local officials have been able to arrange the required local financing because of the benefits provided by this program.

Not only in the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia but also throughout the United States our local citizens have demonstrated their initiative and desire to improve their local areas. These public-spirited citizens have applications pending for Federal funds exceeding twice the amount requested. Unless the Congress appropriates the full $500 million as requested, our local citizens, who have worked so hard to do their part, will be discouraged, and failure to appropriate these funds will justify the fact that the efforts extended to improve local conditions will have been in vain.

Each of these communities, I might add, has expended funds in properly preparing their applications and because of the provisions of the act as previously authorized by the Congress, they fully expected that carefully chosen improvements would be approved. Without additional Federal funds these communities cannot move forward, simply because they do not have the financial resources. In this connection, I have worked closely with the officials of the Area Redevelopment Administration and other participating Federal agencies in following every application through each step. I have respect for these Federal officials for the completely fair and dedicated manner in which they have been doing a most difficult job. To my personal knowledge these officials have worked long hours, including Saturdays and Sundays, in an effort to process those applications which afford the greatest benefit for each dollar expended by the Federal Government.

Just last month southern West Virginia suffered the most disastrous floods in our history. These Federal officials came to see firsthand the unsurpassed damages. Some of our pending applications are in more urgent need now because of this disaster. I have seen firsthand the effectiveness of the accomplishment so far of the officials of the Area Redevelopment Administration and other agencies.

When it is considered that we have nearly one-third of our counties in the United States adversely affected by persistent and substantial unemployment, no one can successfully challenge the

fact that we do have a major internal problem. I am firmly convinced that the accelerated public works program, Federal participation with local governments, is a very important investment in the future of our Nation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully plead with the Members of the House to vote the full $500 million for the continuation of the accelerated public works program. It is my firm conviction that we have an obligation to our citizens in these areas and to our future generations to appropriate these funds in order that our citizens may be able to help themselves and continue to look forward.

Senator Tower Explains the ABC's of Conservatism to a Liberal Texas Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the April 6, 1963, issue of Human Events includes an excellent article entitled "Senator Tower Explains the ABC's of Conservatism to a Liberal Texas Editor."

The Senator's letter to the editor of the Texas Observer does a great deal to place the issue of liberalism versus conservatism in proper perspective:

SENATOR TOWER EXPLAINS THE ABC'S OF CONSERVATISM TO A LIBERAL TEXAS EDITOR

Mr. RONNIE DUGGER,
The Texas Observer,
Austin, Tex.

DEAR RONNIE: I am flattered that the Texas Observer has asked me to do something on my fundamental beliefs. In your note to me, asking me to do this piece, you observed that "* * * our readers have so little, substantially, in common with you." However, I am always glad to speak or write under critical, as well as favorable circumstances.

Too, I remember a line from Rudyard Kipling: "They cannot know England who only England know." Perhaps some exposure to an honestly expressed conservative viewpoint may cause some of my liberal friends to take better stock of their own positions.

At the outset, I should note that, too often, the doctrinaire liberal or the doctrinaire conservative tends to state his case in a manner that would convey the impression that he is God, dictating the Ten Commandments to Moses. I'm as guilty of this as anyone.

So, perhaps I should start with a little disarming humility and say that that I am aware that I have no monopoly on truth and, although political philosophies are things to which insincere men may, from time to time, repair for the sake of political expediency, I will concede the intellectual honesty of those who might be properly regarded as the real opinion leaders of the liberal movement.

LIBERALS POSSESSED OF A MASSIVE CONCEIT

How ver, it occurs to me that they are possessed of a massive conceit. As the attitude toward people low on the socioeconomic scale on the part of the old Tory Democrats of the last century may have been condescendingly philanthropic, so, too, the attitude of the American 20th century so-called liberal is one that sometimes appears to border on contempt for the ability of people in a society to regulate themselves.

Liberal intellectuals cling to the ancient notion that there must be a ruling elite which uses the coercive authority of the state as a means of ordering the lives and destinies of men, through complete planning of the political, economic and social processes.

As I see it, the function of Government is to preserve order in society—not to order society.

It is no more accurate to caricature the conservative as a bloated, greedy, avaricious moneybags, bent on the preservation of privilege and the exploitation of the poor, than it is to caricature the liberal as a bewhiskered, red-eyed, bomb-throwing anarchist.

Assuming that the liberal and the conservative have mutually compatible goals: to wit, the elevation of the whole condition of mankind, the enhancement of the individual dignity of man, consistent with our Judeo-Christian system of ethics, morality and humanity, the difference lies in the approach, the conservative being libertarian, the liberal, essentially egalitarian.

GOVERNMENT PLANNING GUESSWORK AT BEST

In the eyes of the conservative, the liberal approach, too often, becomes an end unto itself and is, therefore, destructive of the goal. The achievement of complete "equality," and its maintenance, it seems to me, would necessarily require substantial sacrifice of individual liberty and freedom of choice.

It appears to me the liberals are bent on the establishment of a system which would marshal the wealth and resources of the land and redistribute them in the form of welfare benefits and public works. While some liberals may not consciously seek the establishment of a Socialist state in America, I believe that many of the programs they advocate establish a trend in that direction.

In seeking the establishment of a planned economy, the liberal apparently fails to take into consideration the fact that capitalism, or the market-regulated economy, has proved to be the most productive system and has afforded the highest standard of living.

Government planning, as one wise man has observed, is not a mature way to organize an economy. It is unproven; it is educated guesswork at best. Carried to its ultimate, it is necessarily tyrannical in character in that it essentially determines what will be produced and consumed, at what jobs people will work and what compensations they will receive.

A market-regulated economy preserves the democracy of the marketplace in which people, by the manner in which they spend their dollars, in effect determine what goods and services will be produced.

A system in which taxes become confiscatory, in which there is extensive government competition with business, or at its worst, one in which the means of production, distribution, and exchange are nationalized, not only denies a certain amount of freedom of choice, it destroys incentive.

I am aware that conservatives are very often accused of placing property rights before human rights. I deny the allegation and defy the alleger. I consider that the right to own and exploit property for private subsistence, or gain, is an essential human right. It prevents the citizenry from being reduced to a status of complete dependency on the government.

I submit, further, that the honest and consistent conservative has equally high regard for other rights which those of us living in an Anglo-Saxon society have grown to expect, such as freedom of speech, press, assembly and worship. We believe in elaborate safeguards for the accused and equality in the eyes of the law.

On that last point, was it Anatole France who cynically said, "The law in its majestic equality prohibits the rich man from begging alms and sleeping under bridges, as well as the poor man"? I don't believe this comment could characterize our legal and political system, as the conservative thinks it should be. We do not seek to foster or preserve privilege.

INTENSE TAXATION PENALIZES SUCCESS

Consistent with our notion that government should preserve order in society and should foster a climate of freedom and growth, we approve such measures as antitrust laws and other legislation designed to protect the general citizenry against the unscrupulous and the greedy—laws that create a climate of opportunity for all the people, regardless of station or origin. In short, we seek a society in which all men can aspire to be successful and have some reasonable chance of realizing that aspiration.

We, therefore, resent a system of taxation and expenditure that penalizes success and encourages indolence, a regulatory system that will prevent one segment of the society from abusing its economic power—but, at the same time, allow, indeed, even encourage another segment to abuse its power with impunity.

Conservatives cling to the idea that ours is, historically has been, and ought to be, a classless society—one in which people move freely and without prejudice up and down the socioeconomic ladder. We are righteously, rightfully indignant at those who foment class war for political purposes.

It should be obvious to any but the most ignorant that the best interests of the working man are closely identified with the best interests of the proprietors and managers. Certainly, there are legitimate differences between labor and management on hours, wages, and working conditions. But generally, where a favorable climate for business exists, where business prospers, the working man prospers also.

MUST THERE ALWAYS BE ALTERNATIVES?

Too often, the cry is raised that we are "aginners"; we are nonprogressive because we oppose programs and proposals which are propounded by the administration. "What are you for?" we are asked.

We are for individual liberty and freedom of choice. We are for a market-regulated economy. We are for the responsibilities of government devolving on those organisms of government that are closest to the people. We therefore oppose that which is destructive of what we are for.

Being in the minority, it is our duty to oppose that which we consider to be conducive to the establishment of dangerous trends. When, and if, we succeed to a majority position, then we will propound our own programs—then it will be the liberals who have to hazard the accusations of obstructivism and negativism.

It is often suggested that we have no alternatives to the proposals of this administration. Why should we oppose bad proposals with programs and proposals that are less bad? Must there always be alternatives?

Well, Ronnie, that about wraps it up. I've probably left out a great deal that I should have said; but I hope this will give your readers some insight into the conservative mentality. We are not without humane feelings; we love our children; we support humanitarian causes; we give as generously of our time and energies to the betterment of our communities as the liberals do—perhaps more so.

We do not deny that responsibilities for the care of the indigent, the education of our children, and the elevation of the whole state of our society, exist. We simply believe that they should devolve on the individual, the

family, the community, the local or State government to the maximum degree possible.

Many thanks to you and the Texas Observer for giving me this forum. It is a tribute to your desire to be fairminded.

Very truly yours,

JOHN G. TOWER.

Sites in Washington, D.C., With Facilities for the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, annually Washington, D.C., plays host to over 10 million visitors. Of this number, many are handicapped and disabled. A request from a handicapped constituent regarding the facilities available to him at the various sites in Washington, D.C., made it apparent to me that a list of such facilities would be of value. Therefore, I would like to make known to the general public the following list of sites in Washington, D.C., with information concerning the facilities they provide for handicapped sightseers.

Aquarium: Basement of Commerce Building, 14th Street between E and Constitution NW., Sterling 3-9200. Open 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily and Sunday. Wheelchairs for the handicapped are not provided. The entrance of the Commerce Building has a few stairs. A ramp, however, at the rear of the building on Constitution Avenue provides access to the elevator. Special arrangements may be made by calling in advance.

Arlington National Cemetery: Jackson 2-3000. The grounds are open daily and Sunday, October through March, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.; April through September, 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. Located here are the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, the Amphitheater and the Custis-Lee Mansion. There is a change of guard at the Tomb every hour on the hour. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. However, members of the staff, if contacted in advance, will usher handicapped persons around.

Botanic Gardens: First and Maryland Avenue SW., Capitol 4-3121, extension 6520. Open Sunday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Open Saturday 9 a.m. until 12 noon. One wheelchair is provided for the use of handicapped persons. The building entrance consists of five stairs. There is no ramp. Special arrangements may be made by calling in advance.

Bureau of Printing and Engraving: 14th and C Streets SW., Executive 3-6400, extension 7514. Open Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 11 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. to 2 p.m., with the exception of holidays. Conducted tours are available. The Bureau provides wheelchairs for visitors because ordinary wheelchairs are too wide for the ramps. A system of ramps makes it possible for handicapped persons to avoid stairs. If desired, wheelchair service from one's automobile to the building can be arranged by calling in advance.

Capitol: Capitol Hill, Capitol 4-3121. Open daily and Sunday, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Open to those who hold passes to the gallery if Congress is in session until one-half hour after adjournment. Tours are available from 9 a.m. to 3:55 p.m. with groups forming every 15 minutes. The guide service is 25 cents for persons 10 years and older. The Capitol provides many wheelchairs for the handicapped. Several elevators and ramps make the Capitol accessible to the handicapped. Special arrangements for tours may be made by calling in advance.

Corcoran Gallery of Art: 17th Street and New York Avenue NW., Metropolitan 8-3211. Closed Monday, open Tuesday through Friday, 10 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; Saturday, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; Sundays and holidays, 2 to 5 p.m. The gallery provides one wheelchair. A ramp entrance is available at the service entrance on E Street and should be arranged for by calling in advance.

Custis-Lee Mansion: Jackson 2-3000, extension 2146. Open daily 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., October through March; 9:30 a.m. to 6 p.m., April through September. Admission is 25 cents per person; persons under 18 years of age may be admitted free. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. The mansion has several steep steps which might cause difficulties for the handicapped. However, the staff is willing to provide personal assistance and tours for the handicapped if contacted in advance.

Dumbarton Oaks: 1703 32d Street NW., Adams 2-3101. The gardens are open Monday through Saturday, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.; Sundays and holidays, 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. One wheelchair is provided for the handicapped, although several steps in the garden make sightseeing difficult for the severely handicapped. In the fall 1963, two museums are scheduled to be opened. The entrance of one will have no steps, while the entrance of the other will have approximately three steps.

Federal Bureau of Investigation: 9th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Executive 3-7100. Open Monday through Friday, 9:15 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Tours start every 15 minutes and last approximately 1 hour. Advance reservations are necessary for large groups. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. However, there are no stairs at the entrance of the building, and most of the stairs inside of the building can be avoided by using elevators. We are informed by the Bureau that handicapped persons should try to avoid the peak tourist seasons. Special arrangements may be made by calling in advance.

Folger-Shakespeare Library: 201 East Capitol Street, Lincoln 6-4800. Open Monday through Saturday, 10 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. However, there is a ramp at the entrance. It is not necessary to make advance arrangements.

Ford's Theatre—Lincoln Museum: 10th Street between E and F NW., Republic 7-1820, extension 2565. Open Monday through Saturday, 9 a.m. to 9 p.m.; Sundays and holidays, 12:30 p.m. to 9 p.m. The building in which Lincoln died is directly across the street and is open Monday through Saturday, 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.; Sundays and holidays 12:30 to 5:30 p.m. Admission to each building is 10 cents. Persons 18 years of age and under are admitted free. No arrangements are made for the handicapped. There are five or six short steps at the entrance to the Museum. Special arrangements may be made by calling in advance.

Franciscan Monastery: 14th and Quincy Streets NW., Lawrence 6-6800. Tours are conducted from 9 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. daily. No wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped; however, a long ramp extends along the side of the main church. It is not possible for a person in a wheelchair to enter the catacombs. Special plans for a large group should be made by calling in advance.

Jefferson Memorial: South Bank of the Tidal Basin, Republic 7-1820, extension 2145. Open daily and Sunday, 8 a.m. to 12 midnight. Special tours are available and may be arranged by calling in advance. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. However, the guards will assist handicapped persons if requested to do so.

Library of Congress: First Street and Independence Avenue SE., Sterling 3-0400. The exhibit halls are open Monday through Saturday, 9 a.m. to 10 p.m.; Sunday, 11:30 a.m. to 6 p.m. Wheelchairs are available for handicapped persons. The guards will assist in lifting the chair if necessary. A special parking place in front of the building and special tours may be arranged in advance by calling the Stack and Readers' Division.

Lincoln Memorial: West Potomac Park at the foot of 23d Street NW., Republic 7-1820, extension 2573. Open daily and Sunday, 8 a.m. to 12 midnight throughout the year. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. Personal help from the guards is available if requested. Blind persons may take their dogs into the memorial and may touch the pedestal.

Medical Museum, Armed Forces Institute of Pathology: 9th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Republic 7-6700, extension 64768. Open daily and Sunday from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. One wheelchair is available. The entrance consists of several stairs, and no ramp is available. Two exhibit halls are located on the second floor and are accessible only by a staircase.

Mount Vernon: Mount Vernon, Va., South 5-2000. Open daily and Sunday, March through September, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.; October through February, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Adult admission is 75 cents. The admission for school groups and children, grades 7-12, is 40 cents. Children under 12 years of age and school groups, grades 1-6, are admitted free. A number of wheelchairs are available for the handicapped. It is possible to arrange by calling in advance for a station wagon to meet and pick up handicapped persons

at the gate as well as at the boat. The staff at Mount Vernon is able to provide better service for the handicapped persons during the nonpeak tourist seasons.

National Archives: Seventh Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Worth 3-1110. Open 9 a.m. to 10 p.m. weekdays; 1 p.m. to 10 p.m. Sundays and holidays. Wheelchairs are not provided for the handicapped. However, a ramp is available at the Seventh Street entrance, and may be used if arrangements are made in advance. Special tours may also be arranged by calling in advance.

National Gallery of Art—Mellon Gallery: Sixth Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Republic 7-4215. Open daily 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.; Sundays, 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. There is a concert every Sunday evening at 8 p.m. in the east garden court starting in September and ending in June. Wheelchairs are provided for handicapped persons. There are no stairs at the entrance on Constitution Avenue. Special tours may be arranged in advance only when a group consists of more than 15 persons.

National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception: Fourth Street and Michigan Avenue NE., Lawrence 6-8300. Open daily 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. Sunday masses are held at 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 noon. Free guided tours are available every half hour. One wheelchair is provided for handicapped persons. The entrance to the building has no stairs. Elevators may be used in the building. Special tours may be arranged by calling in advance.

National Wax Museum: 500 26th Street NW., at E Street, National 8-2996. Open daily and Sunday, 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. The museum features monuments and personalities in American history. Admission: adults, 75 cents; children 6 through 12, 50 cents; children under 6, free. Wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped. There are no stairs at the entrance of the building. During the nonpeak tourist season special tours may be arranged by calling in advance.

Naval Observatory: 34th Street and Massachusetts Avenue NW., Decatur 2-9013. Open Monday through Friday for conducted tours at 2 p.m. only. For groups of 10 or more special advance arrangements should be made. No special facilities are provided for the handicapped. There are stairs at the entrance of the main building. Much walking, including several inclines, is required between the three buildings visited on the guided tour.

Smithsonian Institution Group: National 8-1810. Arts and Industries Building, Ninth Street and Jefferson Drive SW. Museum of Natural History, 10th Street and Constitution Avenue NW. Smithsonian Building, 10th Street and Jefferson Drive SW. Freer Gallery of Art, 12th Street and Independence Avenue SW. All of the above buildings are open daily and Sunday, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Wheelchairs are provided at the entrance of each building for handicapped persons. The entrances of many of the buildings have no stairs; however, not all of the buildings have elevators. In the past, special tours for the blind have been arranged and special exhibits prepared. Special arrangements may be made by calling extension 542 or 543.

Supreme Court: First, and Maryland Avenue NE., Executive 3-1640. Open Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; Saturday, 9 a.m. to 12 noon. Conducted tours are available every 15 minutes except when the Court is in session. No special facilities are provided for handicapped persons. However, if advance reservations are made with the Marshal's Office—extension 281 or 282—the South Drive on Second Street can be used for easy access to the elevator. Special tours may also be arranged by calling the Marshal's Office in advance.

Washington Cathedral: Wisconsin Avenue and Woodley Road NW., Woodley 6-3500. Services are held Sunday, 7:30 a.m., 9 a.m., 11 a.m., and 4 p.m. Conducted tours are available daily, 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., and on Sunday, after 11 a.m. The cathedral and the Bishop's Garden are open from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily and Sunday. The Memorial and Tomb of Woodrow Wilson, the only President buried in Washington, D.C., are located in the cathedral. Wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped. Handicapped persons should enter the cathedral at the west entrance because it has no stairs. Special tours may be arranged by calling in advance.

Washington Monument: On the Mall at 15th Street, Republic 7-1820, extension 2840. Open daily, March 20 through Labor Day, 8 a.m. to 11 p.m. Open daily, Labor Day to March 20, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. The elevator fee is 10 cents for visitors 19 years and older. No wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped. However, special priviliges are given the handicapped in use of the elevator. It is possible for persons in wheelchairs to ride the elevator to the observation point at the top of the Monument.

White House: 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., National 8-1414. Open Tuesday through Friday, 10 a.m. to 12 noon; Saturday, 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. One wheelchair is provided for the handicapped. The elevator may be used. Special arrangements should be made in advance through one's Senator or Congressman.

Zoological Park: 3000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Columbia 5-0743. The buildings are open during November through April, 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; May through October, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. The grounds are open throughout the year from daylight to dark. A limited number of wheelchairs are provided for the handicapped. Many ramps have been constructed in order that handicapped persons may avoid stairs. It is possible to secure directions from the Park Police for seeing maximum part of the park with the minimum effort. Special arrangements for the tour should be made by calling in advance. The park has restaurant facilities, and special arrangements for handicapped persons or groups of handicapped may be made by contacting Mr. Leech at Columbia 5-9434 or Columbia 5-3231.

Sightseeing at the Zoological Park is easier for handicapped persons during the summer months as the animals are kept out of doors and it is not necessary to enter the buildings.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 1963

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Robert Blakely McNeill, minister, Bream Memorial Presbyterian Church, Charleston, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of all nations, whose lordship of the conscience is the basis of our freedom, whose grace confers dignity upon each person, and whose love is the ground of all human affection, look with favor upon those who dare grip the somber issues of our time.

In the intensity of daily conflict, if there is difference of opinion, let there be unity of spirit; if there is diversity of approach, let there be concurrence in purpose, strength in conviction, tolerance of opposition, malice toward none, and charity toward all.

We pray not for world dominion, but for world peace; not for power to destroy, but for a genius to reconcile; not for the right to judge others, but for the right to be judged aright by Thee.

Make of this Nation a sanctuary of good will, a priest of charity, and a prophet of a hopeful future.

We have not forgotten, O God, that this Government is but an assemblage of men, subject to every whim and weakness of human aspiration. Hear the prayers of each of them as they plead for wisdom, stamina, and integrity sufficient for the requirements of this day. Let Thy wisdom become their statecraft, and Thy sovereignty their urgency. We pray this in Thy holy name and spirit. Amen.

THE WILDERNESS ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate S. 4, the so-called Wilderness Act, with respect to which there is a limitation on debate of 1 hour on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Under the limitation, who is to be in charge of the time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proponent of any amendment will be in control of the time available to those who favor the amendment. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] will be in control of the time available to those in opposition to an amendment. The two